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# ABSTRACT

This study investigated the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango (ASUL), Uganda.

The specific objectives were: to examine the contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff at ASUL, to assess the contribution of faculty appraisal to the performance of academic staff at ASUL, and to ascertain the contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. The study was guided by the Equity Theory and Goal Setting Theory, and related literatures reviewed. A cross-sectional survey design involving both quantitative and qualitative data collection was employed. Overall, 186 respondents comprising of 7 university administrators, 26 academic staff and 153 students were assessed. Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient was used to test the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Findings demonstrated that evaluation by students, faculty appraisal as well as feedback contributed significantly to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Regression analysis for students and academic staff responses indicated that 13.5% and 50.3%, respectively of the variations in the performance of academic staff at ASUL is explained by feedback, evaluation by students and faculty appraisal with feedback being the best predictor.

The study concluded that appraisal practices significantly contribute to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango. Based on the findings and conclusions, the study recommends that: Performance appraisal should not only be conducted to rate the performance of academic staff in the past period but the focus should be to strengthen areas of success and improve on areas of weakness in the future. There should be continuous discussion sessions between the university administrators and the teaching staff on matters regarding performance appraisal.

# CHAPTER ONE

# INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Introduction

This study aimed at investigating the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango (ASUL). ASUL was established through a provisional license issued by the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) on the 3rd, March 2008. The chapter provides insight into the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, research hypotheses, conceptual frame work, scope, significance, justification of the study, operational definitions of key concepts and conclusion.

## 1.2 Background of the Study

Performance appraisal is a vital tool used to evaluate human resource and align it to the strategic objectives of an institution. In higher education institutions performance appraisal has a crucial role in reforming the functioning of educational system and productivity of academic staff as well as the overall quality of education. According to Pienaar (2008), academic profession is fundamental to the functioning of any university. Without well qualified and committed academic staff, no academic institution can have a sustainable and quality education system. Higher education institutions are therefore more dependent on the intellectual, creative abilities and commitment of academic staff than other organizations. This study considered academic staff as key stake holders whose performances are to be appraised. The study explored the historical, theoretical, conceptual and contextual perspectives.

## 1.2.1 Historical Perspective

Performance appraisal systems are always of imperative concern to any organization while managing its human resources. Although higher education institutions depend upon both academic and non-academic staff working in it, major responsibilities come upon academic staffs that are the source of students’ knowledge, learning and development. The need for academic staff performance management compels these institutions to have systematic appraisal systems to administer, evaluate and enhance the performance of academic staff.

Universities have continued to play important roles in the provision and the development of man power required for the social, economic and technological advancement of nations worldwide. Central to the realization of university goals and objectives are the academic staff whose roles are crucial and their number, quality and effectiveness have made the difference in the university education production function and to their wider society (Kuttunen, 2003).

Appraisal and management of performance has recently attracted much attention in the European universities and colleges. With increase in the number of students, total costs have risen and, with limited state funding, there is strong competition for money among various social services therefore much more attention has to be paid to the quality of performance and the Total Quality Management (TQM) in higher education institutions. Higher education is one of the major service sectors that have been slow in transition into quality management. Universities and other tertiary institutions have generally had a superficial awareness of TQM (McCarthy & Keefe 1999).

Staff appraisal systems were introduced in public universities in the 1980’s in the United Kingdom (UK) in order to facilitate universities’ flexibility to changes in economic conditions as well as to increase the quality and effectiveness of their performance. Majority of university staff were in favor of the new appraisal scheme although some concerns were expressed about the costliness and objectives of the appraisal process (Webber, 2003).

To improve the quality and standards of academic programs delivered by private colleges and to ensure comparability with universities, private colleges had to improve assessment processes generally. The use of external examining in the UK continues to be an essential to the process of ensuring that the degree awarded by the UK higher education institutions are of an appropriate academic standard (Hannan & Silver,2006).

According to Mok (2009), Quality issues surrounding Australian private higher education provision resulted in students protest about excess fees, quality of teaching, status of the degree being offered and a mismatch between promises and the reality of graduation. Salient lessons could be learned from the Polish experience which shows that private higher education may have negative impacts including low standard of teaching, institutions focusing on maximizing profit with many institutions experiencing serious staff shortages and a narrow focus on institutional governance (Jalowiecki, 2001).

In the African context, much of the expertise base of universities has been eroded to the extent that not enough teaching capacity is available to provide quality training for new generation of citizens. Many institutions are negatively affected by the fact that some African students who are studying abroad or academic staff who are sponsored to pursue further studies do not return because of pull and push factors (Tetty, 2006).

Osalusi et al., (2010) observes that brain drain was a phenomenon that afflicted the Nigerian university system most severely in the 1980’s through to the 21st century that country had lost its experienced academics to even smaller African countries such as Ghana, Uganda and Rwanda and bigger countries such as Britain, America, France and Germany.

In East Africa, qualified academic staff have resigned from Kenya public universities to secure better paying jobs abroad (Waswa et al. 2008). Brain drain among academic staff is real within both public and private universities and this has affected staff performance. Internal brain drain is also rampant with movement of highly skilled academicians to other sectors in the country (Gok, 2006). Naris et al., (2010) observed that every educational institution want to have a competitive edge in order to attract more students and potential employees. It is through improved performance of academic staff that they will be able to have competitive advantage by ensuring continuity in the provision of quality graduates and services.

A study by Makawiti (2011) on the perception of academic staff in Kenyan public universities on the application of performance appraisal results in training and promotion decisions revealed that 47.4% of academic staff believed that there was a training policy in place that probably could not have been related to performance appraisal results. He asserted that if well developed, staff development programmes in public universities could help foster employee commitment.

In Uganda, the rapid growth of universities and especially private universities and their subsequent responses to market forces of demand and supply have raised quality issues. The commercial motives of some universities have compromised their quality. As a result performance appraisal of academic staff has been institutionalized and it is the responsibility of each institution to adopt appropriate performance appraisal practices, (NCHE, 2008).

With regards to university education, Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports have focused on expanded access to higher education through students’ loan scheme, affirmative action, improved infrastructure and rationalization of academic programmes down playing teaching staff development (Republic of Uganda, Budget Report 2015/2016). Quality of academic staff is invaluable particularly in the prevailing circumstances whereby Uganda government is putting much emphasis in the development of science, technology, information and communication technology (ICT) and more importantly the development of oil and gas sector. On the whole university is the pinnacle of education in Uganda, training manpower vital for the economic, social, technological and political pillars of Vision 2040 (Republic of Uganda, 2013). Apart from addressing access, unlike that of teaching staff training at lower levels there is no focus on university staff development. Therefore it becomes critical for individual university managements to fill policy strategy gaps at the national level by instituting appropriate measures locally so as to contribute effectively to Vision 2040.

## 1.2.2 Theoretical Perspective

There are many theories advanced on performance appraisal as a basis for performance improvement strategies of employees in institutions. For this study the researcher limited himself to Equity and Goal Setting Theories.

Equity theory (Adams, 1963) is concerned with the perception people have about how they are treated as compared with others. Equity theory describes a social comparison process whereby individuals compare their inputs and outputs to that of others.

Equity theory was relevant in this study as it helped in the comparison of effective appraisal practices that academic staff feel they are comfortable with in enhancing their performance. The main weakness in this theory is the subjectivity of the comparison process. There is a tendency in human nature to distort their inputs especially in regard to efforts and hence become subjective when making comparison (Beardwell et al., 2007).

Goal setting theory (Locke & Latham, 1990) observes five goal setting principles that can improve the chances of success of employees. These are; clarity, commitment, challenge, feedback and task complexity. For these principles to be used effectively, an institution has to set clear and challenging goals and commit itself to achieving them. Feedback should be provided to the employees on their performance towards achieving these goals, and this should reflect on the progress of the employees as well, the complexity of the task to be considered through breaking down goals into smaller chunks which can be easily achieved.

The set goals give employees the challenge to utilize their knowledge, skills and potentials so that there is high chance of achieving them. The more challenging the goals, the more people will draw on their full repertoire of skills. When the goals of an organization are clear, then employees would know what they are trying to achieve. However, when the goals of an organization are vague, then employees may not realize what they have achieved. This theory was relevant in this study as it enabled to enforce the fact that for an appraisal system to succeed in improving on the performance of academic staff there must be achievable goals of the institution.

## 1.2.3 Conceptual Perspective

In this study the independent variable is the appraisal practices and the dependent variable is the performance of academic staff. Appraisal practices are the central pillars of performance management which has direct impact on an employee’s performance and ultimately affect the institutional performance and its objectives. Appraisal is usually done on a half yearly or yearly basis depending on the agreement between the appraisee and the appraiser. There are many decisions in modern organization that depend on performance appraisal (Davis, 2001). From the organization point of view, an important reason for performance appraisal is the principal of accountability of its employees. Responsibility and accountability must therefore be aligned at every level of the organization.

Performance appraisal is one of the most important components in the systematic approach of Human Resource Management (HRM). Performance appraisal is the process of assessing and evaluating the performance of employees according to the objectives of the organization, and it is used by organizations to promote work abilities and environment. It is the review of the different inputs of employees in an organization and a system of rewarding their contributions through monetary rewards or promotions. Wilson (2005) pointed that performance management is neither a technique nor a single step process. It can be considered as a single step process that include knowledge of employees about what their managers expect of them, their motivation to perform well, mentoring and evaluation of their performance to identify areas where improvements are needed.

The behavior of an employee is dependent on distinguished performance. A flexible and dynamic behavior varies from institution to institution depending on its administrative styles and techniques of getting work done through their employees, the process of decision making and the ways decisions are implemented without impacting on motivational levels of employees (Razak, 2011). When teachers perform well, students are high achievers and institution contributes more towards higher education.

Aguinis (2007) defines appraisal practices as activities that involve processes such as recognition of employees’ achievements, providing them regular feedback, and offering career development. Wilson (2005) supported the idea and observed that appraisal practices is a set of process involving assessing knowledge of employees about what their managers expect of them, their motivation to perform well, mentoring and evaluation of their performance aimed at identifying areas where improvements are needed.

Performance appraisal is a continuous process through which performance of employees are identified, measured and improved in the organization. Aswathappa (2008) asserted that appraisals are done to assess how well an individual performs on allocated tasks in order to identify their short comings and correct them. It enables managers to report on employee’s potentials for advancement to higher positions within the organization. What emerges from the above scholars are that, appraisal involves evaluation and setting effective feedback mechanisms.

According to Armstrong (2003), performance appraisal is the practice of evaluating individuals and team members through understanding and managing performance within an agreed frame work of planned goals, standards and competence requirements. To Cole (1997), appraisal is the systematic review of the work of an individual over a short period usually leading to the formulation of future plans to improve the performance of an employee at work place. Performance is the capacity to achieve desired results Webster (1993). Johnson (2006) observed that performance of a teacher is a set of activities carried out by the teacher to achieve the best results from the teacher’s endeavors, the indictors being; high achievement of students in academic work, high number of students graduating and the quality of graduates produced.

In this study, appraisal practices have been conceptualized as activities involving evaluation of academic staff by students, faculty appraisal and feedback aimed at improving the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango. For this study, evaluation of academic staff by students included the use of evaluation forms and attendance register. Faculty appraisal was limited to peer-review and self-rating while feedback included reports from university management and feedback from multiple sources (360-degree feedback).

In the view of the researcher, performance appraisal is a process by which superior evaluates and judges the work performance of a subordinate. Performance appraisal practices include the processes and procedures involved in implementing, managing and communicating the events involved in performance appraisal. In many cases it is a formal process and is part of human resource management policy. In this study, performance of academic staff was gauged in terms of executing the key functions of the university and was limited to effectiveness in teaching and research. Effectiveness in teaching comprised of regular attendance to students, high completion rate of students and timely assessments of students while effectiveness in research included the number of students supervised, number of research publications and the number of research grants attracted.

## 1.2.4 Contextual Perspective

The growth of private higher education institutions in Uganda can be attributed to government policies related to higher education, migration policies, growing Uganda population and student’s unmet demand to access higher education. Along with the challenges of meeting the needs of increased number of students, the sector as a whole faces significant challenges. As a result reforms are essential to ensure that higher education is competitive, credible and comparable to other developed countries, accessible and that it meets the changing needs of the government, employers, industry and the broader society.

According to NCHE (2008), the responsibilities of assuring quality in HEIs lie with each institution in partnership with NCHE. ASUL has adopted the use of various quality assurance mechanisms in order to make its operation relevant (ASUL Annual Performance Report, 2013). Appraisal of academic staff is done in all the departments and faculties. However there are a number of challenges faced in enforcing the staff appraisal. There are full-time and part-time categories of academic staff. Enforcing appraisal practices to part-time academic staff is extremely difficult as they are reluctant to be appraised whereas full-time academic staff comparatively adheres to the university policy.

National Council for Higher Education has expressed concern over the mushrooming universities and other tertiary institutions in Uganda; some not licensed and might operate irresponsibly and to a larger extent driven by commercial motives at the expense of quality education. NCHE further stresses the need for higher education to be subjected to global forces and to maintain high standards. Universities and Other Tertiary Institution Act (UOTIA, 2001) empowered NCHE to take appropriate action against such irresponsible or illegal universities.

ASUL is operating in line with the statutory frame work for HEIs in Uganda. The institution is licensed by the National Regulatory Agency for HEIs, the NCHE and all the academic programmes are accredited. Besides, the degree and diploma programmes, tailor-made certificate courses are also provided (ASUL Annual Management Report, 2013). However the schedules for academic programmes offered at ASUL hinder the smooth implementation of appraisal practices.

Currently at ASUL, there are three faculties namely; Faculty of Business and Management, Faculty of Social Sciences, and Faculty of Education with four study schedules namely, day, evening, weekends, and recess programmes. These study schedules are faced with challenges of inadequate facilities and competition for students and teaching staff with other mushrooming private and public tertiary institutions resulting from Uganda’s liberalization policy Kasozi (2004). Coordinating academic staff handling various academic programmes at ASUL is also challenging as majority are part-timers with better paid jobs and probably pay less attention to activities at ASUL.

## 1.3 Statement of the Problem

Performance appraisal is useful for evaluation and alignment of human resources to the strategic objectives of an institution (Watson, 2000). In Uganda, performance appraisal practices have been institutionalized (NCHE, 2008). ASUL has in place appraisal practices including evaluation by students, faculty appraisals and feedback as viable tools for taking decisions regarding promotions, trainings, salary increment and retirement (ASUL Strategic Plan, 2010-2030). Despite the above attempts, there seem to be a gap in the appraisal practices at ASUL as students have persistently expressed their dissatisfaction on the performance of academic staff in teaching and research (ASUL Council Report, 2013).

The existing appraisal practices at the institution appear to be so relaxed, and teaching staff are ineffective as evidenced by increasing rate of staff absenteeism for lectures, unavailability for consultations, irregular supervision of students’ research, late release of course works, examinations and research results (ASUL Student Guild Council Minutes, May 2014). This has resulted to students losing morale, scoring low grades and missing graduations. If this state of affairs continues to prevail, ASUL could experience violent students’ strike that may lead to closure of the institution. Whereas there may be other factors contributing to better performance of academic staff, appraisal practices was identified as a possible factor in this study. This prompted the researcher to investigate the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at ASUL, and this performance was measured in terms of effectiveness in teaching and research.

## 1.4 General Objective

The purpose of the study was to establish the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

## 1.4.1 Specific Objectives

The study aimed at achieving the following specific objectives:-

1. To examine the contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.
2. To assess the contribution of faculty appraisal to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.
3. To ascertain the contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

## 1.4.2 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:-

1. What is the contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff at ASUL?
2. Does faculty appraisal contribute to the performance of academic staff at ASUL?
3. What is the contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at ASUL?

## 

## 1.4.3 Research Hypotheses

The study was guided by the following hypotheses:-

1. Evaluation by students has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.
2. Faculty appraisal has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.
3. Feedback has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

## 1.5 Conceptual Frame Work

The conceptual frame work below depicts the relationship between the appraisal practices and the performance of academic staff at ASUL. The independent variable was the appraisal practices thatcomprised of evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback. The dependent variable was the performance of academic staff and it involved effectiveness in teaching and research.

**Independent Variable Dependent Variable**

**Appraisal practices Performance of academic staff**

**Evaluation by students**

-Evaluation forms  
-Attendance registers

**Effectiveness in Teaching**

-Regular attention to students  
-Completion rates of students  
-Timely assessment of students

**Effectiveness in Research**

-Number of students supervised.  
-Number of research publications  
-Research grants attracted

p

punctuality

**Faculty appraisal**

-Peer review  
- Self rating

**Feed back**

-University management  
- 360degree feed back

***Source:*** *Adopted and modified from Rogers (2003)*

Figure 1.1: A conceptual framework showing the relationship between appraisal practices and the performance of academic staff at ASUL

## 1.6 Scope of the Study

The study covered geographical, time and content scopes as given below:-

## **1.6.1 Geographical Scope**

The study was conducted at the main campus of All Saints University Lango (ASUL) located at St Augustine Community Centre, Plot Number 70-75 Obote Avenue, Lira Municipality, Uganda, East Africa.

## 1.6.2 Content Scope

The study content comprised of the appraisal practices as the independent variable, and was limited to; evaluation by students using evaluation forms and attendance register, faculty appraisal with peer-review and self-rating, and feedback informs of contributions by university management and multiple sources (360-degree feedback). The performance of academic staff measured by effectiveness in teaching and research was the dependent variable.

## 1.6.3 Time Scope

The study covered four years from 2011 to 2014. This period was considered appropriate because, from its establishment in 2008 ASUL had tremendous changes in its management (ASUL Council Report, 2013). The researcher believed that the period selected was sufficient to provide a basis for analysis of the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at ASUL since the institution would have gained stability in its management and operation.

## 1.7 Significance of the Study

The study anticipates that the findings and recommendations would be useful in the following areas:-

The Management of ASUL will be able to establish the general trend of staff performance and design appropriate performance appraisal strategy for its employees in order to achieve the objectives of the institution.

This study will be useful in human resource planning in terms of recruitment, training, retention, promotion, retirement and termination of contract of the employees at ASUL.

The Management of ASUL will be in position to assess the challenges of the existing employment policy and be in position to recruit qualified and experienced staff as a strategy to overcome the current challenges facing the management of higher education institutions.

The study is expected to contribute more knowledge to the existing literature on performance appraisal of employees in HEIs, as the researcher is aware that some scholars have conducted studies in this area.

The study will form a basis for further research on performance appraisal of academic staff in HEIs, as future researchers would be able to use materials in this piece of work that are relevant to theirs.

In addition, the study will be beneficial to the researcher as a requirement for the fulfillment of the award of a Master’s degree in Management Studies in Higher Education Leadership and Management of Uganda Management Institute.

Finally the study will enrich the knowledge of the researcher in higher education. This will aid him to practice higher education leadership and management.

## 1.8 Justification of the Study

The study was necessary for addressing the current challenges facing the quality of higher education in Uganda. Performance of academic staff is of great concern in HEIs because of its implications on the quality of education.

More so, education processes and procedures currently pursued at HEIs in Uganda do not meet popular expectations of the stakeholders and the public regarding quality standards. To remain relevant and be able to meet the expectations of stakeholders or offer quality education, HEIs have adopted systematic approaches such as performance appraisals.

This study aimed to explore the appraisal practices used at ASUL and their contributions to the performance of academic staff.

## 1.9 Operational Definitions of Key Terms

**Effectiveness**: refers to completing an assignment as programmed and giving timely feedback at ASUL.

**Efficiency**: is the use of learning/teaching materials carefully to achieve the objectives at ASUL.

**Feedback**: refers to communicating result of the appraisal activities to academic staff of ASUL on matters regarding to their performances.

**Training**: learning process designed to improve on the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

**Academic staff**:refers to a lecturer or teaching staff at ASUL.

**Appraiser**: is a person to evaluate the performance of a lecturer at ASUL through giving scores on an agreed set of activities over a specific length of time.

**Appraisee**: a lecturer whose performance is to be evaluated by the person or group of people given the duty to carry out the assessment at ASUL.

**Performance management**: refers to getting better results from staff by understanding and giving attention to planned activities at ASUL**.**

**Full time lecturers**: teaching staff working on a contract of more than three years at ASUL.

**360-degree feedback**:in this study refers to feedback to appraisal processes from various sources such as: students, academic staff and non-academic staff of ASUL and the public.

## 1.10 Summary

In this chapter the back ground of the study including its historical, theoretical, conceptual and contextual perspectives were discussed in line with the topic in the study. The problem statement was identified and from it the general and specific objectives were drawn. The researcher formulated research questions and hypotheses. The independent and dependent variables were conceptualized. To make the objectives achievable, the study was limited in its geographical, content, and time scopes. The significance and the justifications of the study were discussed and the operational key words defined. Scholarly literature of the study concepts will be reviewed in Chapter Two.

# CHAPTER TWO

# LITERATURE REVIEW

## 2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the review of the existing scholarly literature on performance appraisal. The review was to explore the study done by other researchers on similar topics to that under investigation, identify gaps, and suggest strategies to fill those gaps. The sources of literature reviewed included text books on performance appraisal, dissertations, journals and peer-reviewed articles. It focused on the theoretical and the actual literature reviewed, objective by objective and conclusions drawn.

## 2.2 Theoretical Review

This study was guided by two theories namely the Equity and Goal Setting Theories. It recognized theories advanced by other scholars that are useful to performance appraisal for instance Organizational Justice Theory, McGregor (1960) Theory X and Y which suggests that employees’ evaluations are directly mediated by managers’ attribute as to who is perceived to be in control of the employees’ performance. Herzberg’s (1959) Two Factor Theory argues that employees are motivated by internal values rather than values that are external to the work. In other words motivation to work is internally generated and is propelled by variables that are intrinsic to work which include achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement and growth. For this study Equity and Goal setting theories were more relevant.

There are a number of human resource (HR) practices that could be tested in relation to employee performance. Teseema & Soeters (2006) studied eight human resource practices and their relationship with perceived employee performance. These eight practices included recruitment and selection, placement, training, compensation, employee performance evaluation, promotion, grievance procedure and pension or social security. Huselid (1995) used eleven human resource practices in his study which were personnel selection, performance appraisal, incentive compensation, job design, grievance procedures, information sharing, attitude assessment, labour management participation, recruitment efforts, employee training and promotion criteria. This study examined the contribution of one of the HR practices i.e. appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. ASUL was established through a provisional License issued by the NCHE on 3rd, March 2008 and it still faces many management challenges including staff performance. This prompted the researcher to investigate the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

The researcher could not claim to be the first one to study appraisal practices and the performance of academic staff. Many previous scholars have researched in a similar area, for example Muwanguzi (2010) studied Appraisal practices and Teacher performance in the secondary schools of Nansana Town Council, Wakiso district. However this study did not involve students as one of the key appraisers in teachers’ performance appraisal process. Similarly, Namuddu (2010) studied Staff appraisal systems and teacher performance of Aga Khan Schools in Kampala district, Uganda. In this study, evaluation of teachers’ performances by students was not given attention. Notably in the above two studies, feedback was not given consideration as one of the appraisal practices that enhance teachers’ performance. The researcher intends to contribute in filling the above gaps through examining the appraisal practices that contribute to the performance of academic staff by taking a case of ASUL.

As mentioned earlier this study was guided by Equity and Goal Setting Theories, the relevance of these theories to this study are discussed below.

## 2.2.1 Equity Theory

Adams’ (1963) Equity Theory highlights the perception employees have on how they are treated compared with their counterparts working in similar organizations. This theory suggests that employees should be treated fairly without discrimination and they should have equal opportunities at work place. Equity theory further analyzes that in order for an employee to remain motivated on the job, he must believe that his work is fairly compensated as he will make comparison with his colleagues to determine fairness and whether justice prevails. Adam’s stated that if an employee believes that their work outputs are not equal or greater than their inputs then the employee will become de-motivated. Adams’ theory includes the assertion that when an employee is assessing whether the outputs they receive are fair, the employee will often compare their colleague’s work inputs and outputs with their own. The comparison will often be made among employees at a similar level in the organization.

Equity theory elaborated on the work of Homans (1961) as cited in Marie (2003) proposed that individuals make cognitive evaluations of the differences between their contributions and the resultant outcomes (economic or social compensation). Adams (1963) suggested that individuals go beyond a simple ranking system in their assessment of inputs to outputs to where they precisely quantify the equity or inequity of the comparison. The result of the evaluation or comparison is that the individual either feels inadequately, fairly or over compensated. In the study of performance appraisal, appraisal can be viewed as an outcome itself, or an input to the administrative decisions (Greenberg, 1986). Administrative outcomes include promotion, pay increase, training and career development opportunities.

Henle (2005) observed that with equity theory, employees compare their share of outcomes like pay, allowances, promotions and bonuses to inputs like skills, education and effort. When there is a mismatch between their inputs and outcomes, employees experience inequity hence poor performance. Therefore, Adams (1963) underpins the fact that employees compare their rewards with their counterparts in other organizations and if they are well remunerated, their performance is enhanced. Equity theory assumes that the perceptions people have about how they are treated as compared to others will enhance or decrease performance. It further emphasizes that people expect a fair return for what they contribute to the job.

## 

## 2.2.2 Goal Setting Theory

Latham & Locke (1990) Goal Setting Theory is applicable to performance appraisal. Goal setting theory states that if individuals set goals, they will be more motivated to perform. However in order for goal setting to be successful, the goals must be specific, relevant and challenging. In addition, individuals must be committed to the goals, must participate in the setting of the goals and most importantly must be provided with feedback on the progress of the goals. Goal setting theory emphasizes on performance management and setting of objectives against which performance can be measured.

According to Tough (2009) in her article “Setting Effective Performance Standards”, for an organization to be successful, the employer and employee must set and agree on the performance standards that will apply to each activity and how the standards will be achieved. Understanding the level of performance required gives the employee a sense of achievement which is a key ingredient to achieving performance standards, and it applies to all employees at all levels. Setting effective performance standards energizes and empowers the employees to take ownership of their positions (Aswathappa, 2003). The employers too, become energized and inspired to create a good working environment, and the performance of the organization goes up due to the fact that everyone knows what is expected of him/her, which provide certainty to move forward. Barrie and Sow (2008) claim that there must be standards of comparison, people need to know how well they are doing at their jobs and where they could improve. It is important to keep in mind that appraisals do not equate to criticism. It may be necessary to explain the importance of completing tasks within timelines or changing the techniques of doing a task. The arguments stressed the importance of set standards for appraisal systems to be effective. Unfortunately, many performance appraisals only frustrate the employees by adding more tasks to what appears to be an over loaded agenda.

Latham & Locke (1970) asserts that to achieve your goals, you have to focus your effort and attention to it as you progress and complete goals, but goals should be focused on major areas of responsibility. Greer et al. (2001) maintains that when people are involved in goal setting, they consider themselves responsible for their results, and achievement of their goals also depends upon the degree of support (resources, processes and systems) employees get from their management. Goal setting theory focuses on the setting of specific goals, performance standards, feedback and the general performance improvement of employees which is the central area of investigation in this study.

According to Rao (2008), setting quantifiable targets by an employee for the improvement of his performance in future is the best technique for performance planning. This is in agreement with Mullins (2010) who confirmed that goal setting theory has implications for managers and performance goals should be identified and set to direct behaviours and maintain motivation. To ensure high performance, goals should be set at a challenging but realistic level. In addition, to guarantee high performance, feedback should be given as means of checking goals attainment and as a basis for any revision of goals. When goals are set by the supervisors, the participation of those tasked with achievement is paramount. Based on the above arguments, the researcher feels that there is a gap in setting goals and objectives and probably irregularity in feedback to enhance the performance of academic staff at ASUL. This argument formed part of the issues which prompted the researcher to explore the appraisal practices which contribute to the perceived performance of teaching staff at ASUL.

## 2.3 Evaluation by students and the Performance of Academic Staff

Students play a significant role in improving quality in higher education. Their involvement helps to speed up the process of modernization and reform of higher education (Kasozi, 2003). Students can make accurate ratings of teachers and their ratings tend to agree with each other. The teachers who are rated best by students tend to obtain the highest students’ gain (Aigboje, 2007 & Emetarom, 2007). However, Awe (2009) pointed out that student ratings do not always agree with those of administrators and teachers. This agrees with Aigboje (2007) and Emetarom (2007). As a fact students are placed in better position to give correct information about their teachers on matters regarding their performance in teaching and research which is central to this study. In fact students tend to be more sincere and open when responding to issues concerning their studies and these are not always supported by teachers and administrators (Awe, 2009).

According to Goer (2008), in a survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness pointed that students are better judges of faculty effectiveness since they can assess areas such as: increased knowledge and comprehension, perceived changes to motivation towards subject taught, observe teacher behaviour relevant to competent teaching such as punctuality, student consumerism and information not relevant to competent teaching but important to students such as class attendance policy, course work and available reading materials.

Oyoo & Bwoga (2009) in their study on post graduate students’ perception on an exemplary teacher observed that a teacher with competencies such as work planning, class-room practices and management skills scores highly. In the view of the researcher students can give correct information regarding the performance of their teachers especially in class room activities. In line with the above arguments, evaluation by students becomes a very important tool for appraising teaching staff. It is upon these arguments that the researcher selected evaluation by students as one of the dimensions under independent variable.

Appraising academic staff through student evaluation forms can help to improve on their current performance. This appraisal strategy brings out areas of weaknesses and strengths of teaching staff. University management can utilize this to design appropriate performance appraisal tools in a bid to achieve the set goals of the institution, provide feedback, increase motivation, and identify training needs. It is important for a person to know what is expected of him/her (Torrington and Hall, 2002). It is in line with this analysis that the study attempted to explore the contribution of assessment of academic staff by students to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Quality assurance is a continuous process by which an institution of higher learning can guarantee that the standards and quality of its educational provisions are being maintained and enhanced (Stand, 2008). Quality of the graduates depends on the inputs from the academic staff. It is therefore the responsibility of the university management to employ appropriate quality assurance mechanisms in a bid to improve performance of academic staff so that they are in position to provide quality teaching, research and community service within a rapidly changing environment.

In Higher Education Institutions, quality of staff is derived from the quality of teaching, resource availability and students rating of teaching (NCHE, 2008). This area contains mainly computations of teaching load distributions between full-time and part-time academic staff. The assumption made is that part-time academic staff are only employed when the fulltime academic staffs have been allocated teaching hours corresponding to the maximum recommended work load. Quality of teaching is computed from resources available, quality of staff and staff capacity indicators. The staff capacity indicator was envisioned in this study due to the fact that both full-time and part-time academic staff constitutes the current staff to student ratio at ASUL, yet part-time academic staff are contracted only when teaching needs arise.

Ralph (2008) identified five criteria upon which quality teaching can be judged, these were commitment to learners, knowledge of the materials, organization and management of the environment, desire to improve, and collaboration. He concluded that exemplary university teaching is discernable and the quality can be assessed using Likert scales. Based on this position, this study used Likert scales for students and academic staff questionnaires to establish the extent to which appraisal practices contribute to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Perception of students on quality of academic staff is very crucial in HEIs. These perceptions are the feeling of what they think about the quality, standards and levels of their teachers (teacher’s behavior, teaching competence, characteristics, attitudes etc). This is a situation whereby the students who gain directly from teaching, through direct contact with teachers are involved in rating the teachers by allowing them to express their feelings, perceptions or what they think and feel about their teachers and their performance. So to get more reliable measure of quality of lecturers in HEIs, students’ perception can be more favourable and consistent than any other practice (Sallies 2002, Okorie & Uche 2004). Aigboje (2007) observed that quality teaching makes it possible for students to achieve worthwhile educational objectives and outcome to the best of their abilities.

Excellence in educational outcome especially in universities demands that quality academic staff are recruited and properly developed to perform their roles in the areas of teaching, research and administrative tasks. The provision of adequate infrastructure, facilities, equipment, instructional materials, trained and dedicated academic staff, well-disciplined and motivated students and relevant curricular programmes will definitely enhance the quality of any institution if properly managed (Awe, 2009). The academic staff employed to teach students is expected to be academically qualified in his/her areas of specialization. In this study the academic staff quality is measured through students’ perception using the following teacher quality indicators, professional competence, communication skills, ability to impart knowledge, lecturers attitude to job, accessibility to students, usage of instructional materials, adequate facilities, leadership styles in dealing with the students, method of teaching and quality of supervision of students in research and related fields.

## 2.4 Faculty Appraisal and the Performance of Academic Staff

Staff appraisal is an important element in academic staff management. This is because every institution needs to attract and retain the best staff. One way of ensuring this is through regular evaluation of staff already recruited, and evaluating those who are being recruited.

Staff appraisal is also important in an organization as it enables workers to contribute willingly to their own quota of the job and promotes good inputs amongst employees and it serves several purposes including guiding human resource actions such as promotion, training, contracting, retention and retirement of employees**.** In this regard, faculty appraisal becomes a valuable way of providing feedback and clarification to the concerned staff members on the performance of their roles and responsibilities with the aims of assessing past performance, training and development needs and future potential (Baron,1979).

Mullins (2002) argued that appraising employee performance in an organization is often a complex and challenging task. He pointed that judgment about how individuals are performing are made even without formal performance appraisal system because people regularly make judgment about others. Performance appraisal should not be conducted carelessly because that would be counterproductive. It should be well planned and well executed. All those involved should be well prepared for the task. Officials to carryout evaluation should be well trained in what they ought to do and how this is to be done. In the view of Mani (2002) in his study conducted at East Carolina University, employees perceive appraisal system as a better tool for management decisions when they are satisfied with their supervisor and have trust in him. Roberts (2003) supported the idea and observed that it is important for employees to build trust on the fairness of performance appraisal system as this will make them accept the outcomes of the process. Otherwise if there is no transparency and fairness in the appraisal system, the outcomes will go as useless consequences by which the system becomes ineffective. Basing on this argument, performance appraisal is a vital ingredient that contributes significantly to the performance of an employee at work place.

Tziner & Cleveland (2001) observed that performance appraisal requirements which involve supervision and taking risks like low rating could harm the employee’s participation, thus de-motivating the employee, an idea which Kwamine (2004) disagreed. He observed that appraisal schemes encourage open communication between the supervisors and the subordinates which ultimately help to create effective cohesive work groups. Therefore appraisal practices help to generate accurate records of performance that helps in setting objectives upon which an employee’s performance is judged.

According to Longenecker (1999), there are many reasons why an organization needs a formal performance appraisal system. Most importantly a performance appraisal is needed to take smart decision regarding salary increases, promotions, demotions and transfers. Cokin (2004) put his opinion that performance appraisal system is important for organizations as it mainly focuses on employees to develop capabilities. Performance appraisal does not only do capacity building but also help managers in timely predictions and taking actions promptly to uncertain changes.

Through staff performance appraisal, employees offer high productivity and total commitment while their employers offer enhanced employability rather than long term employment (Aguinis, 2007). There arises a new psychological contract in which the deal between the employer and staff is different but still mutually beneficial. It enables workers to develop skills and experiences that are in demand and allows them opportunity to keep updated ready to obtain an appropriate job when no longer needed by their present employers (Werner, 2006). Unlike the aforementioned, this study focused on the contribution of appraisal practices on job performance of university academic staff.

In higher education, teaching is a scholarly and dynamic endeavour and covers a broad range of activities. HEIs have significant teaching responsibilities and quality of teaching is a major concern of their evaluation. It is the responsibility of each institution to design appropriate performance appraisal strategies to improve on the quality of education it offers in conformity with the set guidelines for the operation of universities and other tertiary institutions in Uganda (NCHE, 2008). As a result of management challenges facing most HEIs, there is poor implementation and supervision of appraisal activities. This study was therefore set to address the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

The performance appraisal and compensation has a crucial role in reforming the functioning of education system and productivity of academic staff as well as the overall quality of higher education. Valance (1999) claimed that performance appraisal is one of the most valuable instruments in the manager’s tool box as no other management has as much influence over individual’s careers and work lives. The faculty members’ motivation has become a very important resource to gain rapid changes in higher education in order to meet the transformation in the public demand. As quick changes increase the work load of academic staff drastically, it is important to implement specific motivation schemes and work out a united performance appraisal and fair compensation system. The purpose of this study was to investigate the contribution of appraisal practices in the system of motivating and compensating of academic staff in order to increase their willingness to react to changes in the educational system as well as increasing their productivity and quality in their teaching and research activities.

Charles Ocici, the Executive Director of Enterprise Uganda, says one of the most important things you can do to ensure that you succeed at your work place is to actively prepare for your appraisal (New Vision Newspaper. July 7, 2014). By preparing well for your appraisal meeting with your supervisor, you can ensure that he/she has a broader picture of your performance and goals, and you take charge of your career progression. Ocici explains that one should start by reviewing their job description, goals, competences and development plans set at their last appraisal. “Use these as the foundation for preparing details on your accomplishments, strengths and areas for development and gather any regular reports you have made. These could be weekly reports or even project status reports. They will help you recall performance highlights, milestones and any challenges”, says Ocici. This study is in line with the argument by Ocici, the researcher believe that it will be useful to examine the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

## 2.5 Feedback and the Performance of Academic Staff

Communication is vital in academic staff management and is equally important in performance appraisal. All staff should therefore be well informed of the appraisal system, the criteria being used and the purpose of the appraisal. It is crucial to give feedback to both managers and employees about their activities, as feedback is a much more constructive tool in performance appraisal.

Namubiru (2003) in her study on the effect of appraisal systems on teacher performance pointed that there is a significant relationship between appraisal systems and teacher participation in school activities. This is in line with Matwire (2002) who observed that appraisal systems provide an actionable feedback that encourages employees’ participation in carrying out activities in an organization. However, staff performance appraisal systems are still largely bureaucratic in terms of the set standards upon which an employee performance is judged.

Feedback can be from multiple sources (Bracken, Timmreck, & Church, 2001). This is commonly referred to as “360-degree feedback”. In 360-degree feedback, information is obtained through various sources which include the immediate supervisor, top management, assistants, co-workers, customers, dealers, advisors and community officials.

Antonioni (2002) observed that 360 degree feedback encourages team work and smooth down work relationship between employees and the manager. If 360-degree feedback is used as a management tool for decision making for teachers’ promotion and training purposes then it would be more helpful in performance improvement and development of teachers as well as of the university. The major challenge involved here is that feedback need to be shared continuously with the concerned teachers in order to enhance on their weak areas and this therefore demands for commitment from the concerned teachers.

360-degree appraisal system has become one of the prominent performance appraisal techniques of managing employees’ performance (Tessema, 2006). Aslam and Sarwar (2010) claimed that this technique can not only give comprehensive performance review but also indulge transparency in the system. Decenzo and Robbison (2002) asserted that setting and communicating appraisal objectives creates clarity in the minds of the employees given the fact that member of staff have the opportunities to talk about the organizational objectives and to define their contributions to the achievement of those objectives.

The importance of appraisal feedback in organizations has been studied extensively (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). A major theme of this research is that several conflicts are built into the appraisal and feedback process. For instance appraisees may want feedback but they prefer positive feedback and tend to dismiss negative feedback. The performance appraisal process puts the appraiser in the position of being a judge who issues ratings and of a counselor who provides advice and coaching on how to improve performance (Meyer & French, 1965) as cited in Marie (2003). Despite conflicts involved in giving and receiving feedback, there is consensus that high quality feedback can be extremely beneficial to both the individual and the organization (Landy, 1995). A significant potential limitation to the value of appraisal feedback is that it is often biased, incomplete or inaccurate (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). This may be as a result of the feedback provider having little knowledge of the job being done by the employee or the job related constraints that may present the employee with difficulty. If appraisal feedback is biased, inaccurate or simply incomplete, the actual benefits may be limited. There are even circumstances where feedback can be harmful such as when it is improperly delivered in the form of negative criticism or in a disrespectful, personal or a specific manner. However appraisal feedback carries such a wide arrays of benefits that even a limited amount of usable feedback may be worthwhile.

Keeping & Levy (2000) examined the measurement of performance appraisal reactions. They investigated how well commonly used reaction scales and representative of those used in the field measures the substantial constructs of satisfaction. They found that these scales did a favourable job of measuring appraisal reactions model. Among reactions investigated were satisfactions (with the system and session), fairness (procedural and distributive justice), perceived utility and accuracy. Tziner et al., (2001) argued that attitudes and beliefs toward the institution and about the appraisal system affect how ratings are done and how feedback is handled. These attitudes and beliefs have an influence on the accuracy and usefulness of ratings. Their findings showed that beliefs about performance appraisal system and rater orientation towards the system explained tendencies to give higher versus lower ratings and to discriminate between ratees and rating dimensions. The researcher observed that performance appraisal reactions as argued by Keeping and Levy (2000) are related to performance appraisal feedback. As pointed the reactions investigated included only satisfactions and fairness and did not consider the contribution of appraisal reactions. This current study explored the contributions of appraisal feedback to the performance of teaching staff at ASUL.

**2.6 Summary of Literature Review**

The literature discussed has brought forward arguments by various scholars in their studies conducted in different institutions of higher learning concerning performance appraisal, where those institutions use the appraisal system to enhance the performance of their academic staff. The literature analyzed the different views advanced by prominent scholars and researchers and their findings with respect to the study. Universities are expected to have in place clear and well defined procedures of performance appraisal of academic staff, employment policy that provide for equal opportunities among employees, All these are geared towards performance improvement of academic staff which probably would result in the achievement of the strategic objectives of HEIs.

# CHAPTER THREE

# METHODOLOGY

## 3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a description of the methodology that was used in carrying out the study. It describes the research design, study population, sample size and selection, sampling techniques and procedure, data collection methods, data collection instruments, validity of the instrument, reliability of the instruments, and procedure of data collection, data analysis, and measurement of variables, ethical consideration and conclusion.

## 3.2 Research Design

The study used a cross-sectional survey. This design was used to gather data from the sample of the study population (Amin, 2005). Cross-sectional survey gave opportunity for a wide range of sample to be studied at the same time. The cross-sectional research design was preferred to collect data just once over a given period of time in an attempt to answer the research questions. The rationale of selecting this design enabled the study to describe, compare and correlate the independent and dependent variables reflected in the conceptual frame work.

## 3.3 Study Population

The study had a target population of 360 people and a sample size of 186 respondents. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) this sample size is representative enough since it is more than 50% of the target population. The study population comprised of academic registrar, faculty deans, and heads of department, academic staff and students of second and third year.

## 3.4 Sample Size and Selection

The study anticipated a sample of 186 respondents to be drawn from a target population of 360 people, the sample size was obtained using Morgan & Krejcie (1970) table for determining sample size from a given population, adopted from Amin (2005).

Table 3. 1 Showing the sample size and selection

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Target population** | **Sample size** | **Sampling technique** |
| Academic Registrar | 1 | 1 | Purposive |
| Faculty deans | 3 | 3 | Purposive |
| Heads of department | 5 | 3 | Simple random sampling |
| Academic staff | 51 | 26 | Stratified random sampling |
| Second and third year students | 300 | 153 | Stratified random sampling |
| **Total** | **360** | **186** |  |

**Source:** Adopted from Morgan & Krejcie (1970) as cited by Amin (2005).

## 3.5 Sampling techniques and procedure

Three sampling techniques were used in this study in accordance with Sekaran (2003), they were purposive, simple random sampling and stratified random sampling. Purposive technique was used to select academic registrar and faculty deans since they were few .The university had one academic registrar and three deans of faculties and due to the nature of their work, they were all purposely considered to participate in the study as the key informants. Simplerandom sampling was used to determine the number of heads of department to participate in the study. From the five, three (3) were sampled to participate in the study. This sampling technique ensured that all the elements in the target population had the same probability of being selected therefore it reduced biasness in selecting the respondents to participate in the study (Amin, 2005).

According to Margaret (1995), stratified random sampling increases the representation of a sample of a given population or an equivalent piece of information for a small sample. Stratified random sampling was used to select academic staff, second and third year students. Academic staff were selected from three faculties namely: Faculty of Business and Management, Faculty of Social Sciences, and Faculty of Education while students’ respondents were selected from four academic programmes operating at ASUL and these are:- Day, Evening, Weekend and Recess programmes. Stratification enabled the researcher to get the knowledge of the population and thus was able to select an appropriate number of respondents for the study.

## 3.6 Data Collection Methods

The study used quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data; it involved use of questionnaire survey, interviews, focus group discussions and documentary review.

## 3.6.1 Questionnaire Survey

Questionnaires have been found to be useful and affordable when quantitative and qualitative methods are concurrently used in research (Sekaran, 2003; Amin, 2005).

Amin (2005) defines a questionnaire as a form consisting of interrelated questions prepared by the researcher about a research problem under investigation. The study used questionnaires to collect information from academic staff and students. This method was very appropriate to use since the researcher was able to collect information about the study within the shortest possible time.

## 3.6.2 Interview

An interview is a purposeful discussion between two or more people (Saunders et al., 1999). The interview was used because of its importance in yielding detailed information about the subject matter. This method was used to supplement the quantitative data generated from the questionnaires and it was more appropriate to get first-hand information from the key informants on the appraisal practices which were in place and the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango.

## 3.6.3 Documentary Review

This involved a review of secondary sources of data. Documentary review provides vital information which could not be accessed through the use of questionnaires and interviews in the data collection process (Creswell, 2003). These sources of information provided a comprehensive basis for the study (Mugenda, 2003).

## 3.6.4 Focus Group Discussion

The focus group discussion method was used in this study to collect information that was not captured in the questionnaires. Only academic staff were involved in the discussions with the researcher. In using this method the researcher spoke face-to-face with the respondents therefore getting first hand information. This method is very appropriate in collecting primary data since the respondents are put in a group and they express their opinions freely on issues concerning the study (Sekaran, 2003). Data is collected from various respondents at the same time unlike the interview method which is convenient for only one respondent and the researcher.

## 3.7 Data Collection Instruments

The study used the following instruments: questionnaire, interview guide, documentary review check list and focus group discussion guide.

## 3.7.1 Questionnaire

Two sets of self-administered, closed ended questionnaires were used in this study, one for academic staff and the other for students’ respondents. Options were given to students and staff respondents to freely express their opinions. These close ended questions with pre-determined multiple choice responses measured against a Likert-scale from 1 to 5 with 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (DA), 3 = Undecided (UD), 4 = Agree (A) and 5 = Strongly Agree (SA) were used to collect quantitative data from academic staff and students. The study used this instrument because it helped to cover a large number of respondents in a relatively shorter time, it was also easy to guarantee respondents’ confidentiality and they generated reliable data as respondents could answer questions freely without interference as suggested by Sekaran (2003). The two sets of questionnaires are attached in Appendices I and II.

## 3.7.2 Interview Guide

The researcher presented a set of questions to key informants. It involved a face-to-face conversation between the researcher and the key informants at a time and he was able to capture keypoints throughrecording in a note book. In this study, the key informants interviewed were the academic registrar, dean of faculties and heads of department. The interview guide as a data collection tool enabled the researcher to go deeper into the information required for the study (Saunders et al., 2003). The Interview Guide is attached in Appendix III.

## 3.7.3 Documentary Review Check List

A documentary check list was used to analyze the existing documents relevant to the study. The university secretary and academic registrar availed the necessary documents to the researcher for viewing as evidence for staff performance appraisal. The documents reviewed were: annual staff appraisal reports, staff attendance book, academic committee reports, university council reports, staff evaluation forms, students’ guild minutes and the University strategic plan (2010 – 2030). The documentary check list is attached in Appendix IV.

## 3.7.4 Focus Group Discussion Guide

A focus group discussion guide was designed to enable the researcher collect qualitative data from the respondents. Issues that were relevant to the study but not contained in the questionnaire were captured by this instrument. Academic staff were the anticipated respondents to participate in the discussion. This was in line with the recommendation by Sekaran (2003). The Focus Group Discussion Guide is attached in Appendix V.

## 

## 3.8 Validity of the Instrument

Validity is the extent to which a data collection instrument measures what it is intended to measure (Amin, 2005). It is the ability of an instrument to produce findings that are justifiable and truthful.

Validity of the instruments was established using both construct and content validity tests. Construct validity was established through the help of experienced lecturers (experts) in research from Kampala International University - Lira Study Centre who vetted the research tools where some commendable corrections were effected especially to the relevancy of the instruments in line with the objectives of the study. The researcher also engaged his two supervisors for guidance. The experts independently judged the items in the two questionnaires, interview check list, focus group discussion guide and documentary review guide in relation to the research objectives.

## 3.8.1 Validity of the Questionnaire

The questionnaires were pre-tested with a sample of five (5) lecturers and 10 students from ASUL. These lecturers and students were not included in the study. The researcher further established the validity of the questionnaires by use of the expert judgment method (Gay, 1996).

The content validity index (CVI) was then computed to determine the validity of the questionnaires by use of the formula.

Table 3. 2 Experts’ judgment on academic staff questionnaire

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number valid** | **Number invalid** | **Total** | **CVI** |
| **Expert A** | 35 | 6 | 41 | 0.85 |
| **Expert B** | 33 | 8 | 41 | 0.80 |
| **Average** |  |  |  | 0.83 |

**Source: Primary data**

Table 3.2 indicates the judgment by two Experts A and B. The figures were computed as demonstrated below:-

CVI for Expert A = = 0.85 whereas CVI for Expert B = = 0.80. As shown, 41 questions were rated. Expert A rated 35 questions as valid which gave a CVI of 0.85 while expert B rated 33 questions as valid which yielded a CVI of 0.80. The average of the ratings by the two experts gave a CVI of 0.83 which was greater than 0.70 as recommended thus the instrument was considered valid (Amin, 2005).

Table 3. 3 Experts’ judgment on students’ questionnaire

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number valid** | **Number invalid** | **Total** | **CVI** |
| **Expert A** | 31 | 7 | 38 | 0.82 |
| **Expert B** | 30 | 8 | 38 | 0.79 |
| **Average** |  |  |  | 0.81 |

**Source: Primary data**

Table 3.3 indicates the judgment by two Experts A and B. 31 questions were rated by the two experts. The computation was done as below:-

CVI for Expert A = = 0.82, and CVI for Expert B = = 0.79.

As demonstrated, Expert A rated 31 questions as valid which gave a CVI of 0.82 while Expert B rated 30 questions as valid which gave a CVI of 0.79. The average of the ratings by the two experts gave a CVI of 0.81 which was greater than 0.70 as recommended thus the instrument was considered valid (Amin, 2005).

## 3.9 Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability of a data collection instrument is the extent to which the instrument produces the same result each time it is used (Oppenheim, 1992).

**3.9.1 Reliability of the Questionnaire**

The reliability of the two sets of questionnaire for all the items was tested using the Cronbach’s Alpha Moment Coefficient provided by the SPSS (Amin, 2005; Bakkabulindi, 2008).

Cronbach’s Alpha ( is given by the formula,

Where, K is the number of items

is the variance of the total instruments

is the variance of the individual items

Table 3. 4 Reliability statistics for academic staff questionnaire

| **Cronbach's Alpha** | **No. of Items** |
| --- | --- |
| 0.847 | 41 |

**Source: Primary data**

In table 3.4, the calculated value of Cronbach’s Alpha for academic staff questionnaire for all the 41 items was 0.847 which is more than the acceptable reliability value of = 0.70 (Amin, 2005), the instrument was therefore considered reliable.

Table 3. 5 Reliability statistics for students’ questionnaire

| **Cronbach's Alpha** | **No of Items** |
| --- | --- |
| 0.881 | 38 |

**Source: Primary data**

In table 3.5, the calculated value of Cronbach’s Alpha for students’ questionnaire for all the 38 items was 0.881 which is more than the acceptable reliability value of = 0.70 (Amin, 2005), the instrument was therefore considered reliable.

## 3.10 Procedure of Data Collection

The researcher obtained an introductory letter from the School of Management Science of Uganda Management Institute (copy attached) after the proposal defense. He took it to the university administrators of ASUL from where he was permitted to carry out the study in the institution. The researcher proceeded and introduced himself to the respondents to whom he administered the questionnaires. Two lecturers picked interest to administer the questionnaires as research assistants to lecturers and students. Appointments were made with academic registrar, dean of faculties and heads of department for interviews, academic registrar also gave the researcher appointment for documentary review and focus group discussion was scheduled with the respondents. The researcher responded promptly for the appointments and thus he was able to collect relevant data for the study.

## 3.11 Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative approaches (Mugenda, 2003).

## 3.11.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

The data collected from the questionnaires was sorted, coded and entered into the computer for analysis using Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) program. The researcher then used descriptive statistics to analyze the bio-data of the respondents. Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient was used to establish the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Regression analysis was also used to determine the extent to which the independent variable contributed to the dependent variable. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique was used to test whether or not there was significant difference in the means of the predictors of the study.

## 3.11.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

The collected qualitative data was summarized and organized in a manner that they attempted to answer research questions. The coded and categorized data from interviews, focus group discussions and documentary review enabled the study to come out with relevant information and these were analyzed through the description of key items under each objective.

## 3.12 Measurement of Variables

This study used the interval and ratio levels to measure the variables. Mason (1990) suggests that these levels are very appropriate for the measurement of any two points on the scale. Interval scale was used because the responses to various items in the questionnaire were designed on a five point Likert-scale with; 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree. The levels of measurement generated descriptive statistics in form of frequency distribution which was easy to present, analyze and interpret. The study was also able to use correlation and regression analysis of the independent and dependent variables.

## 3.13 Ethical Considerations

Studies are normally conducted not only for the consumption of the researcher or the institutions involved but also for the public. With the advancement in Information and Communication Technology (ICT) especially through the use of internet any published work is easily accessed. For the above reason ethical issues have to be taken into account for any study. For this study, the researcher assured the University Management of ASUL and the respondents of the confidentiality of the information gathered from the field and that the information would be used purely for the purpose of the study.

## 3.14 Summary

In this chapter, research design was discussed, study population, sample size and selection considered. Sampling techniques and procedure to be used in the study justified. Data collection methods and the instruments to be used were also discussed. The validity and reliability of data collection instruments were explained. The procedure of data collection and the subsequent analysis were described. The levels of measurement of the variables were considered and equally important ethical issues were taken into account. In Chapter Four the results of the findings will be presented, analyzed and interpreted objective by objective.

# CHAPTER FOUR

# PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

## 4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the presentation, analysis and interpretation of results of the study. The chapter highlights the response rate, bio-data of the respondents, descriptive statistics for the independent and dependent variables, correlation analysis and test of hypotheses according to the objectives of the study, regression analysis and analysis of variance technique for the predictors are also discussed.

## 4.2 Response Rate

The study involved three categories of respondents: University administrators which included the academic registrar, faculty deans and heads of department, the other categories were the academic staff and students. Responses were summarized in Table 4.1.

Table 4. 1 Presentation of response rate

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category of respondents** | **Tool used** | **Target response** | **Actual response** | **Response rate (%)** |
| University administrators | Interview guide | 7 | 7 | 100 |
| Academic staff | Questionnaire | 26 | 24 | 92.3 |
| Second & third year students | Questionnaire | 153 | 132 | 86.3 |
| Academic staff | FGD | 26 | 14 | 53.8 |
| **Average** |  |  |  | **83.1** |

**Source**: **Primary Data**

Analysis ofresults in Table 4.1 shows that a total of 7 key informants were targeted for the interview all of which were interviewed, this represented a 100% response rate. A total of 26 questionnaires were administered to academic staff out of which 24 were returned completed, this implied a response rate of 92.3%. Results also reveal that a total of 153 questionnaires were administered to students of second and third year out of which 132 were returned completed, this represented a response rate of 86.3%. 26 respondents were also targeted for FGD out of which 14 turned up; this represented a 53.8% response rate. The overall average respondent was 83.1%.

It can be interpreted that the response rate of 83.1% was over and above the 70% recommended by Mugenda and Mugenda (2004). This implies that the study was representative enough of the targeted number of respondents.

## 4.3 Analysis of bio-data

This section presents the background characteristics of students, academic staff and university administrators who participated in the study.

## 4.3.1 Results on the background characteristics of students

The background characteristics of students included sex, age bracket, and year of study, study program, and category of study programme. This is presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4. 2 Background characteristics of students (N =132)

| **Variables** | **Categories** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sex | Male | 64 | 48.5 |
| Female | 68 | 51.5 |
| Age bracket | Less than 19 | 1 | 0.8 |
| 20-24 | 45 | 34.1 |
| 25-29 | 48 | 36.4 |
| Above 30 | 38 | 28.8 |
| Year of study | Second | 85 | 64.4 |
| Third | 47 | 35.6 |
| Study program | Degree | 73 | 55.3 |
| Diploma | 58 | 43.9 |
| Certificate | 1 | 0.8 |
| Category of study program | Day | 39 | 29.5 |
| Evening | 3 | 2.3 |
| Weekend | 77 | 58.3 |
| Distance | 13 | 9.8 |

**Source: Primary Data**

## 4.3.1.1 Student Respondents by sex

Results from Table 4.2 demonstrate that out of 132 students who participated in the study, 68(51.5%) were females while 64(48.5%) were males. The findings reflect more than 50% of the total respondents as females and a fair representation of the different sexes. The above results was in line with the data gathered from the key informants where more than 75% revealed that at ASUL the population of female students tends to exceed that of the male students every academic year.

This result was further supported by the information gathered from documentary review. Records from admission book indicated that in the academic year 2012/2013 the number of students who were admitted and reported was 165 with 76 males and 89 females whereas in academic year 2013/2014 there was 183 students with 86 males and 97 females.

## 4.3.1.2 Student Respondents by age bracket

Results from Table 4.2 show that only 1(0.8%) respondent was less than 19 years, in the age bracket of 20-24 years there were 45(34.1%) respondents while in the age bracket of 25-29 years there were 48(36.4%) respondents and 38(28.8%) respondents were above 30 years. From the above results it follows that the highest proportion of the respondents (36.4%) were in the age group of 25-29 years but this is less than 50% of the total respondents.

The results therefore reflect that there is fair representation of students from the different age groups. The age-group information on the students enabled the researcher to determine the ability of the student respondents to give reliable information for the study.

## 4.3.1.3 Student Respondents by year of study

Results regarding respondents by year of study demonstrate that out of 132 respondents, 85 were second year students representing 64.4% while 47 were third year students corresponding to 35.6%.

The above result points that the highest proportion (64.4%) of respondents were the second year students, this could partly be attributed to the busy schedules of third year students and to some extent the high enrolment of second year students (183) compared to the number of third year students (165) at ASUL as evidenced from admission record of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 academic years. In all the number of second and third year students who participated in the study were representative enough of the target population.

## 4.3.1.4 Student Respondents by study program

Results on the study programme point that out of 132 respondents who were representative from the different study options from ASUL, 73 (55.3%) were pursuing degree programmes while 58 (43.9%) were students of diploma programmes and only 1 respondent (0.8%) was offering a certificate course.

This result illustrates that majority of respondents (55.3%) were students of degree courses followed by 43.9% from diploma courses. Record shows that the University on average enrolls 150 students per academic year. This result therefore demonstrates a fair representation of the students as per the enrolment of the university.

## 4.3.1.5 Student Respondents by category of study program

Table 4.2 further gives results on the category of study programmes reflecting 39(29.5%) respondents pursuing day programmes, 3(2.3%) respondents undertaking evening programmes while 77 respondents which correspond to 58.3% engaged in weekend programmes and 13 (9.8%) respondents were in distance programmes.

The results therefore reflect a high proportion of student respondents (58.3%) in weekend programmes. This result may be attributed to the fact that most of the students at ASUL are working people so they prefer to pursue weekend programmes in order to guarantee security of their jobs.

## 4.3.2 Results on the background characteristics of academic staff

The background characteristics of academic staff included sex, age bracket, highest level of education, terms of service, job title, and the length of time one has served in the university. The detailed information is presented in table 4.3.

Table 4. 3 Background characteristics of academic staff (N =24)

| **Variables** | **Categories** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sex | Male | 18 | 75.0 |
| Female | 6 | 25.0 |
| Age bracket | 20-39 | 14 | 58.3 |
| 40-49 | 7 | 29.2 |
| 50-59 | 3 | 12.5 |
| 60 and above | 0 | 00.0 |
| Highest level of education | Masters | 14 | 58.3 |
| Bachelor | 10 | 41.7 |
| Terms of service | Permanent | 2 | 08.3 |
| Contract | 13 | 54.2 |
| Part time | 9 | 37.5 |
| Job Title | Senior Lecturer | 7 | 29.2 |
| Lecturer | 10 | 41.7 |
| Assistant Lecturer | 7 | 29.2 |
| Period served in the university | Less than 3 years | 7 | 29.2 |
| More than 3 years | 17 | 70.8 |

**Source: Primary Data**

## 4.3.2.1 Staff Respondents by sex

Table 4.3 shows that of the 24 academic staff who participated in the study, 18 were males (75%) while 6 (25%) were females. The results indicate that the number of male lecturers was thrice that of females.

This result illustrates that at ASUL, male lecturers dominate the staffing of academic staff since this category of respondents was sampled from a target population of all the academic staff at ASUL. Staff record from ASUL indicates that more than 70% of academic staff are males. The fair representation of both male and female staff enabled the study to gather more reliable and balanced data.

## 4.3.2.2 Staff Respondents by age bracket

Results from Table 4.3 further indicate that 14(58.3%) of respondents are in the age bracket of 20-39 years, 7(29.2%) are in the age bracket of 40-49 years while 3(12.5%) are in the age bracket of 50-59 whereas 00.0% were 60 years and above.

As reflected above, majority of academic staff who participated in this study (58.3%) were in the age bracket of 30-39 years. Staff record also indicates that more than 60% of the staff are in the age group of 30-45 years. This result therefore indicates that ASUL has young, creative, and innovative scholars to deliver its programmes.

## 4.3.2.3 Staff Respondents by highest level of education

Results from Table 4.3 point that out of 24 academic staff who participated in the study, 14(58.3%) are Masters’ degree holders while 10(41.7%) are bachelor degree holders. The findings therefore reveal that more than 50% of the respondents had the academic qualification of Masters’ degree. Information from staff record indicates that about 60% of academic staff at ASUL are Masters’ degree holders.

These results clearly illustrate the competencies of academic staff at ASUL as reflected by the academic qualification of the respondents which meets the minimum requirements by the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE), the statutory regulatory agency for HEIs in Uganda. The number of academic staff sampled was representative enough of the entire population of academic staff at ASUL to give reliable information for the study.

## 4.3.2.4 Staff Respondents by terms of service

Results from Table 4.3 further indicate that out of 24 academic staff who participated in the study, 2(08.3%) were employed in the university as permanent staff, 13(54.2%) on contract terms while 9(37.5%) employed as part time staff. Findings therefore point that more than 50% of the respondents were employed on contract terms. Information gathered from the focus group discussion revealed that the duration of contract at ASUL ranges from 2 to 5 years which are renewable.

Academic Registrar during the interview maintained that:-

*“At ASUL, terms of contract ranges from two to five years, for instance:- two years for assistant lecturers, three years for lecturers, 5 years for senior lecturers (holders of PhD), and five years for the management team (Bursar, AR, US, and VC) which are renewable based on performance”.*

These findings demonstrate that the appraisal process can be affected negatively or positively depending on the terms of service for a particular lecturer.

## 4.3.2.5 Staff Respondents by job title

As observed in Table 4.3, out of 24 academic staff who participated in the study 7(29.2%) were Senior lecturers, 10(41.7%) had the title of Lecturers while 7(29.2%) were in the lower position of Assistant lecturers.

Results above demonstrate that majority of the respondents (41.7%) were in the position of lecturers which is less than 50% of the total number of the respondents and an equal number of respondents in the position of Senior lecturers and Assistant lecturers. The findings therefore reflect a fair representation of academic staff in the various positions in order to generate a more reliable data.

## 4.3.2.6 Staff Respondents by period served in the university

Results from Table 4.3 describe that out of 24 respondents 7(29.2%) have worked at ASUL for less than 3 years whereas 17(70.8%) have served for a period of more than 3 years.

The results show that majority (70.8 %) of teaching staff have worked at ASUL for more than three years. Staff recruitment records revealed that more than 75% of the current staff have worked for more than five years at ASUL. The implication is that the study will generate adequate and more reliable data.

## 4.3.3 Results on the background characteristics of Key informants

The study involved seven (7) key informants who comprised of academic registrar, faculty deans and heads of department. The background characteristics of interest to the study were sex, age bracket, duration one has worked in the university, position held at the university, time taken in the current position, and the highest level of education. Information gathered from the key informants is presented in table 4.4.

Table 4. 4 Background characteristics of key informants (N =7)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Category** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Sex | Male | 5 | 71.4 |
| Female | 2 | 28.6 |
| Age bracket | 30-39 | 0 | 00.0 |
| 40-49 | 2 | 28.6 |
| 50-59 | 3 | 42.9 |
| 60 and above | 2 | 28.6 |
| Years served in the current position | Below 3 years | 3 | 42.9 |
| Above 3 years | 4 | 57.1 |
| Administrative position | Academic registrar | 1 | 14.2 |
| Faculty dean | 3 | 42.9 |
| Head of department | 3 | 42.9 |
| Highest level of education | Bachelor’s degree | 0 | 00.0 |
| Masters’ degree | 7 | 100.0 |
| PhD | 0 | 00.0 |

**Source: Primary Data**

## 4.3.3.1 Key Informant Respondents by sex

Results from Table 4.4 above indicate that out of 7 key informants who participated in this study 5(71.4%) were males while 2(28.6%) were females. This number of males in key administrative positions at ASUL is more than their female counterparts as reflected by the respective proportions of 71.4% and 28.6%.

The result demonstrates a fair representation of sex of university administrators in this study.

## 4.3.3.2 Key Informant Respondents by age bracket

Results from table 4.4 reveal that none of the respondents was in the age group of 30-39 years, 2(28.6%) were in the age group of 40-49 years,3 respondents corresponding to 42.9% were in the age bracket of 50-59 while 2(28.6%) were above 60 years of age. Results therefore illustrate that the highest number of respondents were in the age group of 50-59 as represented by 42.9% but since this is less than 50% of the total number of respondents it can be observed that the ages of the respondents is fairly distributed among the given age brackets.

The findings demonstrate that university administrators who participated in the study composed of mature and experienced academicians with high integrity and therefore more reliable information was expected from them.

## 4.3.3.3 Key Informant Respondents by number of years served in the current position

Results from Table 4.4 also reveal that 3 respondents representing 42.9% have served in their current positions for less than 3 years while 4(57.1%) have been in their present position for more than 3 years. This finding has shown that more than 50% of the respondents have served the university in their current positions for more than 3 years.

This has portrayed a high level of experience of this group of respondents therefore up-to-date information was expected from them.

## 4.3.3.4 Key Informant Respondents by administrative position

The composition of the administrators involved in the study presented in Table 4.4 points that out of the 7 key informants,1(14.2%) was an academic registrar, 3(42.9%) were deans of faculty while 3(42.9%) were heads of department.

Findings above reflect an equal number of deans of faculty and heads of department who participated in the study and each corresponds to 42.9%, more relevant data was expected from this group of respondents since they are the supervisors of performance appraisal practices.

## 4.3.3.5 Key Informant Respondents by highest level of education

Results from Table 4.4 indicate that out of 7 key informants who participated in the study, none of them had the highest educational qualification of a Bachelor degree. All the key informants (100%) had a highest academic qualification of Masters’ Degree while none hold a PhD. This result illustrates that all the key informants had their highest level of academic qualifications above a bachelor’s degree. This qualification meets the minimum requirements and is in line with the set standards by NCHE for university staff.

The results therefore demonstrate that the key informants are well informed about performance appraisal practices at ASUL.

## 4.4 Research objective one

The first objective of the study was to examine the contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Different sets of questionnaires were administered to students and academic staffand all the questions assessed using a Likert scale (Likert, 1932) ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (DA), 3 = Undecided (UD), 4 = Agree (A), and 5 = Strongly Agree (SA).

## 4.4.1 Descriptive statistics on evaluation by students for students’ responses

Table 4.5 gives a descriptive statistics on evaluation by students for student responses.

Table 4. 5 Descriptive statistics on evaluation by students for students’ responses

| **Statements** | **Strongly Disagree (SD)** | **Disagree(DA)** | **Undecided(UD)** | **Agree (A)** | **Strongly Agree (SA)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students regularly evaluate academic staff | 6  (4.5%) | 7  (5.3%) | 14  (10.6%) | 87  (65.9%) | 18  (13.6%) |
| Students are encouraged by academic staff to use evaluation forms | 5  (3.8%) | 9  (6.8%) | 8  (6.1%) | 81  (61.4%) | 29  (22.0%) |
| Academic staff encourage the use of attendance register | 2  (1.5%) | 2  (1.5%) | 2  (1.5%) | 79  (59.8%) | 47  (35.6%) |
| Attendance register is marked regularly by student coordinators | 4  (3.0%) | 7  (5.3%) | 7  (5.3%) | 82  (62.1%) | 32  (24.2%) |
| Students assess academic staff freely without interference | 2  (1.5%) | 6  (4.5%) | 3  (2.3%) | 88  (66.7%) | 33  (25.0%) |
| Academic staff themselves avail to us evaluation forms | 3  (2.3%) | 12  (9.1%) | 15  (11.4%) | 76  (57.6%) | 26  (19.7%) |
| Academic staff freely collect the filled up evaluation forms | 4  (3.0%) | 6  (4.5%) | 8  (6.1%) | 80  (60.6%) | 34  (25.8%) |
| Students are encouraged to express their opinions freely by academic staff | 3  (2.3%) | 2  (1.5%) | 4  (3.0%) | 78  (59.1%) | 45  (34.1%) |

**Source: Primary Data**

Table 4.5 gives the responses of 132 students on the various statements on evaluation by students. On the statement “Students regularly evaluate academic staff”, 6(4.5%) of respondents strongly disagreed, 7(5.3%) disagreed, 14(10.6%) were undecided, 87(65.9%) agreed with the statement whereas 18(13.6%) strongly agreed with the statement.

The findings therefore reflect that majority of the respondents (65.9%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% then students regularly evaluate academic staff.

On the statement “Students are engaged by academic staff to use evaluation forms”, 5(3.8%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. 9(6.8%) disagreed, 8(6.1%) were undecided, 81(61.4%) agreed while 29(22.0%) strongly agreed with the statement.

The results point that majority of the respondents (61.4%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% then students are engaged by academic staff to use evaluation forms.

Regarding the statement “Academic staff encourage the use of attendance register”, 2(1.5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement, 2(1.5%) agreed, 2(1.5%) were undecided, 79(59.8%) agreed while 29(22.0%) strongly agreed with the statement.

The findings reveal that majority of the respondents (59.8%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% then academic staff encourage the use of attendance register.

In response to the statement “Attendance register is marked regularly by student coordinators”, 4(3.0%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, 7(5.3%) disagreed, 7(5.3%) were undecided, 82(62.1%) agreed while 32(24.2%) strongly agreed.

It can be observed that a high proportion (62.1%) of the respondents agreed with the statement since this is more than 50% then attendance register is marked regularly by student coordinators.

Along the same line on the statement “Students assess academic staff freely without interference”, out of 132 respondents 2(1.5%) strongly disagreed, 6(4.5%) disagreed, 3(2.3%) were undecided, 88(66.7%) of the respondents agreed with the statement whereas 33(25.0%) strongly agreed.

Findings above reflect that majority of the respondents agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% then students assess academic staff freely without interference.

On the statement “Academic staff themselves avail to us evaluation forms”, 3(2.3%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, 12(9.1%) disagreed, 15(11.4%) of the respondents were undecided, 76 (57.6%) agreed with the statement while 26(19.7%) strongly agreed.

This result therefore points that a high proportion (57.6%) of respondents agreed with the statement since this is more than 50% then academic staff themselves avail to students evaluation forms.

Responding to the statement “Academic staff freely collect the filled up evaluation forms”, 4(3.0%) strongly disagreed, 6(4.5%) disagreed, 8(6.1%) of the respondents were undecided, 80(60.6%) of the respondents agreed while 34(25.8%) strongly disagreed with the statement. These results demonstrate that a high proportion of the respondents (60.6%) agreed with the statement since this is more than 50% then academic staff freely collect the filled up evaluation forms.

Table 4.5 further illustrates that on the statement “Students are encouraged to express their opinions freely by academic staff”, 3(2.3%) strongly disagreed, 1(0.8%) disagreed, 4(3.0%) of the respondents were undecided, 78(59.1%) agreed while 45(34.1%) strongly agreed with the statement.

Findings above show that majority of the respondents (59.1%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% then students are encouraged to express their opinions freely by academic staff.

Results in Table 4.5 demonstrate that for each of the eight statements concerning evaluation by students, more than 50% of the respondents agreed. The results therefore reflect that students perceive this appraisal practice as one of the viable tools in performance improvement by academic staff.

The results of data gathered through interviewing the key informants was in line with the above findings as 80% revealed that students feel comfortable with their lecturers if their views are addressed on matters regarding the quality of teaching/learning and one of the ways of expressing their concerns on academic issues is through the use of appraisal forms. Through documentary review the researcher was able to get copies of filled academic staff evaluation forms from the AR’s office.

## 4.4.2 Descriptive statistics on evaluation by students for academic staff responses

Table 4.6 below gives a descriptive statistics on evaluation by students for academic staff responses.

Table 4. 6 Descriptive statistics on evaluation by students for academic staff responses

| **Statements** | **Strongly Disagree (SD)** | **Disagree(DA)** | **Undecided(UD)** | **Agree (A)** | **Strongly Agree (SA)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation by students is a very reliable appraisal tool | 1  (4.2%) | 6  (25.0%) | 0  (00.0%) | 13  (54.2%) | 4  (16.6%) |
| I always vary the methods of delivery to make students understand my lectures | 0  (00.0%) | 0  (00.0%) | 0  (00.0%) | 15  (62.5%) | 9  (37.5%) |
| I encourage the use of staff evaluation forms marked by students | 2  (8.3%) | 2  (8.3%) | 3  (12.5%) | 12  (50.0%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| Academic staff encourage the use of attendance register marked by students | 4  (16.7%) | 0  (00.0%) | 2  (8.3%) | 14  (58.3% | 4  (16.7%) |
| I attend to students on matters concerning my department | 0  (00.0%) | 1  (4.2%) | 2  (8.3%) | 18  (75.0%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| I am always available for consultation by students | 0  (00.0%) | 2  (8.3%) | 0  (00.0%) | 17  (70.8%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| Students are best judges of staff performance appraisal | 2  (8.3%) | 2  (8.3%) | 1  (4.2%) | 13  (54.2%) | 6  (25.0%) |

**Source: Primary Data**

Table 4.6 shows the results of responses for 24 academic staff for the various statements regarding evaluation by students. On the statement “Evaluation by students is a very reliable appraisal tool”, 1(4.2%) respondent strongly disagreed, 6(25.0%) disagreed, none of the respondents was undecided, 13(54.2%) agreed while 4(16.7%) strongly agreed with the statement.

This result implies that a high proportion of respondents (54.2%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% then evaluation by students is a very reliable appraisal tool.

Concerning the statement “I always vary the methods of delivery to make students understand my lectures”, none of the respondents neither strongly disagreed nor disagreed with the statement and along the same dimension none of the respondents was undecided, 15(62.5%) agreed while 9(37.5%) strongly agreed with the statement.

This result reveals that a high proportion of the respondents (62.5%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% then majority of academic staff always vary their methods of delivery to make students understand their lectures.

On the statement “I encourage the use of staff evaluation forms marked by students”, 2(8.3%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement, 2(8.3%) disagreed, 3(12.5%) were undecided, 12(50.0%) agreed while 5(20.8%) strongly agreed with the statement.

The result clearly demonstrates that half of the respondents (50.0%) agreed with the statement, it therefore implies that majority of academic staff encourage the use of staff evaluation forms marked by students.

Regarding the statement “Academic staff encourage the use of attendance register marked by students”, 4(16.7%) strongly disagree with the statement, none of the respondents disagreed, 2(8.3%) were undecided, 14(58.3%) agreed while 4(16.7%) strongly disagreed with the statement. The results indicate that a high proportion of the respondents (58.3%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% then it shows that majority of academic staffs encourage the use of attendance register marked by students.

In regards to the statement “I attend to students on matters concerning my department” none of the respondents strongly disagreed, 1(4.2%) disagreed, 2(8.3%) were undecided, 18(75.0%) agreed while 3(12.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed with statement.

The result therefore demonstrates that a high proportion of respondents (75.0%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% it implies that majority of academic staff attend to students on matters concerning their departments.

On the statement “I am always available for consultation by students”, none of the respondents strongly disagreed, 2(8.3%) disagreed, none of the respondents was undecided, 17(70.8%) agreed while 5(20.8%) strongly agreed with the statement.

This result reflects a high proportion (70.8%) of the respondents who agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% it implies that majority of academic staff are always available for consultation by students.

In respond to the statement “Students are best judges of staff performance appraisal”, 2(8.3%) strongly disagreed with the statement, 2(8.3%) disagreed, 1(4.2%) was undecided, 13(54.2%) agreed while 6(25.0%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement.

This result illustrates that more than average of the respondents (54.2%) agreed with the statement, it therefore implies that majority of academic staff are well informed that students are best judges of staff performance appraisal.

Results in Table 4.6 reflect that in all the seven statements on evaluation by students, more than 50% of the respondents agreed with each statement, this demonstrates that evaluation by students is an effective tool for performance appraisal of academic staff at ASUL.

Through focus group discussion with academic staff, 55% of the respondents were in support of evaluation by students and they argued that university management should strengthen this appraisal practice. In contrast, 45% of the respondents expressed their views that evaluation by students is less important to them and that it is just a waste of time to implement this appraisal practice.

## 4.4.2 Hypothesis test for objective one

To test the contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff, the study was guided by the hypothesis for objective one which stated that **“**Evaluation by students has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”. The null hypothesis H₀ for testing was stated as “Evaluation by students does not significantly contribute to the performance of academic staff at ASUL” while the alternative hypothesis H₁ stated as **“**Evaluation by students has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”.

The researcher used Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient, r to test whether there was any correlation between evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff at ASUL.The results are given in Tables 4.7 and 4.8.

Table 4.7 Correlations between evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff for students’ responses.

|  |  | Evaluation by students | Performance of academic staff |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation by students | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .355\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 |
| N | 132 | 132 |
| Performance of academic staff | Correlation Coefficient | .355\*\* | 1.000 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | . |
| N | 132 | 132 |

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

**Source: Primary Data**

Table 4.7 above gives a Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient results (r **=** 0.355, p 0.01). Thecorrelation coefficient of 0.355 implies a weak positive correlation between evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff at ASUL. To test the contribution of evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff, the researcher compared the value of the correlation coefficient of 0.355 with a significant value of 0.000, since this value is less than α = 0.01 (the 1% significant level) this implies that the more evaluation by students the more and better improvement in the performance of academic staff.

Based on these results the null hypothesis H₀ was rejected and the alternative hypothesis H₁ was accepted and a conclusion was made that “Evaluation by students has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”.

This indicates that students believe that evaluation which they carry out through use of appraisal forms and attendance registers was able to lead to the improvement in the performance of academic staff.

The results above concurred with the findings from over 70% of respondents during the interview; they expressed their beliefs that students are the best raters of the performance of teaching staff since they are the recipients of knowledge imparted by the teaching staff. In fact a respondent claimed that,

“Students can easily gauge the strengths and weaknesses of a teaching staff”.

Table 4.8 Correlations between evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff for academic staff responses.

|  |  | Evaluation by students | Performance of academic staff |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation by students | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | -.221 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .299 |
| N | 24 | 24 |
| Performance of academic  Staff | Correlation Coefficient | -.221 | 1.000 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .299 | . |
| N | 24 | 24 |

**Source: Primary Data**

Table 4.8 shows a Spearman’s rank correlation coefficientresults (r **=** - 0.221, p 0.01) between evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff for academic staff responses. The correlation coefficient of - 0.221 implies a weak negative correlation between evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff. To test the contribution of evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff, the researcher compared the value of the correlation coefficient of – 0.221 with a significant value of 0.299 which is greater than α = 0.01 (the 1% significant level). This implies that academic staff perceive evaluation by students not to contribute much to the improvement in their performance at ASUL.

In this regard the researcher accepted the null hypothesis H₀ and a conclusion was drawn that “Evaluation by students does not significantly contribute to the performance of academic staff at ASUL” and the alternative hypothesis H1 was rejected.

In fact during focus group discussion 65% of the respondents were against evaluation by students, they expressed their concern that it is not proper for a subordinate to assess his/her superior. The results indicate that the majority of teaching staff see no much contribution of evaluation by students and the ability to do their work.

## 4.5 Research objective two

The second objective of the study was to assess the contribution of faculty appraisal to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Different sets of questionnaires were administered to students and academic staffand all the questions assessed usinga Likert scale (Likert, 1932) ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (DA), 3 = Undecided (UD), 4 = Agree (A), and 5 = Strongly Agree (SA).

## 4.5.1 Descriptive statistics on faculty appraisal for student’s responses

Table 4.9 below gives a descriptive statistics on faculty appraisal for students’ responses.

Table 4. 9 Descriptive statistics on faculty appraisal for student responses

| **Statements** | **Strongly Disagree (SD)** | **Disagree(DA)** | **Undecided(UD)** | **Agree (A)** | **Strongly Agree (SA)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students are informed of staff appraisals at the faculties | 8  (6.1%) | 13  (9.8%) | 30  (22.7%) | 66  (50.0%) | 15  (11.4%) |
| Students are aware of peer review by academic staff | 3  (2.3%) | 20  (15.2%) | 30  (22.7%) | 63  (47.7%) | 16  (12.1%) |
| Self appraisal is carried by individual academic staff | 6  (4.5%) | 14  (10.6%) | 26  (19.7%) | 71  (53.8%) | 15  (11.4%) |

**Source: Primary data**

Results from Table 4.9 above show the responses of 132 students on the statements concerning faculty appraisal. In regards to the statement “Students are informed of staff appraisals at the faculties”, 8(6.1%) strongly disagreed, 13(9.8%) disagreed, 30(22.7%) of the respondents were undecided, 66(50.0%) agreed while 15(11.4%) strongly agreed with the statement.

The above results therefore illustrate that half of the respondents (50%) agreed with the statement, this implies that students are informed of staff appraisals at the faculties.

On the statement “Students are aware of peer review by academic staff”, 3(2.3%) strongly disagreed, 20(15.2%) disagreed, 30(22.7%) were undecided, 63(47.7%) agreed while 16(12.1%) strongly disagreed with the statement.

The results indicate that majority of the respondents (47.7%) agreed with the statement, since this is less than 50% of the total number of respondents and 22.7% of the respondents were undecided it implies that there is a gap in students’ awareness about peer review by academic staff.

Results from Table 4.9 regarding the statement “Self appraisal is carried by individual academic staff”, 6(4.5%) strongly disagreed, 14(10.6%) disagreed, 26(19.7%) of the respondents were undecided, 71(53.8%) agreed with the statement while 15(11.4%) strongly agreed.

The above results illustrate that more than half of the respondents (53.8%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% it implies that self appraisal is carried by individual academic staff. The results demonstrate a high proportion of more than 50% of the respondents agreeing with two statements and 47.7% in agreement with one statement on faculty appraisal.

The overall average of responses for the three statements on faculty appraisal is more than 50%, this implies that the respondents agreed with all the three statements, this was supported by results of interview with the key informants which gave a response of 75% of respondents in agreement that there is a comprehensive performance management system at the faculties.

## 4.5.2 Descriptive statistics on faculty appraisal for academic staff responses

Table 4.10 gives a descriptive statistics on faculty appraisal for academic staff responses.

Table 4. 10 Descriptive statistics on faculty appraisal for academic staff responses

| **Statements** | **Strongly Disagree (SD)** | **Disagree(DA)** | **Undecided(UD)** | **Agree (A)** | **Strongly Agree (SA)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Peer review is an effective appraisal tool | 1  (4.2%) | 6  (25.0%) | 3  (12.5%) | 8  (33.3%) | 6  (25.0%) |
| I appraise myself regularly | 1  (4.2%) | 1  (4.2%) | 6  (25.0%) | 7  (29.2%) | 9  (37.5%) |
| Academic staff support faculty appraisal | 0  (00.0%) | 1  (4.2%) | 1  (4.2%) | 14  (58.3%) | 8  (33.3%) |
| I participate in setting appraisal strategies at the faculty | 4  (16.7%) | 9  (37.5%) | 2  (8.3%) | 6  (25.0%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| Faculty appraisal is used for promotion | 3  (12.5%) | 4  (16.7%) | 3  (12.5%) | 7  (29.2%) | 7  (29.2%) |
| Faculty appraisal is done regularly | 1  (4.2%) | 3  (12.5%) | 1  (4.2%) | 13  (54.2%) | 6  (25.0%) |
| Faculty appraisal is used for salary increments | 5  (20.8%) | 9  (37.5%) | 3  (12.5%) | 5  (20.8%) | 2  (8.3%) |

**Source: Primary Data**

Results in Table 4.10 show the responses of 24 academic staff on the statements raised concerning faculty appraisal. On the statement “Peer review is an effective appraisal tool”, 1(4.2%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, 6(25.5%) disagreed, 3(12.5%) were undecided, 8(33.3%) agreed while 6(25.0%) strongly agreed.

Results indicate that majority of the respondents (33.3%) agreed with the statement, since this is less than 50%, it implies that there is much disparities in the opinions of the respondents on the statement.

Regarding the statement “I appraise myself regularly”, 1(4.2%) strongly disagreed, equally 1(4.2%) agreed, 6(25.0%) were undecided, 7(29.2%) agreed while 9(37.5%) strongly agreed. The results demonstrate that majority of the respondents (37.5%) strongly agreed with the statement, since this is less than 50% it implies that there is a high divergent views of the respondents on the statement.

Concerning the statement “Academic staff support faculty appraisal”, none of the staff strongly disagreed, 1(4.2%) disagreed, an equal number of 1(4.2%) was undecided, 14(58.3%) agreed with the statement while 8(33.3%) strongly disagreed.

Results illustrate that majority of the respondents (58.3%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% it implies that academic staff support faculty appraisal.

On the statement “I participate in setting appraisal strategies at the faculty”, 4(16.7%) strongly disagreed, 9(37.5%) disagreed, 2(8.3%) were undecided, 6(25.0%) agreed while 3(12.5%) strongly agreed.

The above results point that majority of the respondents (37.5%) disagreed with the statement; since this is less than 50% it implies that there was different opinions of respondents on their participation in setting appraisal strategies at the faculties.

Responses on the statement “Faculty appraisal is used for promotion”, results indicate that 3(12.5%) strongly disagreed, 4(16.7%) disagreed, 3(12.5%) were undecided while an equal number of respondents, each represented by 7(29.2%) agreed and strongly agreed with the statement, this implies that to some extent faculty appraisal is used in the making of decision regarding promotion. On the statement “Faculty appraisal is done regularly”, 1(4.2%) strongly disagreed, 3(12.5%) disagreed, only one respondent represented by 4.2% was undecided, 13(54.2%) of the respondents agreed while 6(25.0%) strongly disagreed.

Results in Table 4.10 therefore demonstrate that more than half of the respondents (54.2%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% it implies that faculty appraisal is done regularly.

In regards to the statement “Faculty appraisal is used for salary increments”, 5(20.8%) strongly disagreed, 9(37.5%) disagreed, 3(12.5%) were undecided, 5(20.8%) agreed while 2(8.3%) strongly agreed with the statement.

Results therefore point that majority of the respondents (37.5%) disagreed with the statement, since this is less than 50% it implies that there is much differences in the opinions of the respondents regarding the use of faculty appraisal as a yard stick for determining salary increment.

Results in Table 4.10 demonstrate that there was much divergence in the opinions of respondents on the seven statements on faculty appraisal with most of the scores for the statements regarding the given options less than 50%.

## 4.5.3 Hypothesis test for objective two

To test the contribution of faculty appraisal to the performance of academic staff, the study was guided by hypothesis for objective two which stated that “Faculty appraisal has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”. The null hypothesis H₀ for testing was stated as “Faculty appraisal does not significantly contribute to the performance of academic staff at ASUL” and the alternative hypothesis H₁ stated as “Faculty appraisal has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”. The researcher used Spearman’s rank correlationcoefficient, rto test whether there was any correlation between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staffat ASUL. The results for correlation are given in Tables 4.11 and 4.12.

Table 4. 11 Correlations between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staff for students’ responses

|  | | Faculty Appraisal | Performance of academic staff |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty Appraisal | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .266\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .002 |
| N | 132 | 132 |
| Performance of academic  staff | Correlation Coefficient | .266\*\* | 1.000 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .002 | . |
| N | 132 | 132 |

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

**Source: Primary Data**

Table 4.11 reflects a Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient results (r **=** 0.266, p between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staff for students’ responses. The correlation coefficient of 0.266 implies a weak positive correlation between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staff. To test the contribution of faculty appraisal to the performance of academic staff at ASUL, the researcher compared the value of the correlation coefficient of 0.266 with a significant value of 0.002 and this value is less than α = 0.01 (the 1% significant level). This implies that the more regular faculty appraisal is conducted, the more is the improvement in the performance of academic staff.

Based on these results, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis H₀ and accepted the alternative hypothesis H₁ and a conclusion was drawn that “Faculty appraisal has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”.

During the interview one of the heads of department had to say,

*“Faculty appraisal encourages departmental staff to be committed to their work and it also brings subordinates closer to their supervisors as the activities agreed upon to be appraised has to be monitored”.*

Table 4. 12 Correlations between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staff for academic staff responses

|  | | Faculty appraisal | Performance of academic staff |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty appraisal | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .328 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .118 |
| N | 24 | 24 |
| Performance of academic  Staff | Correlation Coefficient | .328 | 1.000 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .118 | . |
| N | 24 | 24 |

**Source: Primary data**

Table 4.12 gives a Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient results (r **=** 0.328, p) between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staff for academic staff responses. The correlation coefficient of 0.328 implies a weak positive correlation between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staff at ASUL. To test the contribution of faculty appraisal to the performance of academic staff at ASUL, the researcher compared the value of the correlation coefficient of 0.328 with a significant value of 0.118 and this is greater than α = 0.01 (the 1% significant level).

Based on the above results, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis H₀ and accepted the alternative hypothesis H₁ and a conclusion made that “Faculty appraisal has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”. In fact results from focus group discussion reveals that over 65% of the respondents supported appraisal activities at the faculties.

A university administrator during the interview affirmed that:

*“Staff performance appraisal involves setting of targets to be achieved which have been agreed upon by both parties the supervisor and the subordinates. It also ensures that there is proper aligning of linkage of objectives and facilitating effective communication throughout the institution”.*

This suggested that staff performance appraisal sets a good plan for achievement of institutional goals and objectives thus the university management cannot go astray in trying to meet their set targets.

Responses and analyses from over 75 % of university administrators revealed that faculty appraisal if well conducted could serve to be the most viable tool in improving the performance of academic staff and it can be employed as a yard stick to recommend teaching staff for promotions, trainings and remunerations.

## 4.6 Research objective three

The third objective of the study was to ascertain the contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Different sets of questionnaires were administered to students and academic staffand allthe questions assessed using a Likert scale (Likert, 1932) ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree (SA), 2 = Disagree (DA), 3 = Undecided (UD), 4 = Agree (A), and 5 = Strongly Agree (SA).

## 4.6.1 Descriptive statistics on feedback for students’ responses

Table 4.13 presents a descriptive statistics on feedback for students’ responses.

Table 4. 13 Descriptive statistics on feedback for students’ responses

| **Statements** | **Strongly Disagree (SD)** | **Disagree(DA)** | **Undecided(UD)** | **Agree (A)** | **Strongly Agree (SA)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| There is clear communication of staff appraisal practices to students | 7  (5.3%) | 25  (18.9%) | 30  (22.7%) | 60  (45.5%) | 10  (7.6%) |
| University management regularly give feedback to students on staff appraisal practices | 11  (8.3%) | 35  (26.5%) | 23  (17.4%) | 60  (45.5%) | 3  (2.3%) |
| Feedback on staff appraisals from various appraisers is given to students | 12  (9.1%) | 35  (26.5%) | 27  (20.5%) | 50  (37.9%) | 8  (6.1%) |
| Students are involved in the discussion of staff appraisal feedback | 12  (9.1%) | 34  (25.8%) | 27  (20.5%) | 51  (38.6%) | 8  (6.1%) |
| Report from various sources is a very effective appraisal practice | 6  (4.5%) | 19  (14.4%) | 23  (17.4%) | 63  (47.7%) | 21  (15.9%) |
| Guide line on appraisal feedback is disclosed to students | 7  (5.3%) | 28  (21.2%) | 25  (18.9%) | 61  (46.2%) | 11  (8.3%) |

**Source: Primary Data**

Results from table 4.13 show the responses of 132 students on six statements concerning feedback. On the statement “There is clear communication of staff appraisal practices to students”, 7(5.3%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, 25(18.9%) disagreed, 30(22.7%) were undecided, 60(45.5%) agreed while 10(7.6%) strongly agreed with the statement.

The findings show that majority of the respondents (45.5%) agreed with the statement. Since this is less than 50% and 22.7% of the respondents were uncertain with the statement it implies that some category of students does not access communication of staff appraisal practices.

Regarding the statement “University management regularly gives feedback to students on staff appraisal practices”, 11(8.3%) strongly disagreed, 35(26.5%) disagreed, 23(17.4%) were undecided, 60(45.5%) agreed while 3(2.3%) strongly agreed.

Findings reveal that majority of the respondents (45.5%) agreed with the statement. Since this is less than 50% it implies that there is uncertainty among some category of respondents on the frequency of feedback to students by the university management on appraisal practices.

Concerning the statement “Feedback on staff appraisals from various appraisers is given to students”, 12(9.1%) strongly disagreed, 35(26.5%) disagreed, 27(20.5%) were undecided, 50(37.9%) agreed while 8(6.1%) strongly agreed.

Findings illustrate that majority of the respondents (37.9%) agreed with the statement, since this is less than 50% and a high proportion of respondents (26.5%) disagreed with the statement. It implies that feedback on staff appraisals from various appraisers is not regularly given to some group of students.

Opinions on the statement “Students are involved in the discussion of staff appraisal feedback” indicate that 12(9.1%) strongly disagreed, 34(25.5%) disagreed, 27(20.5%) were undecided, 51(38.6%) agreed while 8(6.1%) strongly agreed.

These results reveal that majority of the respondents (38.6%) agreed with the statement. Since this is less than 50% and high numbers of respondents disagreed and some were undecided then some group of students were poorly involved in the discussion of staff appraisal feedback.

On the statement “Report from various sources is a very effective appraisal practice”, 6(4.5%) strongly disagreed, 19(14.4%) disagreed, 23(17.4%) were undecided, 63(47.7%) of the respondents agreed while 21(15.9%) strongly agreed with the statement.

The results therefore demonstrate that majority of the respondents (47.7%) agreed with the statement. Since this is less than 50% it reflects a divergence in the opinions of the respondents on the effectiveness of reports on appraisal practices from various sources.

In regards to the statement “Guide line on appraisal feedback is disclosed to students”, 7(5.3%) strongly disagreed, 28(21.2%) disagreed, 25(18.9%) of the respondents were undecided, 61(46.2%) agreed while 11(8.3%) strongly agreed.

The above results illustrate that majority of the respondents (46.2%) agreed with the statement, since this is less than 50% and a relatively high percentage of respondents disagreed with the statement, it implies that guideline on appraisal feedback is not disclosed to some category of students. In all results from Table 4.13 demonstrate that majority of the respondents agreed with the six statements concerning feedback.

## 4.6.2 Descriptive statistics on feedback for academic staff responses

Table 4.14 below presents a descriptive statistics on feedback for academic staff responses.

Table 4. 14 Descriptive statistics on feedback for academic staff responses

| **Statements** | **Strongly Disagree (SD)** | **Disagree(DA)** | **Undecided(UD)** | **Agree (A)** | **Strongly Agree (SA)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Appraisal feedback is a very effective tool | 0  (00.0%) | 2  (8.3%) | 5  (20.8) | 12  (50.0%) | 5  (20.8%) |
| University management communicate appraisal feedback | 4  (16.7%) | 4  (16.7%) | 1  (4.2%) | 14  (58.3%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| I am involved in discussing appraisal feedback | 3  (12.5%) | 4  (16.7%) | 6  (25.0%) | 10  (41.7%) | 1  (4.2%) |
| Data on performance appraisal is used for determining promotion | 1  (4.2%) | 7  (29.2%) | 3  (12.5%) | 9  (37.5%) | 4  (16.7%) |
| I am encouraged by appraisal reports from various sources | 0  (00.0%) | 5  (20.8%) | 5  (20.8%) | 11  (45.8%) | 3  (12.5%) |
| Feedback from various sources is communicated in time | 2  (8.3%) | 6  (25.0%) | 4  (16.7%) | 10  (41.7%) | 2  (8.3%) |
| Appraisal feedback is used for organizing trainings for academic staff | 5  (20.8%) | 5  (20.8%) | 3  (12.5%) | 8  (33.3%) | 3  (12.5%) |

**Source: Primary Data**

Table 4.14 shows the results on the statements concerning feedback from 24 academic staff respondents who participated in the study. On the statement “Appraisal feedback is a very effective tool”, none of the respondents strongly disagree, 2(8.3%) disagree, 5(20.8%) were undecided, 12(50.0%) of the respondents agreed to the statement whereas 5(20.8%) strongly agreed.

Results above point that half of the respondents (50%) agreed with the statement, this implies that appraisal feedback is a very effective appraisal tool.

In regards to the statement “University management communicate appraisal feedback”, 4(16.7%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, 4(16.7%) disagreed, only one respondent representing 4.2% of the respondents was undecided, 14(58.3%) agreed while 1(4.2%) strongly agreed with the statement.

Results above demonstrate that more than half of the respondents (58.3%) agreed with the statement, since this is more than 50% it implies that University Management communicate appraisal feedback to academic staff.

Concerning the statement “I am involved in discussing appraisal feedback”, 3(12.5%) strongly disagreed, 4(16.7%) disagreed, 6(25.0%) of the respondents were undecided, 10 respondents corresponding to 41.7% agreed while only one respondent representing 4.2% strongly agreed.

Results above illustrate that the number of respondents who agreed with the statement had the highest proportion of 41.7%, since this is less than 50% it implies that some section of academic staff are not involved in the discussion of appraisal feedback.

On the statement “Data on performance appraisal is used for determining promotion”, 1(4.2%) strongly disagreed, 7(29.2%) disagreed, 3(12.5%) were undecided, 9(37.5%) agreed with the statement while 4(16.7%) strongly agreed with the statement.

Results above point that the proportion of the respondents who agreed with the statement was the highest (37.5%) but since this is less than 50% and a relatively high percentage (29.2%) of respondents disagreed with the statement it implies that data on performance appraisal at times is not used for determining promotion.

Regarding the statement “I am encouraged by appraisal reports from various sources”, none of the respondents strongly disagreed, 5(20.8%) disagreed while an equal number 5(20.8%) of the respondents were undecided, 11(45.8%) of the respondents agreed with the statement and 3(12.5%) strongly agreed.

Results above show that majority of the respondents (45.8%) agreed with the statement, since this is less than 50% it implies that some academic staff are not encouraged by appraisal reports from various sources.

Results concerning the statement “Feedback from various sources is communicated in time”, only 2 respondents representing 08.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed, 6(25.0%) disagreed, 4(16.7%) were undecided, 10(41.7%) agreed, while 2 (8.3%) strongly agreed with the statement.

Results above demonstrate that a high proportion of the respondents (41.7%) agreed with statement but since this is less than 50% it implies that sometimes feedback from various sources is not communicated to academic staff in time.

While on the statement “Appraisal feedback is used for organizing trainings for academic staff”, 5(20.8%) strongly disagreed, an equal number of 5(20.8%) of the respondents disagreed, 3(12.5%) were undecided, 8(33.3%) agreed with the statement while 3(12.5%) disagreed.

Findings revealed that majority of the respondents (33.3%) agreed with the statement, since this is less than 50% it implies that appraisal feedback at times is not a major requirement for organizing trainings for academic staff.

In fact 55% of the respondents from the focus group discussion revealed that academic staff are not regularly involved in the discussion of appraisal reports but they observed that appraisal reports are very useful in performance management and that the contributions from academic staff are vital for appraisal systems to succeed.

## 4.6.3 Test of hypothesis for objective three

To test the contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff, the study was guided by the hypothesis for objective three which stated that “Feedback has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”. The null hypothesis H₀ for testing stated that “Feedback does not significantly contribute to the performance of academic staff at ASUL” and the alternative hypothesis H₁ stated as “Feedback has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”. The researcher used Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient, **r** totest whether there was any correlation between feedback and the performance of academic staff**.** The correlation results are given in Tables 4.15 and 4.16.

Table 4.15 Correlations between feedback and the performance of academic staff for students’ responses.

|  |  |  | **Feedback** | **Performance of academic staff** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Feedback | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .365\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 |
| N | 132 | 132 |
| Performance of academic  Staff | Correlation Coefficient | .365\*\* | 1.000 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | . |
| N | 132 | 132 |

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

**Source: Primary Data**

Table 4.15 shows Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient results (r = 0.365, p 0.01) for feedback and the performance of academic staff for students’ responses. The correlation coefficient of 0.365 implies a weak positive correlation between feedback and the performance of academic staff. To test the contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at ASUL, the researcher compared the value of the correlation coefficient of 0.365 with a significant value of 0.000 and this value is less than α = 0.01 (the 1% significant level).

This implies that the more often appraisal feedback is given to students, the more they are willing to assess the performance of academic staff. Based on the above results, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis H₀ and accepted the alternative hypothesis H₁ and a conclusion was arrived at that “Feedback has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”. This means that students believe that feedback is a very vital appraisal practice that contributes to the improvement in the performance of academic staff.

The above results are in line with the findings gathered during interview with the university administrators where 65% of the respondents revealed that appraisal feedback is regularly communicated to students and that student guild leaders are involved in the discussion of appraisal reports.

Table 4.16 Correlations between feedback and the performance of academic staff for academic staff responses.

|  |  | **Feedback** | **Performance of academic staff** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feedback | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .732\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 |
| N | 24 | 24 |
| Performance of academic  Staff | Correlation Coefficient | .732\*\* | 1.000 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | . |
| N | 24 | 24 |

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

**Source: Primary Data**

Table 4.16 indicates Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient results (r **=** 0.732, p 0.01) for feedback and the performance of academic staff for academic staff responses. The correlation coefficient of 0.732 implies that there is a high positive correlation between feedback and the performance of academic staff. To test the contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff, the researcher compared the value of the correlation coefficient of 0.732 with a significant value of 0.000 and this value is less than α = 0.01 (the 1% significant level).

The implication is that the more regular appraisal feedback is given to academic staff, the more will be the improvement in their levels of performance. In this regard the researcher rejected the null hypothesis H₀ and accepted the alternative hypothesis H1 and a conclusion was drawn that “Feedback has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL”. The results further demonstrate that academic staff rated feedback as the most effective appraisal practice in enhancing their performance.

Along the same line, results gathered through interview with the key informants indicate that 75% of the respondents perceive feedback as a very effective appraisal tool. In fact they observed that there is a high positive contribution of communicating appraisal feedback and the improvement in the performance of teaching staff.

## 4.7 Regression results

Linear regression analysis was computed to determine the extent to which appraisal practices contribute to the performance of academic staff.

## 4.7.1 Linear regression analysis for students’ responses

The linear regression analysis for students’ responses is given in Table 4.17.

Table 4. 17 Linear regression analysis for students’ responses

| **Model** | **R** | **R Square** | **Adjusted R Squares** | | **Std. Error of the Estimate** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | .393a | .155 | .135 | | .42440 | | | |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Feedback, Evaluation by students, Faculty Appraisal | | | | | | | | |
| **Model** | | | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | | **Standardized Coefficients** | **T** | **Sig.** |
| B | Std. Error | | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | | 2.765 | .278 | |  | 9.930 | .000 |
| Evaluation by students | | .137 | .071 | | .171 | 1.939 | .055 |
| Faculty Appraisal | | .047 | .063 | | .077 | .749 | .455 |
| Feedback | | .141 | .058 | | .246 | 2.420 | .017 |

a. Dependent Variable: Performance of academic staff

**Source: Primary data**

Table 4.17 gives linear regression results of the study for students’ responses with the values of R = 0.393 and of Adjusted R Squares= 0.135 meaning that 13.5% of the variance in the performance of academic staff at ASUL is explained by feedback, evaluation by students and faculty appraisal. The remaining 86.5% of the performance of academic staff at ASUL is determined by other factors not covered in this study. This prediction is further borne out by a significance of 0.000. The significance coefficient of 0.017 for feedback indicates that this value makes a significant addition to the prediction in the performance of academic staff over and above other values, in other words feedback is the best predictor, evaluation by students is a weak predictor with a significance value of 0.055 while faculty appraisal is a weaker predictor with a significant value of 0.455.

The above results are in line with the correlation results which showed a high positive contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Correlation results also indicated a weak positive relationship between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

These results reveal that performance of academic staff at ASUL is strongly explained by feedback of the appraisal system in place. The results also imply that performance of academic staff at ASUL is least explained by evaluation by students and faculty appraisal.

## 4.7.2 Linear regression analysis for academic staff responses

The linear regression analysis for academic staff responses is given in table 4.18.

Table 4. 18 Linear regression analysis for academic staff responses

| **Model** | | **R** | **R Square** | | **Adjusted R Squares** | | **Std. Error of the Estimates** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | | .754a | .568 | | .503 | | .33363 | | | |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Feedback, Evaluation by students, Faculty appraisal | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Model** | | | | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | | | **Standardized Coefficients** | **T** | **Sig.** |
| B | | Std. Error | | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | | | 3.999 | | .821 | |  | 4.873 | .000 |
| Evaluation by students | | | -.296 | | .189 | | -.256 | -1.566 | .133 |
| Faculty appraisal | | | 8.312E-5 | | .093 | | .000 | .001 | .999 |
| Feedback | | | .354 | | .096 | | .637 | 3.678 | .001 |

a. Dependent Variable: Performance of academic staff.

**Source: Primary data**

Table 4.18 gives a linear regression results for academic staff responses with the values of R = 0.754 and of Adjusted RSquares = 0.503. This implies that 50.3% variations in the performance of academic staff at ASUL is explained by feedback, evaluation by students and faculty appraisal. The remaining 49.7% of the performance of academic staff at ASUL is determined by other factors not covered in this study. This prediction is further borne out by a significance of 0.000.

The significance coefficient of 0.001 for feedback indicates that this value makes a significant addition to the prediction in the performance of academic staff over and above other values.

The above results are in line with the correlation results which showed a high positive correlation between feedback and the performance of academic staff at ASUL. These results demonstrate that performance of academic staff at ASUL is strongly explained by feedback. Although the performance of academic staff is least explained by faculty appraisal and evaluation by students, they are significant predictors of performance appraisal at ASUL.

## 4.8 Analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique of results

The analysis of variance was used on the sample information to test simultaneously whether or not the means of the three predictors/treatments of the study produce different results. The F-distribution was used as the test statistics. ANOVA was processed using the F- distribution given by SPSS. In this study the predictors/treatments referred to were: evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback. The null hypothesis Ho stated that “There is no significant difference among the means of evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback” while the alternative hypothesis H1 was stated as “At least one mean of evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback is different”. ANOVA was discussed for both the students and academic staff responses.

## 4.8.1 Analysis of Variance technique for students’ responses

Analysis of variance for students’ responses is given in table 4.19 below.

Table 4. 19 Analysis of variance for students’ responses

| **Model** | | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Regression | 4.223 | 3 | 1.408 | 7.816 | .000a |
| Residual | 23.054 | 128 | .180 |  |  |
| Total | 27.278 | 131 |  |  |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Feedback, Evaluation by students, Faculty Appraisal

b. Dependent Variable: Performance of academic staff

**Source: Primary data**

ANOVA table 4.19 above gives the computed F value of 7.816 with a significant value of 0.000 which is less than the 0.01 significance level. Basing on the above results, the researcher accepted the null hypothesis which stated that “There is no significant difference in the means of evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback” and the alternative hypothesis was rejected.

The above finding indicates that there is no significant difference among the three predictors of performance of academic staff at ASUL.

These findings are in line with the results reflected in response to the items for research objectives one, two and three where there was a high proportion of agreement by the respondents. This results suggest that the statistical difference among the mean responses of the above three predictors is negligible.

## 4.8.2 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for academic staff responses

Analysis of variance for academic staff responses is given in table 4.20.

Table 4. 20 Analysis of Variance for academic staff responses

| **Model** | | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Regression | 2.925 | 3 | .975 | 8.759 | .001a |
| Residual | 2.226 | 20 | .111 |  |  |
| Total | 5.151 | 23 |  |  |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Feedback, Evaluation by students, Faculty appraisal

b. Dependent Variable: Performance of academic staff

**Source: Primary data**

ANOVA Table 4.20 above gives the computed F value of 8.759 with the corresponding significant value of 0.001 which is less than the 0.01 significance level. Basing on the above results, the researcher accepted the null hypothesis which stated that “There is no significant difference in the mean of evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback” and the alternative hypothesis was rejected.

The above finding indicates that there is no significant difference among the three predictors of performance of academic staff at ASUL.

These results are in the same dimension to the results in response to research objectives which showed that majority of respondents agreed with the statements for: evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback. As observed above, the statistical difference among the mean responses of the above three predictors is negligible.

## 4.9 Summary

In chapter four the response rate for all the categories of the respondents was presented, analysis of bio-data of the respondents was logically handled. All the three objectives of the study were looked into with in-depth analysis of descriptive statistics, hypotheses tests carried out objective by objective. Furthermore, correlation and regression analyses were presented, analyzed and interpreted, and analysis of variance discussed. Chapter five will present summary, discussion, conclusion and the recommendations of the study findings.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango. In this chapter, the findings from chapter four are summarized, discussed, conclusions drawn and recommendations made in line with the research objectives.

## 5.2 Summary of results

In chapter four the data was presented, analyzed and the results interpreted. The summary of results of the study has been presented objective by objective.

## 5.2.1 Summary of results on objective one

The first objective of the study was to examine the contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. In chapter four, descriptive statistics was presented for both students’ and academic staff responses. Findings from students’ responses revealed that more than 50% of the respondents agreed with the eight statements on evaluation by students. This implies that students were in agreement with the statements, along a similar line finding from academic staff responses showed that more than 50% of the respondents agreed with all the seven statements raised on evaluation by students.

This implies that a good proportion of academic staff were in support of this appraisal practice. Findings from key informants demonstrated that evaluation by students is one of the most reliable appraisal practices in performance management of academic staff.

Results of correlation analysis for objective one for students’ responses gave a correlation coefficient of 0.355 with a significant value of 0.000 which is less than 0.01(the 1% significant value) implying a weak positive correlation between evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff at ASUL. The result therefore reveals that there is a significant contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Results of correlation analysis for academic staff responses gave a correlation coefficient of - 0.221 with a significant value of 0.299. Since this is greater than 0.01(the 1% significant value), it implies that there is a low negative correlation between evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Results of hypothesis test for objective one for students’ responses point that there is significant evidence at 1% level that evaluation by students contributes to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Along the same line result of hypothesis test for objective one for academic staff responses indicates that there is significant evidence at 1% level that evaluation by students does not contribute to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Linear regression results for students’ responses gave a significance value of 0.055 implying that evaluation by students is a weak predictor of the performance of academic staff at ASUL whereas that for academic staff responses gave a significance value of 0.133 similarly implying that evaluation by students is a weak predictor of the performance of academic staff at ASUL. ANOVA results indicated that there is no significant difference in the means of evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback.

## 5.2.2 Summary of results on objective two

The second objective of the study was to assess the contribution of faculty appraisal to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. In chapter four, descriptive statistics was presented for both students’ and academic staff responses. Findings from students’ responses revealed that more than 50% of the respondents agreed with the three statements on faculty appraisal. Findings from academic staff responses also reflected more than 50% of respondents in agreement with all the seven statements on faculty appraisal.

Results of correlation analysis for objective two for students’ responses gave a correlation coefficient of 0.266 with a significant value of 0.002 which is less than 0.01(the 1% significant level) implying a low positive correlation between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Results of correlation analysis for academic staff responses gave a correlation coefficient of 0.328 with a significant value of 0.118 and since this is greater than 0.01 (the 1% significant level) it implies that there is a low positive correlation between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Result of hypothesis test for objective two for students’ responses points that there is significant evidence at 1% level that faculty appraisal contributes to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Likewise result for hypothesis test for objective two for academic staff responses indicates that there is significant evidence at 1% level that faculty appraisal contributes to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Linear regression results for students responses gave a significance value of 0.455 implying that faculty appraisal is a weaker predictor of the performance of academic staff at ASUL whereas that for academic staff responses gave a significance value of 0.999 similarly implying that faculty appraisal is a weaker predictor of the performance of academic staff at ASUL. ANOVA results indicated that there is no significant difference in the means of evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback.

## 5.2.3 Summary of results on objective three

The third objective of the study was to ascertain the contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. In chapter four, descriptive statistics was presented for both students’ and academic staff responses. Findings from students’ responses revealed that more than 50% of the respondents agreed with all the six statements on feedback, while findings from academic staff responses also illustrated that more than 50% of the respondents agreed with all the statements on feedback.

Results of correlation analysis for objective three for students’ responses gave a correlation coefficient of 0.365 with a significance value of 0.000 which is less than 0.01(the 1% significant level) implying a low positive correlation between feedback and the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Results of correlation analysis for academic staff responses gave a correlation coefficient of 0.732 with a significance value of 0.000 which is less than 0.01(the 1% significant level) implying that there is a high positive correlation between feedback and the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Result of hypothesis test for objective three for students’ responses points that there is significant evidence at 1% level that feedback contributes to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Along the same line the result of hypothesis test for objective three for academic staff responses indicated that there is significant evidence at 1% level that feedback contributes to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Linear regression results for students’ responses yielded the value of adjusted R squares of 0.135 which implies that 13.5% of the performance of academic staff at ASUL is explained by feedback, evaluations by students and faculty appraisal with feedback as the best predictor with a significance value of 0.017. Likewise linear regression results for academic staff responses gave the value of adjusted R squares of 0.503; this means that 50.3% of performance of academic staff at ASUL is explained by feedback, evaluation by students with feedback as the best predictor with a significance value of 0.001.

Results for statistical difference obtained by ANOVA computation for students’ responses gave the computed F value of 7.816 with a significant value of 0.000 which is less than 0.01 significance level, basing on the above results the researcher accepted the Null hypothesis and a conclusion was drawn that “There is no significance difference in the means of: evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback”. Similarly results for statistical difference obtained by ANOVA computation for academic staff responses yielded the computed F value of 8.759 with a significance value of 0.001 which is less than 0.01 significance level, and basing on the above findings the researcher accepted the Null hypothesis and a conclusion was made that “There is no significance difference in the means of evaluation by students, faculty appraisal and feedback”.

## 5.3 Discussion

The discussion of results have been done on the basis of the findings of the study and presented objective by objective.

## 5.3.1 Discussion of results on objective one

Objective one of the study was to examine the contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. On testing the hypothesis the results for students’ responses revealed a weak positive contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Contrary to the results for student respondents, on testing the hypothesis for academic staff responses, the result indicated an insignificant contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. This implies that teaching staff tend to ignore evaluation by students; in fact they believe that it has no impact on their performance.

Results of regression analysis for both students and academic staff responses indicated that evaluation by students is a weak predictor of the performance of teaching staff at ASUL. This demonstrates that other factors can best explain the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Results from ANOVA point that there is no significant difference in the mean of evaluation by students compared with the means of the other dimensions under independent variable namely faculty appraisal and feedback. This implies that evaluation by students is equally important as the other predictors in this study.

Based on the above results, the finding for objective one was drawn and concluded that Evaluation by students has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

This finding corroborates or differs with the findings of other researchers who conducted a similar study on performance appraisal as discussed below:

The finding corroborates with the study finding by Wanyama (2001) who conducted a study on the assessment of staff performance appraisal on organizational performance, a case study of the Institute of Teacher Education Kyambogo; his findings revealed that staff appraisal has a significant contribution on organizational performance. Kamwine (2004) also agrees with the above findings, he conducted a study on the management of appraisal schemes and the performance of teachers in some selected government aided secondary schools in Kampala district and the study findings revealed a significant contribution of appraisal schemes in teacher performance.

The researcher therefore observed that there are great similarities in the findings of this study with those of Wanyama (2001) who conducted the study from an institution of higher learning in more or less the same level as ASUL though a public institution whereas ASUL is a private institution the deviations in the study findings to some extent can be attributed to different management styles of these institutions. The findings of the current study slightly differ with that of Kamwine (2004) who conducted a study in the secondary school settings whereas this study was carried out in a university setting, there is therefore much difference in the objectives of institutions considered in the studies.

The finding of this study is also in line with the finding by Namutebi (2003), as cited in Nuwanguzi (2006) who observed that there is a significant correlation between the results of evaluation by students and the teacher’s content delivery in the class room in secondary schools of Mukono district, this was supported by Namubiru (2003) who recommended that assessment by students should be aimed at helping a teacher to exhibit a high level of professionalism, commitment, identify areas of strengths and weaknesses and therefore place him/her in a better position to adjust on the teaching methodologies in a bid to overcome the weaknesses and further improve on the areas of strengths. A study by Nuwanguzi (2006) put emphasis only on the content delivery of teachers leaving out other critical areas of performance of teaching staff. It is therefore this gap that this study intended to address.

Adams (1963) Equity Theory underpins the above findings for objective one. The theory confirms that individuals go beyond a simple ranking system in their assessment of inputs to outputs to where they precisely quantify the equity or inequity of the comparison. The theory demonstrates comparative perceptions on evaluation by students on the performance of academic staff. The above arguments demonstrate that findings for objective one are in line with Equity Theory.

Latham and Locke (1990) Goal Setting Theory likewise underpins the findings for objective one. The theory supports performance management and setting of objectives against performance which can be measured and managed. The theory further demonstrates that if individuals set goals, they will be more motivated to perform. The above arguments confirm that findings for objective one are in line with Goal Setting Theory.

## 5.3.2 Discussion of results on objective two

The second objective of the study was to assess the contribution of faculty appraisal to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. On testing the hypothesis, results from both students and academic staff responses presented in chapter four revealed a significant contribution of faculty appraisal to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Correlation results for both students’ and academic staff responses reflected weak positive correlations between faculty appraisal and the performance of academic staff at ASUL. This reflects that there is need for improvement of appraisal practices at the faculties so that the process serves the purpose for which it was designed.

Results of regression analysis for both students and academic staff responses indicated that faculty appraisal is a weaker predictor of the performance of teaching staff at ASUL. This demonstrates that other factors can best explain the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Results from ANOVA point that there is no significant difference in the mean of faculty appraisal compared with the means of the other dimensions under independent variable namely evaluation by students and feedback. This implies that faculty appraisal is equally important as the other predictors in this study.

Based on the above results, the finding for objective two was drawn and concluded that Faculty appraisal has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

The finding of this study is in line with Tumusiime (2000) who pointed that appraisals at departmental levels have made it possible for heads of learning institutions to identify teachers’ strengths and weaknesses especially in regards to the quality of teaching in schools. This finding was further supported by Brewer (2005) who asserted that high quality teaching in schools can only be achieved if the administrators of the institutions appraise their teachers on a regular basis to identify their potentials in regards to teaching and research. In fact the head teachers through their association have on many occasions organized seminars and workshops to help teachers learn new techniques and expose them to challenges facing the quality of education so that they are in position to adapt to practices aimed at improving on the performance of teachers with ultimate goal of getting quality education.

However the above findings did not clarify the involvement of teachers in setting appraisal targets and strategies. The finding only mentioned the exposure of teachers in appraisal processes but not their active participation in all the appraisal processes. This gap necessitated the researcher to carry out this study.

In regards to the findings of this study, the faculty deans and heads of department in their capacities as supervisors should actively involve academic staff in designing performance appraisal strategies at the faculties and department; this to some extent will make academic staff build a sense of commitment and team spirit with the ultimate goal of achieving the objectives of the institution.

The findings of the current study are further supported by finding from Mugizi (2007) who conducted a study at Mbarara University of Science and Technology which revealed that there was a significant relationship between administrative policies and employees’ job satisfaction, this is however contradictory to Acom (2007) who claimed that school policies contribute less to teachers’ job satisfaction and commitment. The researcher contends that administrative policies vary from institution to institution, notably implemented in all HEIs in Uganda is the performance appraisal policy NCHE (2008).

As observed the findings by Mugizi (2007) did not specify the administrative policies that lead to employees’ job satisfaction, as a well planned appraisal practice to a greater extend makes an employee motivated in his/her job leading to improvement in performance. The current study findings also disagrees with the claim by Acom (2007) who observed that school policies contribute less to teachers’ job satisfaction and commitment, the weakness in the study is that it did not specify the policies that weakens the morale of teachers to perform. The shortcomings in the above study findings fuelled the need for this current study.

Adams (1963) Equity Theory underpins the findings for objective two. The theory maintains that employees should build fairness in performance appraisal systems as this will make them accept the outcomes of the process. The theory further asserts that employees contribute to their own quota of the job which helps to promote good inputs amongst them and guide human resource actions which include performance appraisal which was central in this study.

Latham & Locke (1990) Goal Setting Theory underpins the findings for objective two. The theory focuses on setting of specific goals, performance standards, and the general performance improvement of employees. Goal Setting Theory observes that appraisal practices help to generate accurate records of performance that helps in setting objectives upon which an employee’s performance is judged. The above arguments show that findings for objective two are in line with Goal Setting Theory.

## 5.3.3 Discussion of results on objective three

Objective three of the study was to ascertain the contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. On testing the hypothesis, results from both students and academic staff respondents revealed a significant contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Along the same line correlation results for both students and academic staff responses portrayed a significant contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. This demonstrates that feedback is perceived as a very useful tool in performance appraisal.

Results of regression analysis for both students and academic staff responses indicated that in this study, feedback is the best predictor of the performance of teaching staff at ASUL. This implies that for the purpose of this study, feedback can best explain the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Results from ANOVA pointed that there is no significant difference in the mean of feedback compared with the means of the other dimensions under independent variable namely evaluation by students and faculty appraisal. This implies that feedback is equally important as the other predictors in this study.

Based on the above results, the finding for objective three was drawn and concluded that Feedback has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

The current study finding is in line with the study findings by other scholars. Nkata and Maicibi (2001) presented four major sources of information that are used by managers as strategies to measure the performance of their employees they included personal observation, statistical reports, oral reports and written reports, each of these sources has their strengths and weaknesses, but a combination of these strategies increases the chance of obtaining reliable information regarding the potentials of an employee. Wanyama (2001) agrees with Nkata and Maicibi (2001), from his study on performance appraisal conducted at the Institute of Teacher Education Kyambogo (ITEK), he observed that regular and systematic feedback increases employee participation in various departments. He further contends that for effectiveness of employees to be realized there is need for frequent appraisal feedback from the supervisors. However the findings from Wanyama (2001) did not address the sources of feedback, it generally talked of regular and systematic feedback that improves on an employee’s commitment to work. The above findings form part of the arguments that prompted this study as the researcher was with the view of discussing some dimensions of feedback for effective performance improvement.

The finding of this study is also in line with Matwire (2002) who viewed that appraisal feedback encourages employees’ commitment in performing their duties and that it builds team spirit in an institution and as such employees participate willingly in running the affairs of the institution. Kamwine (2004) agrees with Matwire (2002), he observed that appraisal schemes encourage open communication between supervisors and subordinates or employers and employees which ultimately help to create effective work teams. In the view of the researcher if the supervisors can communicate freely with the subordinates then team spirit will be developed in the work environment (institution) this will make the appraisal process enjoyable by both the appraiser and appraisee.

Kluger & Angelo (1996) agree with this study finding by ascertaining that performance feedback has the potential to influence future performance of individuals and organizations at large. They are supported by Dorfman, Stephen & Loveland (1986) who revealed that satisfaction with appraisal feedback among staff is regarded as one of the most consequential of the reactions to employee reactions.

Earley et al., (1990) conclude that feedback discussions include a discussion of outcomes (ratings) and process (strategies to enhance future performance) both of which enhance motivation to perform. This study disagrees with Kluger and Angelo (1996) who in their study concluded that appraisal feedback lowered staff performance. This was one of the arguments that prompted the researcher to investigate the contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Adams (1963) Equity Theory underpins the findings for objective three. The theory supports the view that feedback is a much more constructive tool in performance appraisal, as it is crucial to give feedback to both the supervisor and subordinates. The above reflects that the findings for objective one are in line with Equity Theory.

Latham & Locke (1990) Goal Setting Theory underpins the findings for objective three.

The theory maintains that actionable feedback encourages employees’ participation in carrying out activities in an institution. Employees have to be informed on the criteria being used and the purpose of the appraisal. The above observations maintain that findings for objective three are in line with Goal Setting Theory.

## 5.4 Conclusion

In chapter four the results of the study were presented, analyzed and interpreted and in the preceding sub-section the results were discussed. This sub- section therefore looks at the conclusion of the results of the findings of the study objective by objective.

## 5.4.1 Conclusion of objective one

Objective one of the study was to examine the contribution of evaluation by students to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango. From the results of the study discussed in the preceding sub-section, the following conclusion was drawn;

The study has a number of implications to the management of ASUL firstly the weak correlation between evaluation by students and the performance of academic staff needs prompt attention. It was concluded that evaluation by students has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango.

## 5.4.2 Conclusion of objective two

Objective two of the study was to assess the contribution of faculty appraisal to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango. Basing on the discussion of the findings of the study, it was concluded that faculty appraisal has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango. In fact staff-based evaluation carried out by academic staff has a high influence on how they evaluate themselves individually or as a team to identify their strengths and weaknesses so as to improve on their performance.

## 5.4.3 Conclusion of objective three

Objective three of the study was to ascertain the contribution of feedback to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango. From the discussion of the findings done in the preceding sub-section, the study concluded that feedback has a significant contribution to the performance of academic staff at ASUL. Indeed feedback is a very vital management tool for an institution to achieve its objectives.

## 5.5 Recommendations

The recommendations have been done on the basis of the findings of the study. The researcher has recommended the measures that should be taken by the university management in order to improve the current performance appraisal practices for academic staff at ASUL. The recommendations have been handled objective by objective.

## 5.5.1 Recommendations on objective one

The researcher recommends that for evaluation by students to be a meaningful performance appraisal practice in enhancing performance of academic staff at ASUL then;

Performance appraisal should not be conducted only to rate the performance of academic staff in the past period, where possible it should focus on the questions on how the performance can be enhanced in future and how the teaching staff can overcome the weak performance areas.

ASUL management should clearly state the areas to be evaluated by students, statements in the appraisal forms should be easy to understand and the targets achievable. Evaluation by students should not be seen as a strategy to expose the weaknesses of academic staff rather it should be perceived as a strategy of improving the quality of education at ASUL.

ASUL management should use other motivational strategies alongside evaluation by students in order to engineer staff interest for improved job performance, such strategies may include; rewards, recognition and promotion.

## 5.5.2 Recommendation on objective two

In any institution of higher learning its strengths largely depend on how its faculties or different units are managed, and to some extent the performance of teaching staff depend on the performance appraisal system in place, the researcher therefore recommends that;

Performance planning should be conducted before performance period where teaching staff should be allowed to set the goals and objectives for the appraisal system. In other words teaching staff should be encouraged to identify their strengths and weaknesses so that they can determine their key performance areas (KPAs) and set goals for future performance.

ASUL management should recognize the achievements and accomplishments of academic staff properly in order to enhance their motivation. This can be done by offering different rewards to them including monetary incentives, excellence awards, promotions, trainings and study tour.

There is need for the establishment of a policy frame work that encourages open and participatory faculty appraisal system so that academic staff are actively involved in performance appraisal process at ASUL.

## 5.5.3 Recommendation on objective three

Feedback on performance appraisal is a vital tool in any institution of higher learning for its smooth operation. The researcher therefore recommends that;

ASUL management should ensure that the reports on appraisal processes are communicated to both the appraisees and the appraisers in order to make performance appraisal a meaningful performance improvement strategy at ASUL.

360-degree feedback system should be the base of appraisal system at ASUL. Feedback should be taken from various sources namely; administrative staff, teaching staff themselves and students. This feedback should be periodically taken and provided systematically to teaching staff.

Continuous discussion sessions should be conducted between the university administrators and the teaching staff. If in the course of performance period the appraiser realizes that there is a gap, then there is need to hold a discussion with the appraisee rather than to wait up to the end of performance appraisal period where improvement may be so challenging.

Generally the researcher recommends that Government should closely monitor and inspect private universities, not only in the quality of education offered but also in other aspects like appraisal practices in place, work environment and physical infrastructure. They should assess from time to time the institution’s capacity to generate knowledge and maintain staff. Institutions which do not abide by such standards should be closed.

## 5.6 Limitations of the study

The study findings demonstrate that appraisal practices contribute significantly to the performance of academic staff. However the findings were limited since only ASUL was considered as a case study.

The following threats to the comprehensiveness of the findings were encountered:

There was limited access to some policy documents relevant to the study as a result of restriction put by the university management for fear that some of their confidential information could be published. This rendered the researcher incapable of reviewing some documents to collect secondary data.

Not all the respondents were committed to complete the questionnaires in time; others seemed not to be interested in participating in the study while some of the respondents especially the students on distant programmes were not available at the campus during the time of collecting data. This delayed data collection process since they were required to participate in the study.

## 5.7 Contributions of the study

This study on performance appraisal of academic staff has been the first of its kind to be conducted at All Saints University Lango (ASUL) since its establishment in 2008. The study will therefore contribute to the improvement of performance appraisal practices of academic staff of ASUL.

The study will contribute to already existing body of knowledge in the areas of staff performance appraisal in HEIs. The researcher therefore is of the view that the findings of this study will enable HEIs to strengthen their human resource department.

## 5.8 Areas recommended for future research

The researcher proposes the following areas for future research:-

1. Future researchers should complement the findings of this study by carrying out and establishing other factors that contribute to the performance of academic staff in universities and other tertiary institutions in Uganda.

2. There is need to compare perceptions of supervisors and subordinate employees towards the appraisal system in other HEIs.

3. There is need to establish in details factors that influence the performance of staff in public higher educational institutions in Uganda.

# REFERENCES

Adams, J.S. (1963). *Towards an understanding of Inequity*. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 67(5), 422-436

Aguinis, H. (2007). *Performance Management*. Prentice Hall. London.

Aigboye, C.D. (2007). *Strategies for improving the quality of academic staff in Nigerian Universities for quality assurance*. In J.B, Babalola. G.D Akpa, A.O Ayeni, S.O Adede ( Eds); Higher Education. Ibadan; NAEAP.

Allen, P. (2003). *Performance Appraisals with More Gains, Less Pains.* Harvard Management Communication Letter. May, 2003 Vol.6, Issue 3.

All Saints University Lango. (2013). *Annual Performance Report*.

All Saints University Lango. (2013). *Council Report*.

All Saints University Lango. (2014). *Students’ Guild Council Minutes*.

Amin, M. (2005). *Social Science Research; Conception, Methodology and Analysis*. Kampala, Makerere University Printery.

Antonioni, D. (2002). *360-Degree Feedback.* Industrial Management. San Francisco .Jossey. Bass Publishers.

Armstrong, M. (2000). “*Performance Management; The New Realities”.* London Institute of Personnel and Management.

Armstrong, M. (2006). *Key Strategies and Practical Guidelines.* 3rd edition*.* Kogan Page. Limited, London.

Armstrong, M. (2009), *Human Resource Management*. (7th Ed) .Kogan Page Limited.

Aslam, H.D. (2010) & Sarwar, S. (2010). *Improving Performance Management Practices in IT Firms of Pakistan.* J. Manage. Res….,02(3):1 - 15

Aswathappa, K. (2003). *Organizational Behavior*. Mumbai; Himalaya Publishing House.

Aswathappa, K. (2008). *A Handbook of Personnel Management Practice (2nd Ed).* Kogan Page

Axelrod, P. (2008). *Student Perspectives on Good Teaching; What History Reveals -Academic Matters*. The Journal of Higher Education, 24 (227).

Awe, A. B. (2009). *Quality Management of University Education in Nigeria*. In: B. Babolola. A.O Ayeni (Eds). Education Management; Theories and Tasks. Lagos: Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Limited PP.761-786.

Bakkabulindi, F. (2008). *Individual characteristics affecting the use of computers in Makerere University.* Research for Masters Students (Educ). Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.

Barie, E., & Sow, S. (2008). *Effects of Performance Appraisal on employees attitudes*. Accessed on 18/May/2015 from [www.referaty.atlas.sk](http://www.referaty.atlas.sk)

Baron, B. (1979). *The Managerial Approach to Tertiary Education. A crucial analysis*. London, University of London, Institute of Education.

Beardwell, J., & Claydon, T. (2007). *Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice. A contemporary approach* .London; Prentice Hall.

Bracken, D. W., Timmreck, C.W & Church, A.H. (2001). *The Hand Book of Multisource Feedback*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brewer, D. J. (2005). Evaluating the effects of Teacher Degree level on Educational Performance. Accessed on 16 /May/2015 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/97535l.pdf>

Cokins, G. (2004). *Performance Management. Finding the Missing Pieces and Closing the Intelligence Gap*. John Wiley and Sons, Austria.

Cole, A. (1997). *Personnel Management* .(4th edition). London. Ashford, Colour Press.

Conway, G. P. (2003). *Higher Education Trends in the 21st Century*.

Decenzo & Robbison (2002). *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management*, (8th edition).

Dorfman, P. W., & Stephen, W. G. (1986). *Performance Appraisal Behaviors; Superior Perceptions and Subordinate Reactions*; Personnel Psychology, 39. 579-597.

Earley (1990). *NFER Middle Management Project*. Follow up of 1989.

Emetaron, U. G. (2007). *Student Evaluation of Teaching; An Administrative Strategy for Quality Assurance in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria*: S.O Adedeji (Eds); Higher Education, Ibadan NAEAP, pp 318-327.

Frye, M.B. (2004). *Equity-based compensation for employees’ firm performance and determinants*. The Journal of Financial Resource, 27(1).34-54

Gay, L. (1996). *Education Research; Competencies for analysis and application*. Toronto, Prentice Hall.

Goer, L. G., Bell, C. & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness*: A Research Thesis. Comprehensive Centre for Teacher Quality. Washington DC.

Greenberg, J. (1986). *Determinants of Perceived Fairness in Performance Evaluation*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 340-342

Greer , R. (2001). *Strategic Human Resource Management* .A General Management Approach .2nd Edition. Printice Hall, London.

Henle, C. (2005). *Predicting work place deviance from the interaction between organizational justice and personality*. Journal of Managerial Issues 17; 247.

Homans, C. C. (1961). *Social Behavior; Its Elementary Forms.* NY, Harcourt, Brace and World.

Huselid, M.A. (1995). *The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Turn over, Productivity and Corporate Financial Performance.* Academy of Management Journal,38(3) 635-672.

Kakozi, A.B.K (2003). *University Education in Uganda, Challenges and opportunities in Uganda for reform* .Kampala. Fountain Publishers.

Keeping, L.M & Levey, P. E. (2000). *Performance Appraisal Reactions, Measurement, Modeling and Methods*. Bias, Journal of Applied Psychology, pp708-723.

Kettunen, J. (2003)*. Strategic evaluation of institutions by students in higher education, perpectives*,7(1) 14-18

Kluger & Angelo, D. (1996). “*The Effects of Feedback Interventions on Performance. A Historical Review, Meta-Analysis and a Preliminary Feedback Intervention theory*”. Psychological Bulletin 119 (March 1996).

Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.V. (1970). *Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and psychological measurements*. 30, 607-610.

Kwamine, E. (2004). *Management of appraisal schemes and teachers performance in government aided Schools in Kampala District*. Unpublished Masters (of Education Management) Dissertation. Makerere University, Kampala. Uganda.

Landy, F. J & Farr, J. L (1985). *The Measurement of Work Performance, Methods, Theory and Applications.* Orlando, Academic Press.

Lansburg, R. (1988). *Performance Management. A Process Approach. Human Resource Management*. Australia, 46-55.

Latham, G.P. & Locke, E.A. (1970). *Goal setting in Practice. The Effects of Personality and Perceptions of the Goal – Setting Process on job satisfaction and goal commitment.* Personnel Psychology.

Latham, G.P. & Locke, E.A. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance.* *Englewood accomplishment, self evaluation and performance related-outcomes?* .Theory Based Applications and Directions for Research. Personnel Psychology.48(4), 803-839.

Maicibi, N.A. (2007). *Human Resource Management Success*. The tips for HRM theorists and practitioners. Kampala; Makerere University Printery.

Makawiti, D.W. (2011). *Perception of Academic Staff in Kenya Public Universities Towards Application of Performance Appraisal Results in Training and Promotion Decisions*. Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi.

Mani, B. (2002). *Performance appraisal systems, productivity and motivation* .A Case Study Pub.Pers.Manag., 32(1)141-159.

Margaret, R. (1995). *Social science research methods;* A Hand Book for Africans (2 Ed) Nairobi; Education Publishers Ltd.

Marie, B. W. (2003). *Perceived Fairness of and Satisfaction with Employee Performance Appraisal*. Published Dissertation of HRM ( Louisiana State University)

Mason, R. D. (1990). *Statistical Techniques in Business and Economics*. 7th Ed, Pg 11-18.

Matwire, K. (2002). *Analysis of factors affecting the effective implementation of appraisal practices in private companies*. Bombardier Transportation Uganda Ltd.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Scoting.

Meyer, H., & French, T. (1965). *Effects of Threats in Performance Interviews*. Journal of Applied Psychology 49, 311-317.

Mugenda, A.G., & Mugenda, O.M. (2003). *Research methodology:* Acts Press Nairobi, Kenya.

Mugenda, A.G., & Mugenda, O.M. (2004). *Research methodology:* Acts Press Nairobi, Kenya. Austria

Mugenda, O.M. (2003).*Research methods, quantitative and qualitative approaches*. ACTS Press, Nairobi, Kenya.

Mullins, L.J. (2002). *Management and organizational behavior*, (6th edition). London. Pitman Publishing House.

Mullins, L. J. (2010). *Management and Organizational behavior*, ( 9th edition) . Harlow; Pearson’s Educational Limited.

Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding Performance Appraisal*, Thousand Oaks. CA, Sage.

Namubiru, J. (2003). *Appraisal system and improved teacher performance in secondary schools of Mukono District*. Unpublished Masters of Educational Management Dissertation. Uganda Management Institute .Kampala ,Uganda.

Naris, S., & Ukpere, W. I. (2010). *Developing a retention strategy for qualified staff at the Polytechnique of Namibia* .Business Papers and Reports No.26.

NCHE. (2008). *Quality assurance framework for universities and the licensing process for higher education institutions.* Kampala, Uganda*.*

Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnai*re *design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. Printery. London.

Okorie, N.C., & Uche, M. (2004). *Total Quality Management in Education*; Its imperatives and Key Content.

Oyoo, S.O., & Bwoga, P.O. (2009). *Post graduate students’ perspective of an exemplary teacher*. The International Journal of Learning Vol.16(6) 43-64.

Rao, T. V. (2004). *Performance management and appraisal systems*. HR Tool for Global Competitiveness. Sage Publications.

Roberts, T. (2003). *Employee performance appraisal systems participation. A technique that works.* Pub.Pers. Manag, 32(1) 89-98.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations*.(5th edition). New York. The Free Press.

Sallies, E. (2002). *Total Quality Management in Higher Education.* US Department of Education. Office of Educational Resources Information Centre (ERIC). New York.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thorn hill, A. (1999). *Research method for business students. London*. Prentice Hall-Financial Times. The Youth Care Centre at Helwan University. World Journal of Sports Sciences.

Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business, A skill building approach*.4th Ed) John Wiley and Sons Inc.USA.

Somerick, N. (1993). *Strategies for improving employee relations by using performance appraisals more effectively*. Pub. Rela Q…..J, 38(3); 37-39.

Tchniowski, C., Shaw, K & Prennushi, G. (1997). *The Effects of Human Resource Management Practices on Productivity:* A study of Steel Finishing Lines. The American Economic Review, 87(3).291-313.

Tessema, M & Soeters, J. (2006*). Challenges and Prospects of HRM in developing countries; Testing the HRM* - Performance link in Eritrean Civil Service, International Journal of HRM

Tetty, J. W. (2006). Staff retention in African Universities; Elements of a sustainable strategy. Washington, DC

Tough (2009). *Administration of the Performance Appraisal Process.* West Chester.

Tumusiime (2000). *Effect of appraisal practices in secondary schools* of *Mbarara District.* Published Bachelor of Education Dissertation. Kyambogo University, Kampala, Uganda.

Tziner, A., & Cleveland, J. (2001). *Relationships between attitude towards organizational and performance appraisal systems and rating behaviors* .Vol.3 Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Vallance, S. (1999). *Performance Appraisal* in Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines *.A Culture Perspectives*. Australian J. Pub.Adm, 58(3), 78-95.

Wanyama, O. (2001). *An assessment of staff performance appraisal on organizational Performance.* A Case Study of Institute of Teacher Education Kyambogo. Masters of Management Studies Dissertation (Human Resource Management).Uganda Management Institute. Kampala, Uganda.

Watson, S.R. (2000). *”Why is it that Management academics rarely advise on the management of their own institutions?”* Human Resource Development International, 3;1,89-100.

Webber, G. (2003). *Funding in UK Universities; Living at the Edge,* Perspectives 7(4), 93-97.

Weihrich, H. (2005). *Essentials of management*. An International Perspectives , 6th Edition McGraw Hill, New York.

Werner, J., Randy, L & Le Desimone, R. (2006). *Human Resource Development*. South Western Centage, London; CIPD.

Wilson, J. P. (2005). *Human Resource Development*. 2nd edition . Kogan Page. London.

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX I

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ACADEMIC STAFF

**Dear Sir/Madam,**

I am Alfred Ojok carrying out a study on the topic **“*The contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango”* (ASUL).**

This is a study leading to the award of a Master’s degree in Management Studies (Higher Education Leadership and Management) of Uganda Management Institute (UMI).

Given your experience and position in the university, you have been selected for this study. Your response will therefore contribute greatly to the success of this study.

You are kindly requested to freely express your opinion on all the issues raised as objectively as possible. Information given will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used for the purpose of this study only.

**Section A: Background Information**

Please tick the applicable option as it relates to you

1. Your sex: 1. Male

2. Female

2. Your age bracket: 1. 20-39 3. 50-59

2. 40-49 4. 60+

3. Highest level of education:

1. PhD 3. Bachelor

2. Masters degree 4. Diploma

4. Terms of service:

1. Permanent 3.Part-time

2. Contract

5. Job title: 1. Senior Lecturer 3. Assistant lecturer

2. Lecturer 4. Teaching Assistant

6. How long have you served in this University?

1. Less than 3 years 2. More than 3 years

**Section B: Independent Variable – Appraisal Practices**

Please tick the applicable options regarding the appraisal practices used at ASUL.

Use scale; **1 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (D), 3 = Undecided (UD),**

**4 = Agree (A) and 5 = Strongly Agree (SA)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **SD** | **D** | **UD** | **A** | **SA** |
| No. | **Evaluation By Students** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 7 | Evaluation by students is a very reliable appraisal tool |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | I always vary the methods of delivery to make students understand my lectures |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | I encourage the use of staff evaluation forms marked by students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Academic staffs encourage the use of attendance register marked by students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | I attend to students on matters concerning my department |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | I am always available for consultation by students |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Students are best judges of staff performance appraisal |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Faculty Appraisal** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 14 | Peer review is an effective appraisal tool |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | I appraise myself regularly |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Academic staff support faculty appraisal |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | I participate in setting appraisal strategies at the faculty |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | Faculty appraisal is used for promotion |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Faculty appraisal is done regularly |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Faculty appraisal is used for salary increment |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Feedback** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 21 | Appraisal feedback is a very effective appraisal tool |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | University management communicates appraisal feedback |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | I am involved in discussing appraisal feedback |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | Data on performance appraisal is used to determine promotion |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | I am encouraged by appraisal report from various sources |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | Feedback from various sources is communicated in time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | Appraisal feedback is used to organize training for academic staff |  |  |  |  |  |

**Section C: Dependent Variable –Performance of Academic Staff**

Please tick the applicable option regarding the performance of academic staff.

Use the scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (D), 3 = Undecided (UD),

4 = Agree (A), 5 = Strongly Agree (SA)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **SD** | **D** | **UD** | **A** | **SA** |
|  | **Effectiveness in teaching** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 28 | Academic staff are punctual for lectures |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | Academic staff make effort to ensure that students complete their courses in time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | Academic staff exhaust their teaching contact hours as scheduled |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | Academic staff assess students as programmed |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Academic staff mark students’ examinations in time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | Academic staff submit students’ examination results in time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | Academic staff administer remedial tests to students |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Effectiveness in Research** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 35 | Academic staff pay attention to students’ research work |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | I ensure that students under my supervision complete their research promptly |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | Academic staff are active in the publication of books |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | Academic staff organize research seminars |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | Academic staff prepare proposals to attract research grants |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | Academic staff collaborate with colleagues in other universities in research publications |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41 | Academic staff are always available for consultations by students on matters related to research |  |  |  |  |  |

**Thank you for your precious time.**

## 

## APPENDIX II

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

**Dear respondent,**

I am Alfred Ojok carrying out a study on the topic ***“The contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango”( ASUL).***This is a study leading to the award of a Master’s degree in Management Studies (Higher Education Leadership and Management) of Uganda Management Institute (UMI).

You are kindly requested to freely express your opinion on all the issues raised as objectively as possible. Information given will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used for the purpose of this study only.

**Section A**: **General Information**

Please tick the applicable option.

1. Your Sex: 1. Male 2. Female

2. Your age bracket: 1.Less than 19 3. 25-29

2. 20-24 4. Above 30

3. Year of study:

1. Second 2. Third

4. Study program being pursued:

1. Masters 3. Diploma

2. Degree 4. Certificate

5. Category of study program.

1. Day 3. Weekend

2. Evening 4. Distance

**Section B: Independent Variable –Appraisal Practices**

Please tick the applicable options regarding the appraisal practices used at ASUL.

Use scale; **1 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (D), 3 = Undecided (UD),**

**4 = Agree (A), 5 = Strongly Agree (SA).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **SD** | **D** | **UD** | **A** | **SA** |
| **No.** | **Evaluation by students** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 6 | Students regularly evaluate academic staff |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Students are encouraged by academic staff to use evaluation forms |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Academic staff encourage the use of attendance register |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Attendance register is marked regularly by student coordinators |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Students assess academic staff freely without interference |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Academic staff themselves avail to us evaluation forms |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Academic staff freely collect the filled up evaluation forms |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Students are encouraged to express their opinions freely by academic staff |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Faculty appraisal** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 14 | Students are informed of staff appraisals at the faculties |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Students are aware of peer review by academic staff |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Self appraisal by academic staff is carried out by individual staff |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Feedback** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 17 | There is clear communication of staff appraisal practices to students |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | University management regularly give feedback to students on staff appraisals practices |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Feedback on staff appraisals from various appraisers are given to students |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Students are involved in the discussion of staff appraisal feedback |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | Report from various sources is a very effective appraisal practice |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | Guide line of appraisal feedback is disclosed to students |  |  |  |  |  |

**Section C: Dependent Variable –Performance of Academic Staff**

Please tick the applicable option regarding the performance of academic staff at ASUL.

Use the scale; **1 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (D), 3 = Undecided (UD),**

**4 = Agree (A), 5 = Strongly Agree (SA).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **SD** | **D** | **UD** | **A** | **SA** |
|  | **Effectiveness in teaching** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 23 | Academic staff are always regular for teaching |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | Academic staff provide us with enough materials |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | Syllabus is covered in time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | Assessment of students is done timely |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | Remedial tests is given to students |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | Examination results are processed timely |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | Academic staff ensure that students complete their study programmes in time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | Academic staff adhere to academic programmes |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Effectiveness in research** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | Academic staff put much attention in the supervision of students’ research |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Academic staff encourage students to do research work |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | Academic staff guide students on the techniques of preparing proposals to attract funding |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | Academic staff mark students research work in time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | Academic staff encourage students to publish books |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | Research workshops is organized for students |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | Academic staff mark students’ internship reports in time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | Academic staff involve students in national publications |  |  |  |  |  |

**Thank you for your precious time.**

## APPENDIX III

## KEY INFORMANTS INTERVIEW GUIDE

**A. Back Ground Information**

1. Sex of the respondent

2. Age bracket of the respondent

3. How long have you worked at ASUL?

4. What is your position at ASUL?

5. How long have you worked in the current position?

6. What is your highest level of education?

**B. Independent Variable: Appraisal Practices**

7. Does your institution have in place staff performance appraisal practices?

8. If yes which are those appraisal practices?

9. Does your institution set staff performance appraisal targets?

10. Does your institution organize performance appraisal training for staff? If yes when?

11. What are the perceptions of academic staff towards the appraisal system in place?

**(a) Evaluation by students**

12. Do students assess academic staff in your institution?

13. If yes, when is the exercise conducted?

14. Which activities are involved in this assessment process?

**(b) Faculty Appraisal**

15. Is staff appraisal done at the faculties?

16. If yes when is the exercise conducted?

17. Which activities are involved?

18. Who participate in the appraisal exercise?

**(c) Feedback**

19. Does the university management communicate staff appraisal feedback?

20. If yes when?

21. Who participates in the appraisal feedback discussions?

22. Do academic staff get feedback from multiple sources?

23. If yes when?

**C. Dependent Variable: Performance of Academic Staff**

**(a) Effectiveness in teaching**

24. Are academic staff committed in teaching?

25. Do academic staff assess students regularly?

26. Is marking of examinations done within schedule?

27. Is processing of examination results done in time?

28. Comment on the completion rate of students.

**(b) Effectiveness in Research**

29. Are teaching staff committed in research supervision?

30. Do teaching staff actively participate in research publications?

31. Are students’ research work marked in time?

32. Are students’ internship reports marked in time?

33. Do staff participate in preparing proposals to attract research grants?

34. Are students actively involved in research?

35. Is there collaboration with other universities in research work?

36. What are the challenges facing staff performance appraisal in your institution?

37. Suggest the possible solutions to the above challenges.

**Thank you very much for your precious time**

## APPENDIX IV

## DOCUMENTARY REVIEW CHECK LIST

The study reviewed the tabulated documents for the periods stated in line with performance appraisal of academic staff at ASUL.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Items reviewed** | **Period(year)** |
| 1 | Appraisal reports | 2011-2014 |
| 2 | Staff attendance register | 2011-2014 |
| 3 | Academic committee reports | 2011-2014 |
| 4 | University Council reports | 2011-2014 |
| 5 | Students’ evaluation forms | 2011-2014 |
| 6 | Faculty evaluation forms | 2011-2014 |
| 7 | Students guild minutes book | 2011-2014 |
| 8 | Strategic plan | 2010-2030 |

## APPENDIX V

## FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

**Dear Respondent,**

I am Alfred Ojok carrying out a study on the topic ***“The contribution of appraisal practices to the performance of academic staff at All Saints University Lango” (ASUL).***This is the study leading to the award of a Master’s degree in Management Studies (Higher Education Leadership and Management) of Uganda Management Institute **(UMI).**

You are kindly requested to freely express your opinion on all the issues raised as objectively as possible. Information given will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used for the purpose of this study only.

**A. Back Ground Information**

1. Sex of the respondent

2. Age bracket of the respondent

3. How long have you worked at ASUL?

4. What is your highest level of education?

5. Which faculty do you belong?

**B. Independent Variable: Appraisal Practices**

**(a) Evaluation by students**

6. How relevant is evaluation by students to your work?

7. What are the challenges of this appraisal practice?

**(b) Faculty appraisal**

8. How relevant is faculty appraisal to your work?

9. What are the challenges of this appraisal practice?

**(c) Feedback**

10. What can you say about feedback of appraisal practices at ASUL?

11. What should be the use of appraisal reports at ASUL?

**C. Dependent variable: Performance of Academic Staff**

12. Comment on the performance of academic staff at ASUL in terms of teaching and research.

**Thank you for your precious time**