



Implications of Demographics of History and Government teachers on the implementation of the Teacher Performance Appraisal Development tool and Learning Outcomes in Kwale County, Kenya.

Mwangangi Leonard^{1*}, Ondigi Samson² and Bwire Adelheld³

Department of Educational Communication and Technology, Kenyatta University, Nairobi Kenya.

***Corresponding Author**
Mwangangi Leonard

Department of Educational
Communication and
Technology, Kenyatta
University, Nairobi Kenya.

Article History

Received: 18.11.2024
Accepted: 13.12.2024
Published: 02.01.2025

Abstract: This study investigated the implications of History and Government teachers' demographics on the implementation of the Teacher Performance Appraisal and Development (TPAD) tool and its impact on learning outcomes in Kwale County, Kenya. Teachers' demographics, including age, gender, academic qualifications, teaching experience, and workload, these variables play a crucial role in shaping teachers attitudes and effectiveness in implementing the TPAD tool. This study explored how these demographic variables influence teachers' engagement with the appraisal process, adherence to its objectives, and the resulting impact on learning outcomes in History and Government in Secondary schools in Kwale County. Using a mixed-methods approach, data were collected through survey involving a questionnaire and document analysis of KCSE results both at national and Kwale County levels. Quantitative and qualitative was analyzed to provide insights on the implications of teachers' demographics in compliance with the TPAD tool requirements and implications on learning outcomes. Findings reveal that younger teachers with fewer years of experience often exhibit higher adaptability and positive attitudes toward the TPAD tool while more experienced teachers tend to resist its implementation. Gender differences were also observed, with female teachers demonstrating greater diligence in adhering to the TPAD guidelines compared to their male counterparts. Teachers with advanced academic qualifications showed greater effectiveness in aligning the TPAD tool expectations. However, high workloads and administrative responsibilities were identified as key barriers, hindering teachers' ability to fully embrace the TPAD tool implementation and enhanced learning outcomes. This study underscores the importance of tailoring professional development programs to address the specific needs and challenges faced by teachers based on their demographics. It recommends enhanced support systems, reduced workloads, and targeted capacity-building initiatives to optimize the implementation of the TPAD and improve learning outcomes in Kwale County. This study contributes to the broader discourse on teacher appraisal systems and their role in educational quality enhancement.

Keywords: Implications, Demographics, implementation, learning outcomes.

Cite this article:

Mwangangi, L., Ondigi, S., Bwire, A., (2025). Implications of Demographics of History and Government teachers on the implementation of the Teacher Performance Appraisal Development tool and Learning Outcomes in Kwale County, Kenya. *ISAR Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 1-14.

Introductory Reflection

Teacher performance appraisal plays a critical role in education systems globally by assessing and enhancing the effectiveness of the teacher in provision of teaching services. Teacher Performance Appraisal (TPA) is considered important in the teaching service because as observed by Teshoma, (2018), modern appraisal of teachers enables them to become reflective practitioners. As a reflective practitioner the teacher thinks and is critical of their own

performance with a view of improving it. Pawson, (2019), points out that teacher performance appraisal is important because it aims at improving individual teacher's performance and motivation which leads to improved classroom content delivery and enhanced learning outcome.

The appraisal of teachers is a process and not an act as observed by Adili, (2021) which involves data gathering, measuring current performance to reinforce strengths and identify deficiencies

through provision of feedback that influences future performance. This is in line with remarks by the Netherlands Minister for education while opening the 2013 Amsterdam International Education Summit on the teaching profession, who said, “giving and receiving feedback keeps each other on our toes with regard to quality and is key to effective teaching” UNESCO, (2014). The global trends to evaluate teacher’s performance has led many countries to embrace teacher’s performance appraisals. Historically teacher performance appraisal falls within two global trends, these are early practices where teachers were evaluated informally through observation based on seniority and 20th and 21st century reforms where there is emphasis on structured evaluation systems driven by educational reforms and the need for teachers to be accountable in their work. A survey involving 28 countries in OECD (2013) indicated that 22 of the 28 countries surveyed had developed a national policy framework for teacher evaluation. In the United States of America, 90% of the states as reported by Reddy, Fabiano, Dudek, & Hsu, (2013) have teacher evaluation systems in place. The overall objectives of teacher performance appraisals globally according to (UNESCO, 2023) are to improve teaching quality, by identifying strengths and areas for growth in teaching service. Teacher professional development for teachers particularly in pedagogy and content mastery and accountability where teachers are held responsible for learners’ outcomes and general performance of teaching service.

In Kenya, since independence, teacher appraisal was done by carrying out school and individual teacher inspection occasionally and the annual confidential appraisal report for each teacher by the principal as observed by Ngeno, Bett & Kimutai, (2013). Kenya, in line with Republic of Kenya (2012), TSC Act Section (f) and 35(1), TSC monitors the conduct of teaching duties by teachers. TSC developed teacher’s code of conduct and regulations (2015). Regulation 52 (1) provides that the Teacher Service Commission develops performance appraisal system for teachers under its employment. In 2016, TSC developed an open performance appraisal system for teachers with a view of strengthening supervision and continuous monitoring of the performance of teachers and maintenance of teaching and learning standards. The tool is called Teacher Performance and Appraisal Development (TPAD). TPAD envisages that teachers will become more empowered in their implementation of the curriculum leading to enhanced learning outcomes.

According to TSC, (2019) Teacher Performance Appraisal and Development (TPAD) tool is a performance evaluation mechanism that assesses the performance of a teacher as per the set standards as presented by TSC. This appraisal tool was launched in Kenya in 2016 in all public schools to replace the earlier appraisal which was a confidential principal’s report on individual teacher performance. The confidential report by principals had gaps in that, it did not involve the teacher being appraised, the confidential reports were prone to bias and lacked objectivity, a view confirmed by Ngeno, *et al*, (2013). Since introduction the TPAD tool in 2016, there has been controversy with teachers’ unions opposing it publically and legally in a court of law. The opposition to the TPAD tool implementation has encouraged scholars to research on the tool. This study investigated teachers’ demographic variables and their implications on the implementation the TPAD tool and learning outcomes with reference performance at KCSE to History and Government in Kwale County, Kenya.

Teaching just like any other endeavour must ensure transformative accountability in service delivery as noted by Regina, (2019). To ensure quality education as envisaged in Republic of Kenya Vision 2030, (2008) a key pillar in creating sustainable development the need to appraise teachers’ performance is crucial. Additionally, the TPAD intends to review and improve teaching and learning standards through systematic appraisal approach with a view to evaluate teacher’s performance and promote professional development for enhanced learning outcomes. TPAD like other teacher performance appraisal tools in other countries has gaps and challenges. Before the launch of the TPAD in 2016 a study by Ngeno, *et al*, (2013) had found that TSC teacher performance appraisal policies were unclear and appraisal tools were not having impact on teachers’ classroom performance therefore the need for TSC to develop a tool to measure and evaluate the efficiency of teacher performance in Kenya.

Methodology

Study design is the blueprint that is utilized to conduct research Bonghurst and Brown (2015). The study employed descriptive survey design. According to Kothari, (2009). This method involves describing, recording, analyzing and interpreting phenomenon as it is. The result of the investigation enables an explanation of a social phenomenon under investigation.

Descriptive survey is suitable for this study because as noted by Cresswell, (2014) it explains the situation as it is. Descriptive survey involves respondents’ and participant’s responses to relevant issues of study objectives; is appropriate as it points out characteristics, trends, frequencies and provides an indepth perspective of issue of concern, additionally descriptive survey is considered appropriate in this study as it facilitates collection of diverse data, minimizes biases and maximizes reliability as observed by Maichomo, Karanja, Olum, Magero, and Nyoke, (2019). This is possible as both quantitative and qualitative data will be sort.

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in selected public secondary in Kwale County, Kenya. According to Kwale County Government website (2022), Kwale County is located in South Coast of Kenya, has a surface area of 8270 km² and a population of 866,820. Kwale County has been selected for this study because according to TSC, (2021) the TPAD compliance report rating the County was ranked 2nd best in the TPAD tool compliance. This study will be interested to establish how the good ranking in the TPAD tool compliance, a tool geared towards enhancing teachers’ professionalism and learning outcomes has influenced learning outcomes in History and Government. Public Secondary schools have been selected because in Kenya curriculum, History and Government is offered in Secondary schools.

History and Government as a learning area has been selected because it is an important discipline of study that helps humanity in understanding their past, learning lessons from the mistakes and success of the past by avoiding repeating mistakes of the past and replicating successful strategies of the past. History shapes society’s identity and heritage and helps communities to be rooted and value based. Additionally, the field of History contributes in developing critical thinking, shaping informed citizenship by enabling individual to participate actively in civic life of the community and to make informed decision about governance and

policy as well as inspiring people through the roles of historical figures such as Mahatma Ghadhi and Nelson Mandela. History is gaining popularity among learners in secondary schools as demonstrated in KNEC Report on candidature (2011-2022) with candidature increase averaging 5% annually. History indeed provides valuable lessons and insights that are crucial for personal and societal growth and is also the area of specialization by the researcher with emphasis on History education.

Targeted population

Target population in research has been defined by Cresswell, (2014) as all members of real or hypothetical set of people, events or objects to which the researcher wishes to generalize the results of the study. The target population of this study was all the 61-sub county secondary schools in Kwale, Sub County Secondary schools have been targeted because they constitute 60% of all public secondary schools in Kwale County. These schools admit student from the area near the school are not well funded and staffed therefore these schools required interventions to enhance learning outcomes. 100 teachers of History and Government were targeted, these are the trained, registered and employed by TSC as the TPAD tool is applicable to all TSC registered teachers.

Sampling and sample size

Sampling procedure refers to the strategies which enable the researcher to select representative subjects from the target population as observed by Rukwaru, (2007). The sample size for the study was 15 public sub secondary schools in Kwale County

which represents 25% of the target population. 25% sample size as observed by Sahaya, (2017) is acceptable to make generalization and transferability of the finding.

This study utilized simple random sampling for the schools and convenience sampling to access the teachers of History and Government. Sample refers to individuals or subjects from the population that contains the elements representative of the characteristics found in the entire target population as observed by Kothari, (2009).. The Sub County schools in Kwale were be categorized as mixed sub county secondary schools, Day sub county secondary schools, and Day and boarding secondary schools in each category five secondary schools were picked to attain a sample size of 15 sub county secondary schools, cut the list so that each school stands out alone, put them in a basket shake and pick one, then shake and pick till 15 public sub county secondary schools are attained. History and Government teachers were conveniently sampled in that the questionnaire was filled by the History and Government teachers who were be in school when the researcher got to the sampled schools.

Sample size is the actual number of subjects who were used in the study as noted by (Main 2012). The study considers a sample size of 25% of the target population as acceptable in line with observations of (Gay 1992) who observes that to a large population a sample of 10% and above is acceptable in descriptive survey. Sample size as noted by Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003) is a small accessible population. The sample size for the study is summarized in table 3.1 below.

Table 1: Sampling grid

| Target Population | Number | Sampling procedure | Sample Size | Percentage |
|--|--------|-----------------------|-------------|------------|
| Sub county secondary schools in Kwale County | 61 | Simplerandom sampling | 15 | 25% |
| Principals | 61 | Purposive sampling | 15 | 25% |
| History and Government Teachers | 100 | Convenience sampling | 30 | 30% |

Data Collection Tools

The study employed a variety of research tools guided by the nature of the study objective. Both qualitative and quantitative data were sort. This is what Cresswell, (2014) refers to as mixed methods. According to Willis and David, (2009) selection of research tools is guided by nature of data sort, time availability as well as study objectives. The study employed two reseach instruments to collect data. Kothari, (2009) observes that use of multiplicity of research tools enables collection of views, opinions, perceptions, feelings and attitudes of respondents and bridges gaps in data collection.

Questionnaire for History and Government teachers

The questionnaire was the main tool of collecting primary data that is both quantitative and qualitative. The questionnaire was appropriate tool for this study because as observed by Sahaya,

(2017) questionnaire offers objective means of collecting information both qualitative and quantitative. According to Maichomo *et al* (2019), Questionnaire can collect a lot of data within a short period of time, it is manageable and cost effective in terms of time and money, Kothari (2009) confirm that questionnaire is free from the biases of the researcher. The questionnaire focused on objectives, one, to establish levels of teacher preparedness in History and Government to implement the TPAD tool, objective two, to investigate the perceptions of teachers of History and Government in the implementing the TPAD tool and objective three, to analyze how teachers implement the TPAD tool in content delivery in History and Government of the study.

Review of related literature

New trends are emerging in the world where every organization is keen on ascertaining how their systems and staff are performing

towards the attainment of set goals. This has led human resources departments to develop what is referred to as performance appraisal for staff. In teaching service performance appraisal in many countries is commonly referred to as Teacher Performance Appraisal or Teacher Appraisals (TPA) or performance Appraisal (PA). Teacher performance appraisal has been adopted by many countries across the world as reported by OECD (2013). In the USA, Reddy *et al.*, (2013) points out that USA pioneered in the implementation of teacher performance appraisal with majority of USA states having enacted formal policies that use students' achievements as a measure of teachers' evaluation system. This confirms that evaluation of teacher performance is key in ensuring quality education and teacher performance appraisals are geared towards learning outcomes.

Different countries have devised ways of determining teachers' performance and making teachers accountable. In Sweden, school self-evaluation and external school evaluation has been the practice according to Deborah *et al.* (2011). However, in Sweden, teacher appraisal has gaps in that there is no legal framework and procedure to follow in evaluating teachers' performance. Additionally, there is limited professional feedback to teachers. The absence of formal procedure to appraise teachers' performance implies teacher do not undergo any preparation to be appraised. According to goal setting and task performance theory, feedback is a key principle in performance without feedback improvement of performance may not be effective.

In Northern Ireland teacher appraisal is an annual review of teacher performance, a program launched in 2005. Performance review and staff development aims to develop teachers professionally and connect them to school programs as noted by Peterson, Wah, & Bone, (2020). However, that linkage of teacher's development needs to the school development plan is not clearly spelt out in Northern Ireland leaving a gap on how the linkage should proceed. There is no evidence on how teachers are prepared for the annual appraisal, this demonstrates teacher performance appraisal require constant reviews to enable them serve intended purposes of enhancing learning outcomes making teachers accountable and supporting teachers' professional growth.

Teacher performance appraisal in South Africa applies the approach of Integrated Quality Management Systems (IQMS). In spite of use of (IQMS) as observed by (CDE, 2015), South African teacher appraisal has limited implementation as envisaged by Integrated Quality Management Systems (IQMS) Waudu and Ouya, (2010) point out IQMS in education is a timely tool which must be clearly understand, adopted and implemented, for up to 80% of the success of a school or organization depends upon the systems used to pursue success. This means preparing teachers on (IQMS) is crucial to enable them understand and adopt it. The limited implementation of (IQMS) in South Africa indicates inadequate teacher preparation to adopt IQMS as a performance appraisal tool or low levels of adoption. The diffusion of innovation theory would support higher rates of adoption of teacher performance appraisals.

In Egypt as documented in World Bank Report, (2010) there is an elaborate teacher appraisal mechanism with the following aims; (a) to create levels of performance by teachers; (b) attract the right persons for teaching; (c) provide training opportunities for teachers; (d) align teachers training to learners need; (e) principals providing direct instructional support and (f) supervise learning

process as well as improving instructions (pedagogy). That notwithstanding, the Egyptian teacher appraisal has gaps as it seems to reward top performing teachers while ignoring low performing teachers. How the Egyptian teacher performance appraisal is operationalized is not well articulated as goal setting and task performance theory advocates for clarity in operation and how the provision of teachers with useful training and experiences is not articulated in Egyptian teacher performance appraisal.

Teachers' performance appraisals have gained popularity in Ghana aimed at checking on standards and quality to ensure enhanced learning outcomes. Lydia *et al.*, (2015), point out that in spite of central government's efforts in Ghana to check on teachers' performance the appraisal system does not take into consideration the opinions of staff (teachers), resources required for appraisal are not made available to teachers and the results of the performance appraisal are never acted upon nor used as bases to inform future decisions on teachers' performance. The gaps in Ghana's teacher performance appraisal indicate inadequate teacher preparations by not considering the teachers' opinion, raising questions on how teachers' commitment to the appraisal can be assured. According to Locke and Latham (1990), commitment to set goals and feedback are key in effective goal setting and task performance which are not well articulated in teacher performance appraisal in Ghana.

In Kenya, as observed by TSC (2019) the Government has endeavored to transform public service sector by introducing employee performance management system as one of the public sector reform policies (PSRP) designed to improve service delivery, offer quality, effective and efficient services that meets customer satisfaction and achieves Kenya's vision 2030 (Republic of Kenya 2008). In the spirit of improving service delivery TSC to develop the TPAD tool for Teachers as provided for in Republic of Kenya, (2012). The TSC Act part 11(f) and 35 (i) and in line with TSC reform agenda based on three strategic pillars of; Teacher competence for teachers, conduct of teachers and performance of duties by teachers. This is the TSC reforms and creativity in service delivery in teaching to be per the expectations of (the customer) the learner and ensure effective curriculum content delivery in classroom and enhance learning outcomes.

According to TSC, (2019), TPAD tool is a performance mechanism of assessing the performance of duties by teachers according to prescribed standards by TSC. The aims of the TPAD tool is to evaluate and enhance teaching standards through a systematic appraisal approach with a view to evaluating teacher's performance and promote professional development. The TPAD tool envisages to achieve six specific objectives according to TSC (2019), that provide quality teaching and learning in all schools, enable teachers improve in their performance of teaching duties, identify teaching gaps and support teachers in professional development and ensure learners rights and safety in public institutions.

A study by Asiago and Gathii, (2014) revealed that teachers' negative perception to performance appraisal was because teachers had not been trained on appraisal procedure, an indicator of inadequate preparation, the feedback from appraisals in not used to identify teacher professional gaps while it is clear teachers need awareness on role of teacher performance appraisal curriculum content delivery in the classroom and learning outcomes. Similar conclusions on why teachers have negative perception to

performance appraisal had been drawn by Werugu (2010) on teacher performance appraisal, therefore the proposed study will seek to propose an alternative teacher performance appraisal.

After the TPAD tool launch in 2016, studies conducted on the TPAD tool by Kagema and Irungu, (2018) revealed that the TPAD tool is a complex appraisal system which teachers may not fully understand and was implemented without addressing teachers concerns. Kagema and Irungu raised concerns on validity and reliability of the TPAD tool appraisal process which can influence the delivery of content and learning outcomes. Regina, (2019) in a study on assessing impact of the TPAD tool observes that the readiness of teachers and credibility of appraisers is a challenge in

the TPAD tool implementation. Therefore, the need for further research to propose effective ways of preparing teachers for implementation of an effective performance appraisal taking in to accord all variables including demographics of the teachers.

Data presentation discussion and interpretation

Questionnaire Return Rate for Teachers of History and Government

Data was collected using questionnaire. A total of 30 questionnaires were administered to History and Government teachers as shown in Table 4.1 below.

Table 2: Questionnaire Return Rate

| Participant | Number administered | Number returned | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|
| History and government teachers | 30 | 28 | 93% |

The return rates for questionnaire are presented in Table 2. above. The questionnaire was utilized to collect primary data targeting History and Government teachers, on the implementers of TPAD tool in the teaching and learning of History and Government in secondary schools. Out of the 30 questionnaires, 28 were returned fully responded to. However, during, data collection period some of the respondents were reported to be out of school, one unwell

and the other on official duties outside the school, therefore their responses to the questionnaire was not received.

This study included 30 secondary school teachers of History and Government. Their demographic information was based on gender, level of qualification, period of teaching History and Government, as well as their age brackets.

Table 3: Demographic Information for Teachers of History and Government

| Variable | Specification | N | Percent (%) |
|---|-----------------------|----|-------------|
| Gender | Male | 15 | 53.6 |
| | Female | 13 | 46.4 |
| Level of qualification | Diploma in Education | 3 | 11.1 |
| | Bachelor of Education | 24 | 85.2 |
| | Masters of Education | 1 | 3.7 |
| Period of teaching History and Government | Less than one year | 0 | 0.0 |
| | 1 - 5years | 6 | 21.4 |
| | 6 – 10 years | 10 | 35.7 |
| | 11 – 15 years | 4 | 14.2 |
| Age bracket | 15 years and above | 8 | 28.5 |
| | 20 – 35 years | 2 | 7.1 |
| | 36 – 51 years | 16 | 57.1 |
| | 52 – 60 years | 7 | 25 |
| | 61 and above | 5 | 17.4 |

The demographic information displayed in Table 3 was important since the information helps the to tap into the characteristics of the participants in relation to the implementation of the TPAD Tool and how it impacts learning outcomes. Demographic as observed by Hayes (2024) means describing the specific characteristics of participants and relating the description to the area of study. The demographics that were of interest to this study included gender, level of qualification, period of teaching History and Government and age. This demographic information is useful as it enabled identification of trends and patterns within the respondent that are related to implementation of the TPAD tool in the teaching in History and Government as described by Indeed editorial team (2024) on demographics and research.

Gender of Respondents

On Gender, Table 3 shows a gender parity of (15/28) 54% of the respondents being female while (13/28) 46% being male. The implication is that male and females are well represented in the teaching of History and Government at acceptable ratio that meets the 2/3 gender rule. These findings are in agreement with findings (UNESCO, 2023) which indicates that teaching is increasingly becoming a female dominated profession with 52% of secondary teachers being female and their numbers has been on increase since 2015. Additionally, UNESCO observes that men are more likely to leave the teaching profession globally at attrition rate of 9% for males in secondary schools compared to 6% for females at the same level because men have greater employment mobility than women. According to the study findings, the trend in teaching profession having more female than males has implications on implementation of TPAD tool and learning outcomes as argued by Kagema & Irungu (2018). The reason is that diversity of the teaching force is critical in eradicating gender stereotypes in education and enhancing equal pathways in careers for all learners.

Level of Education of Respondents

The level of education of the study respondents as illustrated in table 3 shows graduate teachers were (24/28) 89%, Post graduate level of education was (1/28) 4%. The implication is that there are well trained teachers teaching History and Government who were in a good position to implement the TPAD tool and enhance learning outcomes. Chalmers and Gardeners (2015) in a study established that professional teacher training development offered to graduate teachers at the university had a positive impact on teachers and their learners therefore the need for deployment of graduate teachers in Secondary Schools to teach History and Government.

Khatete and Macharia (2020) however argued that whether trained teacher had diploma, degree or Masters in education did not make any major difference just as studies by UNESCO, (2023), revealed that outcomes of learners based on levels of education of the teacher is insignificant as long as a teacher is trained. This information is crucial in Kenya because TSC employes trained teachers to teach in secondary schools, with minimum of a Diploma in Education with expectations that they could implement new teaching tools and skills among them the History and Government Curriculum the TPAD tool and any educational requirements that may come to force from time to time. With regard to the period of teaching History and Government, this study findings revealed that (22/28) 79% of the teachers had been teaching for five years and above. This revelation implied that the respondents had been involved in implementing the TPAD tool for

over five years. A minority of the respondents (5/28) 21% revealed that they had taught for less than five years. This was a significant number of teachers who needed continuous retooling on TPAD tool and teacher performance appraisals in order to enhance learning outcomes.

Teaching period is an important factor in teaching since it helped teachers to gain a firsthand insight into the world of teaching and classroom environment thereby improving teachers' communication skills, confidence and performances noted by KICD (2019) the importance of teaching period in teachers' performance is emphasized by Kelly (2020), by observing that teaching experience enabled teachers to navigate through the demands of the teaching profession. However, it can be argued that in as much as the teaching period is healthy, there are some cases where teachers who have taught for a long time suffered burnout and could not perform as enthusiastically as newly appointed teachers. This calls for continuous training on the implementation of the TPAD tool. **Age of Respondents.**

This study was interested on the age of the respondents the History and Government teachers. A question on the same was asked, data was collected and analyzed. From the findings a minority of teachers (5/28) 18% were aged between 20 and 35 years. These was a youthful group of teachers that required training on the implementation of the TPAD tool. The majority of the teachers (16/28) 57% were aged between 36 and 51 years. These findings implied that majority (26/28) 93% of History and Government teachers had ten years and above to offer teaching services because in Kenya teachers retire after attaining the age of 60 years (Mandatory retirement age in Kenya for teachers and civil servants) and therefore there is need to focus on how to capacitate them to implement TPAD tool and enhance learning outcomes. Another minority of (7/28) 15% were aged between 52 and 60 years these were teachers who may not serve the teaching profession for long and may be preparing for their retirement hence not keen on TPAD tool implementation and enhancing learning outcomes However, since they were still in schools there was need to ensure their full engagement of the TPAD tool implementation in order to enhance learning outcomes.

The low percentage of teachers aged between 20 and 35 years is partially due to the long time a trained teacher takes before being employed by TSC in Kenya due to limited vacancies and budgetary constraint. This challenge has resulted in a teachers' shortage that stands at 40,000 teachers in secondary schools according to the TSC (2024) although this category of teachers was low in numbers, in the teaching of History and Government they were the best when it came to implementation of new teaching tools like the TPAD tool. This view is supported by Miriti (2013) who in a study established that the best performing age bracket of teachers in academic and other co-curriculum areas is the age bracket between 20 and 35 years. Kelly (2020) supports this argument by opining that teachers in the age bracket (20-35 years) are likely to embrace changes in pedagogy and the ever-changing world of teaching profession. Implications of the TPAD Tool Implementation on Performance at KCSE in History and Government

Implications of History and Government teachers' demographics on learning outcomes.

The study sought to establish the implications of teacher's demographics on the performance in the KCSE in History and

Government. To achieve this, the study tested the following null hypothesis;

H0: There is no statistically significant difference in performance at KCSE in History and Government between the implementation of the TPAD tool (2011-2015) five years before the TPAD tool implementation and (2017-2022) five years after the TPAD tool

implementation given the current status of History and Government teachers demographics in the implementation of the TPAD tool

The analysis focused on the performance of KCSE (2011-2015) five years before and five after (2018-2022) the TPAD tool implementation has been presented in Table 4. below.

Table 4.: KCSE National History and Government Performance (2011-2015) five years before TPAD tool.

| Year | Candidature | Mean | Standard deviation |
|------|-------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 2011 | 115923 | P1 51.38 P2 32.32 83.66/ 200 | P1 17.00 P2 15.17 30.26 |
| 2012 | 293172 | P1 46.63 P2 35.31 81.90/ 200 | P1 16.94 P2 16.47 31.69 |
| 2013 | 309120 | P1 55.67 P2 31.87 89.44/ 200 | P1 18.97 P2 15.47 31.87 |
| 2014 | 333655 | P1 50.27 P2 57.41 107.66/ 200 | P1 17.99 P2 18.33 33.89 |
| 2015 | 394086 | P1 45 P2 40 85.6/ 200 | P1 17.8 P2 22.44 37.40 |

Source: Kenya National Examination Council 2023

The mean for 2011 – 2015 was 44.4 and a standard deviation of 5.34. This study analyzed mean and standard deviation for the period 2018-2022 five years after TPAD tool implementation as shown in Table 4.11 below

Table 4.1: K.C.S.E National History and Government Performance (2018-2023) five years after TPAD tool

| Year | Candidature | Mean | Standard deviation |
|------|-------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2018 | 458230 | P1 45.73 P2 36.68 82.4 /200 | P1 19.30 P2 19.30 39.74 |
| 2019 | 483678 | P1 45 P2 39 84/ 200 | P1 19.29 P2 20.45 |

| | | | |
|------|--------|--|-------------------------------|
| 2020 | 508070 | P1 54.74 P2 48.46 103.18 $\sqrt{200}$ | P1 21.71 P2 22.22 41.83 |
| 2021 | 566636 | P1 45.89 P2 42.00 87.86 $\sqrt{200}$ | P1 19.34 P2 21.05 38.54 |
| 2022 | 599199 | P1 54.86 P2 63.65 118.5 200 | P1 20.43 P2 22.11 40.35 |

Source: Kenya National Examination Council 2023

Table 4.1 presents the analysis of mean and standard deviation of K.C.S.E performance 2018 – 2022 five years after TPAD tool roll out. The year 2016 is not considered in this study as it was the launch year for TPAD tool, while the year 2017 is considered by this study as a grace period, during which TPAD tool implementation should have taken off. The mean for the period (2018-2022) is 47.31 and a standard deviation of 7.54.

An independent t-test was carried out as developed by William Sealy Gosset in 1908. Independent t-test is ideal in comparing two independent groups, K.C.S.E performance five years before the TPAD tool roll out (2011-2015) and five years after the TPAD tool roll out (2018-2022). Independent t-test formula incorporates sample size and variability within each group which helps to accurately gauge whether the difference in mean is significant considering the variations within the groups. The independent t-test is widely recognized and used in research because it is simple and highly practical in statistics for evaluating the significance of mean differences.

Formula

$$t = (\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) / \sqrt{((s_1^2 / n_1) + (s_2^2 / n_2))}$$

t- Test results of the two means.

T -Statistics = 0.70

value = 0.503

The high value (greater than 0.05) the common significance suggests that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean (2011-2015) five years before the TPAD tool implementation and mean (2018-2022) five years after the TPAD tool implementation in History and Government K.C.S.E performance at national level, therefore, the null hypothesis for this study in History and Government at the national level between the implementation of the TPAD tool (2011-2015) five years before TPAD tool implementation and (2018-2022) five years after the TPAD tool implementation is accepted. The study was interested to correlate the K.C.S.E performance in History and Government at the National level with the Kwale County level. Table 4.12 below presents Kwale County History and Government K.C.S.E performance (2011-2015) as presented below:

Table 4.2: History and Government K.C.S.E Results for Kwale County (2011-2015)

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

KWALE COUNTY

311 HISTORY & GOVERNMENT, KCSE PERFORMANCE 2011-2015

| YEAR | ENTRY | | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- | E | X | MEAN SCORE |
|------|-------|---|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------------|
| 2011 | 3016 | % | 0.3647 | 1.16048 | 3.6804 | 4.0451 | 6.7639 | 8.4549 | 10.113 | 12.699 | 12.5995 | 23.607 | 13.329 | 2.9509 | 0.232 | 4.797607 |
| 2012 | 3056 | % | 0.1309 | 0.52356 | 2.356 | 2.945 | 4.483 | 8.6387 | 10.438 | 12.14 | 10.2421 | 25.72 | 15.02 | 7.0681 | 0.295 | 4.33574 |
| 2013 | 3272 | % | 0.3056 | 0.79462 | 2.8729 | 5.4707 | 7.1822 | 12.225 | 11.522 | 11.491 | 10.1773 | 20.66 | 12.439 | 4.8594 | 0 | 4.924205 |
| 2014 | 3259 | % | 0.2762 | 0.76711 | 2.7923 | 4.7867 | 5.9221 | 11.292 | 11.353 | 11.752 | 11.66 | 20.927 | 12.918 | 5.4311 | 0.123 | 4.773272 |
| 2015 | 3756 | % | 0.213 | 0.7721 | 2.0501 | 2.9553 | 5.5112 | 10.33 | 10.996 | 11.741 | 13.2055 | 23.509 | 12.966 | 5.4579 | 0.293 | 4.553004 |

Source: Kwale County Education Office (2024)

Table 4.2 shows that the mean for (2011-2015) was 4.68 with a standard deviation of 0.23.

Table 4.3: History and Government K.C.S.E results for Kwale County (2018-2022)

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

KWALE COUNTY

311 HISTORY & GOVERNMENT, KCSE PERFORMANCE 2017-2021

| YEAR | ENTRY | | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- | E | X | MEAN SCORE |
|------|-------|---|--------|---------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------------|
| 2018 | 4761 | % | 0.7561 | 1.17622 | 2.6045 | 4.9989 | 4.8939 | 6.4272 | 7.7715 | 7.0153 | 6.55325 | 25.457 | 19.639 | 12.371 | 0.336 | 4.145205 |
| 2019 | 4379 | % | 0.6394 | 1.16465 | 2.9002 | 5.1153 | 8.7006 | 6.9879 | 7.7872 | 7.1021 | 7.92418 | 22.037 | 21.763 | 7.5588 | 0.32 | 4.465979 |
| 2020 | 4492 | % | 2.293 | 5.38736 | 9.52per8 | 9.6839 | 10.663 | 6.5672 | 4.8753 | 5.4096 | 4.34105 | 16.34 | 15.828 | 8.2591 | 0.935 | 5.684045 |
| 2021 | 5769 | % | 0.78 | 1.56006 | 3.0681 | 4.4548 | 7.3496 | 7.6443 | 7.9217 | 8.2337 | 7.71364 | 25.516 | 16.537 | 8.6497 | 0.485 | 4.496081 |
| 2022 | 4791 | % | 0.083 | 2.337 | 3.986 | 5.280 | 7.326 | 9.350 | 10.185 | 10.561 | 9.935 | 21.603 | 11.479 | 2.838 | 0.208 | 4.834553 |

Source: Kwale County Education Office (2024)

Table 4.3 above reveals a mean of 4.73 and a standard deviation of 0.59. An independent t-test was done and revealed the following results.

T- Statistics = 0.30

value = 0.771

The upvalue greater than (0.05) indicated that there is no statistically significant difference between K.C.S.E performance (2011-2015) and (2018-2022) at K.C.S.E level in History and Government ta County level in Kwale. Therefore, the study null hypothesis is accepted and significantly correlated in History and Government K.C.S.E performance both at the National level and at Kwale County level. The acceptance of null hypothesis suggest the need to review the TPAD tool to aligned it with schools, learners and teachers context as observed by (TSC, 2021 further, acceptance of the null hypothesis points to a position that a new Teacher performance appraisal model could be considered to fill gaps and challenges identified in TPAD tool implementations in order to enhance learning outcomes as suggested by this study (Ondari, 2023) concurs that TPAD tool to be effective requires review which this study suggest through adoption of a new model. An interview with one of the KII indicated;

This study additionally analyzed learners' grades in Kwale County in History and Government at KCSE (2018-2022) five years after the TPAD tool implementation in percentage as per table 4.12. Quality grades refer to performance levels in examinations that meets or exceeds a standard considered acceptable for academic or professional purpose according to NCES, (2024) in Kenya at KCSE C+ and above is accepted as quality grade to enable learners to qualify for professional training at the university. The purpose of analysis of quality grade at KCSE in History and Government in Kwale County was to establish implementation of the TPAD tool implication on learning outcomes in terms of quality grades deliverable Mudassir, (2024) observes that quality is conformance to requirements and fitness for use and grade as a category assigned to deliverable for use.

Therefore, quality grade at KCSE in History and Government that is A, A-, B+, B, B- and C+ in five years after the TPAD tool implementation (2018-2022) averaged at 20% as summarized in table 4.12. This is far below internationally accepted levels of 30-35% according to (NCES,2024) to which (UNESCO 2023) concurs at an average of 20% in five years since the TPAD tool launch this implies that 80% of the candidates do not qualify for professional careers in History related careers. This is wastage of learners in terms of career prospective. The low grades within the TPAD tool implementation period (2018-2022) are worrying as low grades from D, D- and E accounted for an average of 40% of the candidates in the five years' period. This may be referred to mass failure because as (UNESCO 2023) points out, the average subject deliverable at a national assessment should be a pass at 50% (half) of the candidates. The low levels of quality grade validate this study's null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference in performance at KCSE five years before the TPAD tool and five years after therefore the need to review TPAD tool or propose an alternative.

Conclusions

Demographic information of teachers of History and Government in relation to implement the TPAD tool and enhanced learning outcomes. This study sort demographic data for teachers of History and Government in Kwale County under the following variables; gender, level of qualification, period of teaching, age and workshops attendance on the TPAD tool implementation. These variables were considered crucial as they have implication on the TPAD tool implementations and learning outcomes in History and Government.

On gender of the respondents, this study revealed that gender parity has been achieved among teachers of History and Government in Kwale County with female teachers at 54% and male teachers at 46%. These findings concurred with studies by UNESCO (2023) which observes that, female in teaching profession is 52% of the teaching force in secondary level of education, thereby making teaching profession an increasingly female dominated career a trend on the increase. This trend has implications on learning outcomes because diversity of teaching force facilitates eradication of gender stereotypes in education and creates equal career pathways for learners. Information on level of education, this study revealed that History and Government teachers are trained and qualified, with graduate trained teachers at 89% and post graduate trained teachers at 4%. The high level of teacher training has implications on learning outcomes, as studies by Ventista & Brown (2023) confirmed that teacher training programs offered to teachers positively impacts on teachers and their learners.

The study was interested on the variable of period of teaching service by History and Government teachers. Teaching period as observed by Kelly (2020) is crucial as it enables teachers gain firsthand insights into the world of teaching service. The study established that majority of the History and Government teachers (22/28) 79% had taught for five years and above. This was a significant number of teachers who had been involved in implementing TPAD tool, which in turn has implications on learning outcomes. However, long periods of service may at times result in burnouts and reduced enthusiasm, therefore need to offer continuous professional development and motivation. A minority of History and Government teachers (6/28) 21% had served for less than five years, which implies limited interaction with TPAD tool implementations therefore need for continuous retooling. The study additionally concluded that since the launch of the TPAD tool in 2016, there has been no significant difference in performance at KCSE in History and Government five years (2011-2015) before the launch of the TPAD TOOL and five years after (2018-2022), which could be attributed to many factors, key among them failure to take into accord teachers demographic variables.

Recommendations

Policy makers need to take into accord teachers demographics when developing and implementing policies, retooling of teachers is crucial in implementation of the TPAD tool and enhancing learning outcomes, however factoring in teachers demographics may contributes to effective implementation of the TPAD tool and enhanced learning outcomes and teachers collaborative activities and mentoring relationships can be effectively done with clear understanding of teachers demographics , therefore the urgency to main stream demographic variables in matters teaching and learning.

References

1. Abdulrab, H. (2023). Teacher Professional Development in the 21st century. *African journal of education and practice* 9(4) 39-50
2. Amstrong, H. (2006). *A handbook of human resources management practice*. Kagen Page Ltd. United Kingdom.

3. Amy, K. (2022). *Workplace compliance: What is workplace compliance and why it is important?* <https://envoy.com.workplace.copliance>
4. Anol, B. (2012). *Social Sciences Research: Principles, methods and practice*. University of South Florida.
5. Asiago, D., & Gathii, A. (2014). Teachers' perception of performance appraisal practice in public secondary schools in Limuru District. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2, 240–256.
6. Ben. K. (2023). *Prospects and practice of induction for Novice teacher*.
7. Bon. N. (2012). Effects of syllabus coverage on secondary students. *Performance in Mathematics in Kenya. International Journal of Educational Science*41)3-34.
8. Badruddin, B. (2021). The effects of working environment on the teacher's performance. *Journal Lantera Pendidikan*, 24(ue 2), 28–35.
9. Banghurst, T., & Brown, T. (2015). Emotional Intelligence in Undergraduate Kinesiology Student: Brief Report. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 17, 37–44.
10. Boudersa, N. (2016). *The importance of Teachers Training programs and Professional Development in the Algerian Educational Context. Towards informed and effective teaching practice*.
11. Burgen, P. (2007). *Open Performance appraisal who appraised teachers? Image books Limited*.
12. Burmester, E., & Leane, M. A. (2012). *Sample size. How many is enough? Australian critical care*. <https://do.org/10>.
13. .C.D.E. (2015). *Teacher evaluation in South African school*.
14. Chalmers & Gardiner. (2015). *An evaluation framework for identifying the effectiveness and impact of academic teacher development programmes*. <https://www.researchgate.net>
15. Chu. S Reynold.R, Notar.I, Treveres W. & LecC. (2016). *21ST centaury skills development through inquiry-based learning: From theory to practice*. Spring science).
16. Cresswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative and mixed approach* (4th ed.). Sage Publication. Oak.
17. Daniel, G. (2009). *Learning outcomes in secondary and preparatory school performance in West Zone of Oromom Regional State*. Unpublished Master's. Thesis Addis Ababa University.
18. Danku, L. S., Soglo, N. Y., Dordor, F., & Bokor, M. J. (2015). Performance appraisal in the Ghana education service the case of basic school teaching Ho municipality. *June 2015*, 3(ue 6), 117–133.
19. Danley, T. (2024). *The New UK teacher appraisal guidance*. <https://blueskyeducation.co.uk>
20. Debora, D. (2022, June). *Goals-setting theory; why it is important and how to use it at work*.
21. Deborah, N. G., H., J. L., Pauls, & Claives, S. (2011). *OECD review of evaluation and assessment*. <http://dx.do.org/10.1787/9789264207707-en>.
22. Demirdag, S. (2023). *Exploring communication skills transformational leadership and intergenerational climate in education institutions*.
23. Denis, A., & Pritchard, R. (2006, July). *Performance appraisal, performance management and improving individual performance, a motivational Framework Management and Organization Review*.
24. Echaune.M and Maiyo. J (2023). *Teacher mentorship and support in Kenya: A Desktop Review*. (n.d.). <https://doi.org/10.372184/eajes.6.2.1364>
25. Elliot.K (2015). *Teacher Performance Appraisal; more about performance Development. Australian journal of teacher education*, 40(9) 6. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2015.vol.40.9.6>
26. Francis, A. (2021). *Do teachers experience and age contribute to their teaching performance*. <https://www.iemsociety.org>
27. Gacheru, R. G. (2010). *Impact of transformational leadership on performance of teachers in secondary school in Nairobi West District*. Kenyatta University Library.
28. Haittie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A teacher guide structural learning*. <https://poshukaci.com/serach?fr=PSOgp>
29. Hargreaves, A. (2021). *Policy teacher education and quality of teachers*. Routledge.
30. Hayes A. (n.d.). *Demographics, how to collect, Analyze and use Demographic data*. <http://www.investoopedia.com/demographic>
31. Igbal, M. (2024). *Quality vs grades*.
32. Indeed, E. team. (2024). *What are Demographics? Definitions, Examples and uses*. <https://www.inddeed.com/demographics>.
33. Isore, M. (2009). *Teachers' evaluation current practices in OECD Countries and literature review: OECD Working Paper 23*.
34. Kagama, J., & Irungu, C. (2018). An analysis of teacher performance appraisals and their Influence on the teacher performance in secondary schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Education*, 22, 93–98.
35. Karim F. (n.d.). Naiz.S and Saeed.F (2023). Needs analysis of workshops for effective teaching among teachers in secondary schools in Karach Pakistan. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 3(1), 71–84.
36. Kariuki D & Guantai K. (2020). Way forward for teacher profession Development in Kenya: Utilization of performance reports. *European Scientific Journal*, 6(16). <http://dx.org/10.10944/esj.2020vol16p230>
37. Katsuno, M. (2016). *Teacher Evaluation Policies and Practice in Japan*.
38. Kelly, M. (2020). *My best teaching experience. Turning classroom misbehavior into trump* .
39. Khatete & Macharia. (2020). Monitoring and evaluation of teacher effectiveness: A case of teacher performance appraisal and development tool in public secondary schools in

- Nyandarua South Sub-County Kenya. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 7(1), 320–329.
40. K.N.E.C. (2019). *Report on the 2019 monitoring of learner's progress grade3*. KNEC.
41. K.N.E.C. (2021). *KCSE report for 2020*. KNEC.
42. K.N.E.C. (2023). *KCSE reports*, KNEC.
43. Korir. (2022). Teacher performance appraisal and development and instructional competence. *Journal of Advances in Education and Philosophy. Issue 252*. [Doi.10.36348/Jaep2022v6i105.00](https://doi.org/10.36348/Jaep2022v6i105.00).
44. Kothari, C. (2009). *Research methodology, methods and techniques: New Age International Publishers*.
45. Lynch, D. (2011). *Preparing teacher in times of change. Teaching school standards new content and evidence*. Primrose Hall Publishing Group.
46. Mapei, & Vet. A. (2022). Teacher professional development Around the world: The gap between evidence and practice. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 37(ue 1), 107–136.
47. Maichomo, M. K., Olum, T., Magero, M., Okech, J., T., & Nyoike, N. (2019). *The status of donkey slaughter in Kenya and its implications on community livelihoods*. Kenya Agricultural and Livestock organization. Kikuyu.
48. Maina, M. (2012). *Qualitative research simplified*. Fragopa Printers Mall.
49. Malongwe, C. (2005). *Towards effective self-appraisal*. Government Printers.
50. Miriti, E. P. (2013). *Effects of teachers' age on KCPE and Co- Curriculum Performance in Public Primary Schools in Tigania Central Division Kenya*. Master's Thesis. Kenya Methodist University.
51. Monyatsi, P. (2009). *Teacher appraisal: An evaluation of practice in Botswana secondary schools*. Unpublished Doctor of Education. Thesi University of South Africa.
52. Monyatsi, S. & Kamper. (2006). Teachers' appraisal in Botswana secondary school. A Critical Analysis. *South Africa Journal of Education*.
53. Mugenda & Mugenda. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Acts Press Nairobi.
54. Mumo, R., Mwangangi, L., Warfa, A. O., Ondigi, S., & Bwire, A. (2024). Opportunities and Challenges in Developing the 21st Century Teacher: Case of Kenyatta University Mentorship Programme in Matungulu Sub—County, Machakos County-Kenya. *Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies*, 8(4), 24–36.
55. Mwangangi, L., ayot, H & Kiio, M (2015). Mentoring secondary school teachers for effective teaching. Accessed from <https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/pdf>
56. Mwangangi. L Mumo.R, Ondigi. S, Kiio.M and Nasibi.M (2019) Revitalizing Assignment pedagogy to enhance teaching and learning of social sciences in selected secondary schools in Nzau sub-County, Makueni County. *African Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 794 133-136.
57. Murdoch, G. (2000). Introducing a teacher-supportive evaluation system.
58. Ngeno, W. C., Bett, S., & Cheruiyot, K. (2013). The performance appraisal policy and tools used by the Kenya Teachers Service Commission in Bomet Constituency. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(16), 229-235.
59. Nusche, D., Halász, G., Looney, J., Santiago, P., & Shewbridge, C. (2011). *OECD review of evaluation and assessment in education in Sweden*.
60. O.E.C.D. (2013a). OECD Review of evaluation and assessment in education synergies for better learning. An international perspective on evaluation and assessment. *Report*.
61. O.E.C.D. (2013b). *Teachers for 21st Century using evaluation to improve teaching*. Google Scholar.
62. O.E.C.D./U.N.I.C.E.F. (2021). *Education in Eastern Europe and Central Asia: Findings from PISA*. OECD Publishing Paris. <https://OECD.org/10.1787/eedeed>.
63. Orodho. (2008). *Elements of education and social sciences research methods*. Kanzja Nairobi.
64. Orodho & Kombo. (2002). *Research methods*. Kenyatta University, Institute of Open learning. Nairobi.
65. Oso, W. Y., & D, O. (2009). *A General Guide to writing research proposal and report. A handbook for beginning researchers*.
66. Pandey, A. (2021). Teacher Performance appraisal at school, a critical analysis. *Journal of Holistic Education*, 8(1), 32–39.
67. Pawson, M. (2019). *Perceptions of effectiveness of teacher appraisal: A case study of two states funded Academies: A Doctor in Education*. University of Readings.
68. Peterson, K. O., Wah, C., & Bone, K. (2020). Students survey for teachers Evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 14(2), 135–153.
69. Regina. P. M. (2019). Assessing impact of the implementation of teacher performance appraisal development tool on quality of teaching in Kenya. A case study of Narok county secondary schools. *African Journal of Education and Social Sciences Research*, 7(ue No. 1), 16–28.
70. Ritchie, D. (2021). *Importance of Classroom Observation*.
71. Rukwaru, M. (2007). *Fundamentals of social research*. Eureka Publisher Sabar Country Report.
72. Sahaya, G. S. (2017). *Empirical research: A study guide*. Pauline Publications. Africa. Nairobi.
73. Santiago, P., Donaldson, G., Herman, J., & Shewbridge, C. (2011). *OECD reviews of evaluation and assessment in education* – Australia. <https://www.oecd.org/education/school/48519807.pdf>
74. Shewbridge, C., Hulshof, M., Nusche, D., & Staehr, L. S. (2014). OECD Reviews of evaluation and assessment in education: Northern Ireland, United Kingdom. *OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education*, OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264207707-en>
75. Sultan, T. (2011). Improving the impact of pupils' achievements in UK. *Interim Findings*. Suter E. (n.d.).

76. Areba.G & Syonhi. J (2022) Teacher performance Appraisal in aiding to bridge teacher professional performance gaps in Uasin Gishu County. *Kenya. African Journal of Education and Social Sciences Research*, 110(ue (2)59-68).
77. Tarhan, L., Kempainen, K. A., & Aerila, J. (2019). Understanding teacher evaluation in Finland. A professional development framework. *Australian journal of teacher education*, 44(ue 4). <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajle/vol44iss4/3>
78. Teshoma, M. (2018). *Teachers' perception on the practice of performance appraisal and its associated challenges in secondary schools in Bole Sub city, Addis Ababa* [MA Thesis]. Addis Ababa University.
79. T.S.C. (2015). *Code of conduct for teachers*. TSC.
80. T.S.C. (2019). *Teachers Performance appraisal and development operational manual* (T.S.C).
81. T.S.C. (2021). *TPAD Observation form*.
82. T.S.C. (2024). *Roll out of TIMEC programme*.
83. Tumusiime, P. M., S., & Okemasisi, K. (2021). *Principals Implementation of Teacher Performance Appraisal and development tool and Teacher Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Kikuyu constituency*. Africa.
84. U.N.E.S.C.O. (2003). *Teacher education and learning outcomes*. <http://learning>
85. U.N.E.S.C.O. (2014). *EFA global monitoring report 2005*. Education for all.
86. The U.N.E.S.C.O. (2021). *A study based on the UNESCO report of treasures within*. <https://www.nudeodohecimento.com.br/education>.
87. U.N.E.S.C.O. (2023). *Gender equality in and through the teaching*. <https://www.unesco.org/article/gender-equality-and-through-teaching-profession>.
88. Ventista.O and Brown (2023). Teacher professional learning and its impact on students learning outcomes; Finding from systematic review. (n.d.). *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 1):00565.
89. Wanjala, G., & Osendo, L. (2019). Teacher perception of performance appraisal development tool in public primary schools in Mumias East Sub-County. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Knowledge*, 4(6) Pg 69–78.
90. Wanzare, Z. O. (2002). Rethinking teacher evaluation in third world. *Journal of Education Management and Administration*, 30, 213–229.
91. Waudu, J., & Ouya, E. (2010). *Total quality management in education, making your school better*.
92. Weruga, K. S. (2011). *Teacher Perception on Performance Appraisal Feedback in Secondary Schools within Bungoma East Sub County, Kenya* [MED Thesis:]. Kenyatta University.