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Abstract
Reward and feedback are generally understood as the most crucial aspects of human management in performance appraisal. However, managers are faced with the challenge of choosing the measure to adopt on rewards system and communicating feedback in real time on employee performance appraisal. The study sought to examine the influence of feedback delivery and reward strategy on the implementation of TPAD. The study comprised of a population of 619 respondents comprising of 52 head teachers, 366 teachers and 1 Sub-county Director of Education in Kieni-East Sub-County. Systematic stratified random sampling technique was used to select a sample size of 170 teachers, 30 head teachers and 1 Sub-county Director of Education. Data were analyzed using SPSS software programme. Test-retest was checked on instrument reliability. Pearson correlation and regression analysis was used. The study established a relationship between feedback, reward system and performance appraisal P (0.002) <0.05: reward strategy r (180) = 0.176, P (0.018) <0.05 and a weak negative relationship between evaluation feedback and appraisal r (180) = -257, P (0.000) <0.05. The study concluded that respondents had negative attitude on the effect of evaluation feedback on performance but reward strategy was effective in enhancing performance outcomes in secondary schools in Kieni East Sub County. The study suggests future research to focus on motivation to improve teacher performance appraisal and development leading to better understanding of reactions regarding Teacher performance appraisal and Development and intentions. Teachers promotions and pay structures should be based on job evaluation and market analysis.
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1.Introduction
Reward and feedback strategies are crucial aspects of performance appraisal in human resource management. Research shows a positive relationship between rewards, feedback and performance (Puwanenthiren 2011; Chen and Eldridge, 2012. Performance appraisal is the process of evaluation of employee’s job related behaviours with the aim of capturing the strengths and recommending intervention for poor performance outcomes (Gardner, 2008). The actual advantages of performance appraisal lie in its intricate linkages between feedback and the reward strategy (Nyandoro and Goremusandu, 2016). Armstrong (2010); Mujtaba and Shuaib, (2010) state that rewards are concerned with the compensating the employees’ contributions towards achieving organizational goals. This involves remuneration and other rewards systems (Malhotra, Budhwar and Prowse, 2007). According to the OECD (2013), many countries are faced with the challenge of rewards system and communicating feedback in real time to employee during appraisal. Clynes and Raftery (2008) state that feedback delivery is an interactive process which aims at providing insight into teaching and non-teaching duties. This will depend on the quality of appraisal that are put in place.
There are a variety of appraisal methods that may be used to appraise employee in learning institutions. According to Shaout and Yousif (2014) performance appraisal may comprises of graphic evaluation scales, observations, critical incident and narrative. One of the most critical methods of appraisal is management By Objective. This is where both supervisor and supervisee set targets on a regular basis and make decisions relating methods to be used, feedback delivery and rewards based on the individual achievement (Khanha and Sharma, 2014). This kind of appraisal is based on organizational objectives, execution of duties and feedback delivery (Shaout and Yousif, 2014). Appraisal by objective is a useful tool for developing and preparing staff for future roles as well as skill assessment for current organizational roles (Huang et al., 2011, p. 274). It includes continuous monitoring and evaluation and providing feedback in performance of duties (Ghicajanu, 2008).

Performance appraisal involves ratings the individual’s achievements asked on specific standards and criteria. For example, in America, specific rating on various aspects of performance in classroom play a specific role in teacher appraisal. According to Danielson (2011) teachers are evaluated using classroom observations and portfolios that comprise of lesson plans, timelines, attendance records, students’ academic performance, class discipline records, parents’ communication and teachers’ professional qualification. Further study by Lash, Tran, and Huang (2016) used Danielson’s Framework that was designed to assess various teaching domains. This study supports the use of a single score derived from the average of all ratings to provide feedback and predict rewards based on performance outcomes. In Canada, OECD (2013), the appraisal focusses on pedagogy, instructional leadership, and ongoing professional growth. Appraisals for newly hired teachers are undertaken during and at the end of probation period. This appraisal is reviewed after five years in addition to regular appraisal at the request of the individual teacher, the government and school boards for reward purposes. Performance appraisal include feedback crucial for teachers’ promotions, salary increment and contract renewal.

Evaluation feedback is a continuous process that involves both formal and informal aspect of performance appraisal. The formal feedback involves official communication of feedback in relation to set goals and objectives. This means that appraisal is done against agreed goals and objectives. According to (OECD, 2009a) performance evaluation feedback has a positive effect on teachers’ job satisfaction, students’ outcomes, professional expertise, and opportunities for growth and development. Donaldson and Donaldson (2012) state that teachers require constructive informal feedback from their mentors in order to enhance their expertise. However, there is evidence of lack of regular mentorship and constructive feedback in most schools (OECD, 2009a; Zatynski, 2012). This means that quality teaching and learning is characterized by informed timely and constructive feedback delivery for both teachers and students. Gilbert (2011) states that there is a strong relationship between evaluation feedback, professional learning and individual goals. Constructive feedback is therefore crucial in strengthening the link between professional learning and performance appraisal.

There are numerous challenges facing performance appraisal in most learning institutions. For example, a study by Karaxha (2019) and Obisi (2011) argues that supervisors often ignore management by objectives and critical incidents in providing feedback and rewards due to personal prejudices. This according to Obis is retrogressive because it is characterized by personal influences and organizational preoccupation to use confidential appraisal system which. This is detrimental in ensuring objectivity and fairness. Lash, Tran, and Huang (2016) argued that school principals discriminated against the most effective and competent teachers and rarely identified the least effective ones. According to Duffin (2006) and OECD (2013) six out of ten teachers in England never received an appraisal evaluation feedback on personal strengths and weaknesses. In addition, feedback delivery is not communicated effectively (Bies, 2013). Negative feedback constituted communication of negative information about employee’s behavior and performance. A study by Mercer, (2013) indicates most managers and administrators did not provide truthful and interactive dialogue about the employee performance. Further it was revealed that improving manager’s ability to provide constructive feedback contributed positively towards performance outcomes. In Pakistan, performance appraisal leads to pay reduction as well as dismissal of teachers (Karimi, Malik, and Hussain, 2011). In Korea, once the teachers’ performance appraisal is completed, evaluation sheets are collected and drafted into final report without feedback delivery (Kim et al, 2010). In South Africa, (Mosonge and Pilane, 2014), teachers resisted performance appraisal because they consider these performance appraisals as fault finding. This means that lack of knowledge and expertise in communicating feedback and rewarding accordingly hamper the zeal to implement performance appraisal.

Performance appraisals has been used in Kenya in determining the individual teacher performance for promotion and salary increase. The Teachers Service Commission (TSC) is mandated to carry out the teacher performance appraisal (TSC 2016; Sessional paper No. 1 of 2019). However, teacher appraisal has not been successful since
its inception in 2016 and it is not linked to feedback and reward. This is because the supervisors pressurize the teachers towards the achievement of targets irrespective of the challenges in the work environment. Moreover, the appraisal exhibit weaknesses particularly in feedback and reward system which require urgent intervention in order to improve performance outcomes (Omayo 2010). Although there have been many studies on this topic, the role of feedback and reward strategy as predicting variable has been given less emphasized in literature. Previous studies have indicated weakness in methodology, are outdated and were carried out in different contexts. Some of the approaches neglect to measure the effect size. Therefore, purpose of this study was to examine the influence of feedback sand reward systems on the teachers’ performance appraisal in public secondary schools in Kieni East Sub-county, Kenya. Hypothesis were tested: that there is no significant relationship between evaluation feedback, reward strategy and implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development public secondary schools. This was done through correlation and regression to establish the relations and effect respectively.

1.1 Concept of Teacher Performance Appraisal Development
Organization performance has been differently defined by a wide-ranging expects and authorities with various attributes however is firmly connected to corporate efficiency. Performance appraisal is based on clearly defined expectations, standards and shared understanding of the teaching profession. As such, it is essential to reassess teacher competencies in order to meet the needs of the 21st century in a fair and reliable manner. Performance appraisal is referred to as the evaluation of employee’s job related behaviours with the aim of assessing the strengths and weaknesses that form the basis of recommending intervention for good performance outcomes (Gardner, 2008). According to Gupta (2011) teacher performance appraisal as the process of accessing the performance, progress and their potential for future development. Myhem (2018) states that performance appraisal is a tool for analyzing strengths, weaknesses and provide feedback, recognize, reward and reinforcement good performance. This presents the role of the supervisor as a coach who recognizes strengths, weakness end explains the necessary steps to be employed towards improvement in performance.

Other studies reveal the need for standard criteria during the performance appraisal. For example, Mansor, Chakraborty, Yin and Mahitapoglu (2012) carried out a study on organizational factors influencing performance management system in higher educational institution. The study was both quantitative and qualitative. The findings reveal that employee engagement and internal management support, performance-oriented culture and management commitment was a fundamental aspect of performance outcome. Performance appraisal required supervisor and the supervisee to participates in developing the appraisal plan, understanding the objectives, and their respective roles (Cintron and Flaniken, 2011). Participation of both appraiser and appraiser provided bargaining power including the opportunities to refute performance ratings, documentations, and verbal feedback. In addition, strong leadership and training was curial, however, standards of rating were characterized by poor ratings and biasness based on supervisor’s personal values. This means that here is need for managerial support during the process as well as sufficient training for the supervisors

1.2 Evaluation Feedback and Implementation of Teachers Performance Appraisal Development
Constructive feedback is an essential component of performance appraisal in enhancing the performance outcomes. Positive and contractive feedback plays a critical role in employee motivation and job performance. Providing feedback is considered as one of the most common justification for an organizational performance (Swan, 2012). As Swan (2012) further explains, it is through the process of performance appraisal that employees learn exactly what they did during the work period and use that information as a reference point to improve their future performance. In this regard, the feedback given through performance appraisal ensures that the employees’ expectations are clearly communicated. In this case feedback considered as an important tool for increasing employee morale and motivation by pointing out areas where employee did something especially good. Specifically, the positive feedback motivates the employee to do better. In case of cases where the employee’s performance was below expectation the fair criticism from the feedback helps address the deficiencies and failures and hence reinforce appropriate behaviour in terms of better performance (Cardy & Leonard, 2011).

Feedback is an interactive process that enables the employees to come in terms with their strengths and weaknesses. According to Clynnes and Raftery (2008), feedback delivery is an interactive process which aims at providing insight into teaching and non-teaching duties. Ece Kuzulu Kanaslan (2016) carried out a study on 360 Degree Feedback Appraisal. The study also indicated that factors such as the appraiser personality and the culture of the organization may affect feedback delivery. The study concluded that proper utilization of feedback leads to positive outcomes are highly satisfying. Bies (2013) states that feedback can be distressing and managers often fail to deliver feedback appropriately. A particularly aspect of performance appraisals is the delivery of negative
Feedback. Negative feedback involves communication of negative information about an employee’s behavior, performance outcome. This is because most supervisors find it more difficult to communicate negative outcomes rather than positive information. For example, Schaefer, Kerber, Berger, Medvec, and Swaab (2018) carried out a study on the illusion of transparency in performance appraisals. The study reveals that managers communicate negative feedback ineffectively because they suffered from transparency illusions that caused them to overestimate how accurately employees perceive their feedback. These illusions emerged because managers were insufficiently motivated to engage in effortful thinking, which reduces the accuracy with which they communicate negative feedback to employees. In addition, the study demonstrates that transparency illusions are driven by more indirect communication such as face to face by the manager as opposed to indirect communication such as use of tape and video recording.

1.3 Reward Strategy and Implementation of Teachers Performance Appraisal Development

Reward systems play a crucial role in building job satisfaction and productive behavior in organizations. Reward system is crucial factor that must be effectively managed by human resource managers. Reward system refers to a strategic human resource management policy that aims to recognize the contributions of employees to the organization as a part of employment contract (Azman, 2017). Employee’s performance is closely associated with reward strategy. According to Selmer, Jonasson, and Lauring, (2013) good rewards engage workers by making them creative and interested in other activities that are related to their job.

Effective and timely rewards and recognition plays a critical role in retention in an organization. Organizations with engaged workforces experience less turnover, reduces pressure and increase confidence. Ameen, and Baharom (2019) found that via engagement, recognition is one of the leading ways for worker inspiration. They further assert that workers expect to be acknowledged when they accomplish success. Workforces, who are acknowledged, are expected to feel more appreciated and dedicated to their establishments. Scott, McMulle, Royal and Stark (2010) found that financial recognition has a great influence on engagement. Their findings propose that nonfinancial recognition should serve as means of inspiring and engaging workers. The allocation of reward to the employees based on their actual performance is very important in order to bridge the gap between the wages of workers, to meet the basic needs of competent employees and to improve the quality of life, well-being and their status in society (Okotoh, 2015). This situation is able to attract, retain and motivate good employees to always support the ultimate goals of workplace reward administration in terms of efficiency, fairness, compliance with laws and regulations, and ethics (Ismail et al., 2014).

Other studies show that effective performance-based reward has three salient dimensions: communication, participation and performance appraisal (Anuar et al., 2014; Harris and Brown (2010). In this reward system, vertical and horizontal communication systems are usually practiced in the forms of an employer delivering the information about reward systems to employees and allowing its employees to provide suggestions to their employer. If an organization is able to openly and honestly implement this communication system, it will clearly expose the value of the compensation package quantitatively and qualitatively, deliver accurate information about pay and performance relationships, permit a voice in the system and increase the ability to understand and perceive equity and fair treatment within the system.

In addition, Olufemi (2015) confirms that the low pay of workforces in the organization in Nigeria has economic, social and psychological effects on their defiance to perform in a place of work. He states further that emotionally, low remuneration could bring about “lateness to work, loafing at work, absenteeism, and buck-passing among workers etc. Therefore, every organization has to embrace suitable approaches and schemes for the health and safety of their employees, hence, payment serves as one of the predictors that influence engagement of employee. According to Puwanenthiren, (2011) reward strategy consists of all the institutional components such as the people, process, rules and decision-making processes in the allocation of compensation and benefits to employees in exchange for their service. Armstrong (2009) defined the reward system as consists of interrelated processes and activities to ensure that reward management is carried out effectively for the benefit of the institution and employees. Puwanenthiren (2011) identified three main components of a reward system; compensation, benefits and recognition. These components encapsulate the total rewards in which include transactional and relational rewards. Benefits are described as forms of value other than payment that are provided to employees for their contribution to the growth of the institution. Benefits can be tangible or intangible benefits. Examples of tangible benefits are retirement plans, life insurance, vacation pay, holiday pay, employee stock ownership plans, profit sharing and bonuses. Intangible benefits on the other hand include, appreciation from a boss, likelihood for promotion, office space.
1.4 Theoretical Framework
This study was guided by input output systems theory by Ludwig Von Bertalanffy (1973) systems theory approach and organizations as open social systems must interact with the environment, in order to survive. This approach identifies organizational behaviours by mapping the repeated cycles of input, throughout, output and feedback between the organization and external environment. The system looks at management as an open-ended process. It emphasizes detachment, objectivity and control. It helps in coordinating purposeful individuals (teachers) whose actions stem from applying their unique interpretation to the particular situations confronting them. Teachers receive inputs and transform them to outputs. The system will help in viewing common and uncommon themes that explain their behavior and their effectiveness in terms of their goals, objectives or common purposes.

In order to understand the relationship between inputs, outputs and processes one need to understand the environment in which all this occurs. Though environment is not part of the system, it represents everything that is important to understanding the functioning of the system. Education is a system because it has a set of inputs (administrative factors, money, pupils, teachers, infrastructure etc.) which are subject to a process, in order to attain certain objectives, which appear as outputs.

In this case, the researcher wanted to assess the input by head teachers, the throughput, in order to get the output from teachers who are then gauged through teacher’s performance appraisal. In this case, an open-ended system was used to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the so laid down objectives in this study. The ability of heartache to guide teachers through transformational leadership has great influence on implementation of teacher’s performance appraisal development. Reward strategy laid down by the head teacher results to how motivated teachers are and this will definitely influence implementation of teacher’s performance appraisal development. Teachers require learning resources in order to effectively carry out their teaching and their provision will highly result to good output hence influence implementation of teacher’s performance appraisal development. Teachers will also require to be exposed to learning.

Learning has no end and therefore input on teachers further learning will result to their improved output hence influencing implementation of teacher’s performance appraisal development. Timely evaluation and feedback will also boast teacher’s capability of self-evaluating themselves, geared to enhancing effective output. This will also influence implementation of teacher’s performance appraisal development. Hence, the input output system theory greatly helped to guide this study.

1.5 Conceptual Framework
This is a description of the main independent and dependent variables of the study and the relationship among them. Dependent variables are conditions which appear to change as independent variable changes. From the figure head teachers’ transformational leadership was examined to establish its influence on implementation of teacher’s performance appraisal development. Reward strategies will be studied to determine the influence of implementation of teacher’s performance appraisal development. Provision of resources will be studied to establish whether they have any influence on implementation of teacher’s performance appraisal development. Exposure to learning will be studied to determine whether it has any effect on implementation of teacher’s performance appraisal development. Evaluation and feedback and their effects on implementation of teacher’s performance appraisal development.

Figure 1. conceptual framework
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  - Involvement in decision making
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  - Improved performance
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- **Promotion**
- **Motivation**
2. Research Methodology and Study Paradigm
This study employed mixed methods approach underpinned by pragmatism. Specifically, this study used descriptive survey and correlation research design (Rothbauer, 2008; Creswell, 2009). The sample was drawn from 52 schools in Kieni-East Sub-County which has 52 head teachers and 566 teachers were randomly selected. Thirty 30 head teachers and 180 teachers were randomly sampled out of 566. This formed slightly above 30% of the population as suggested by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003). Two sets of questionnaires were administered to principals and teachers respectively requesting general information about evaluation feedback, institutional reward strategy and teachers’ performance appraisal. The questionnaires were carefully designed through a review of literature and involved the extent to which respondents agree with the statements on a five-point likert scale whereby 5: strongly agree, 4: Agree, 3: undecided, 2: Disagree, 1: Strongly disagree. The items were pre-tested with 10 principals and 20 teachers in order to assess content validity. Pilot study was carried out in 10 schools outside the study area. The statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) was used. This made it easy for the researcher to transform the likert type of scale data into continuous data that enabled computation of correlation and regression analysis.

Descriptive statistics involved frequencies, percentages and means. Pearson-Product Moment Correlation was used to establish the relationships while Linear Regression Model was used to test the effect of the relationship between the two variables. According to Creswell (2008), a correlation coefficient of between -1.00 to +1.00 is used to measure the degree and strength of relationship between the variables. Positive value indicates positive relationship; a negative value shows negative relationship while 0.00 correlation coefficient indicates lack or absence of linear relationship. The closer the correlation coefficient to 0.00, the weaker the relationship between the variables. Hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using correlation coefficient. The regression models were as follows: \( Y = \beta_0 + \beta X + \varepsilon \), Where \( y \) = implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development. While \( \beta_0 \) is the constant, \( \beta \) is the coefficients of \( X \) variable and \( \varepsilon \) is the error term.

3. Analysis Results
The study examined the relationship between feedback practices and reward strategy on teachers’ performance in secondary schools Kieni East county. The finding of the study would influence the organization to consider a more structured approach to teachers’ performance appraisal.

3.1 Demographic Information
Demographic information included information of teachers and the head teachers in terms of age and gender as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 yrs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 yrs</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 yrs</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings reveal that majority 76 (50%) of teachers were between 51 to 60 years, 44 (28.9%) were between 41 to 50 years, 28 (18.4%) were aged 31 to 40 years while the least 4 (2.6%) were below 30 years. Majority of the teachers were over 41 years.

Three quarters of the head teachers 21 (75%) were between 51 to 60 years while the least 5 (17.9%) were 41 to 50 years, 2 (7.1%) were 31 to 40 years. The findings imply that majority of the head teachers were above 50 years.

It was necessary to find out the gender of the teachers and the head teachers and the findings are presented in Table 2.
Table 2: Distribution of respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 2 shows that majority of the teachers 84(55.3%) were female while among the head teachers the male were 17 (60.7%). There were therefore more female teachers than the male but more male head teachers than the female.

3.2 Evaluation Feedback and Teachers’ Performance Appraisal

The first objective of the study sought to determine the influence of evaluation feedback on the implementation of teacher performance appraisal and development. The school principals and teachers evaluated the characteristics of evaluation feedback practices. This was through a six items Likert’s scale questionnaire from five strongly agree to one strongly disagree. Means and standard deviation generated are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Teachers’ Response on Evaluation Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>5 SA</th>
<th>4 A</th>
<th>3 UD</th>
<th>2 D</th>
<th>1 SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback only when asked</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback only when request</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback after an event</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No G&amp;C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject panels meetings</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicate that the head teachers did one on one feedback after an event or a test only when asked to do so indicated by 85(47%) and supported by mean of 4. The respondents disagreed that they give feedback only when they request indicated 92(51%) with a mean of 2 and standard deviation of 22. Feedback was given immediately after an event as indicated by 112 (62%) respondents and supported by mean of 4. It was agreed that head teachers do self-assessment after an event has taken place as indicated by 124 (69%) with a mean = 4. The respondents disagreed that they do not offer guidance and counseling in their school indicated by 90 (50%) respondents and supported by a mean =2. The respondents agreed that they hold subject panel meetings after every evaluation test indicated by 88(49%) with support of a mean of 4.

Evaluation feedback and teacher performance appraisal were correlated using Pearson correlation. Using the p-value computed from the correlation, the null hypothesis was tested, there is no significant relationship between evaluation feedback and implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development. The findings are presented in Table 4.
Table 4 Correlation analysis between use of Feedback and implementation of TPAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TPAD</th>
<th>EFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPAD</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFP</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.257**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The correlation coefficient $r = -0.257$, $p (0.000) <0.05$. This is a weak negative relationship between evaluation feedback and implementation of TPAD. Further analysis of the qualitative statement indicated that there could be some problems with the way feedback is given resulting into resistance of teacher appraisal. The $p$-calculated was found to be 0.00, which was less than 0.05 level of significant. This led to rejection of the null hypotheses and conclusion that there is a significant relationship between evaluation feedback and implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development.

Further a simple linear regression test was run to determine the predictive power of evaluation feedback on implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.257a</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), EFP

The R Square was 0.066 implying that evaluation feedback determined 6.6% variation in the implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development. Further analysis indicated ANOVA result of P-value of 0.00<0.005 implying that evaluation feedback is a significant predictor in implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>12.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30.199</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.341</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TPAD
b. Predictors: (Constant), EFP

The F critical at 5% level of significance, 1d.f, 178 d.f was 3.89 while F calculated was 12.627, since F calculated is greater than the F critical (value = 3.89), this shows that the overall model was significant. The processed data, which is the population parameters, had a significance level of 0.00% since $p 0.000 <0.05$ we reject the null hypothesis. This shows that there is a significance relationship between evaluation and

The study determined the level at which introduction of evaluation feedback influenced implementation of teacher performance appraisal and the results are shown in Table 7.
Table 6: Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFP</td>
<td>-.302</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TPAD

It was observed that holding evaluation feedback to a constant zero, implementation of teacher performance appraisal and development would be at 3.890. Thus, a unit increase in evaluation feedback would lead to decrease in implementation of teacher performance by 0.017 units. This decrease was found to be significant at 0.05 level of confidence.

4.3 Reward Strategy on implementation of Teacher Performance Appraisal

The second objective was to determine the influence of head teachers’ use of reward strategy on implementation of TPAD. The findings are presented in Table 7

Table 7: Responses on reward strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reward system</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward transparent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys used to assess opinions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders do not support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the effectiveness</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports appraisal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC do not attend to equal pay</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No competitive pay structure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay on job evaluation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay schemes not revised fairly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total List wise 180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings revealed that majority of the head teachers and teachers were undecided as to whether a reward system was in place (both financial and non-financial) as shown by 13(17%) respondents and supported by a mean of 3.36. It was not clear whether managers were transparent and communicated reward arrangements to staff as agreed by 23 (13%) respondents and supported by a mean of 3.26. Respondents were undecided on whether the...
reward policies and practices are well developed to support the schools’ objectives and the stakeholders’ needs as indicated by 98 (54.4%) respondents as supported by a mean of 3.14.

Surveys are not used to assess the opinions of staffs about reward and action taken on the outcomes as indicated by 10 (57.8%) respondents and supported by a mean of 2.75. Most of the respondents 75 (41.7%) were undecided on whether stakeholders support the reward system in the school as supported by a mean of 3.13. It was disagreed by 75 (41.7%) that steps are taken to evaluate the effectiveness of reward management process and to ensure they reflect the changing needs as supported by a mean of 2.42. It was undecided by 104 (57.8%) respondents on whether the teachers’ reward system supports the performance appraisal and is up-to-date and non-discriminating. This had a mean of 2.02.

Majority of the teachers and head teachers, 78 (43.3%) agreed that the TSC do not give serious attention to equal pay issues and equal pay reviews as further supported by a mean of 3.92. The teachers disagreed that TSC has not set in place a competitive pay structure that tracks the market rates for attraction and retention of teachers 82 (45.6%) which was supported by a mean of 2.38. Grade and pay structures are based on job evaluation and market rate analysis as supported by 96 (53.3%) respondents and a mean of 3.63. It was disagreed by 81 (45%) respondents that contingent pay schemes are not revised fairly and consistently which was further supported by a mean of 2.83.

A correlation was carried out to establish the relationship between reward strategies on implementation of TPAD. It also sought to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between reward strategy and implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development. To achieve this objective, Pearson correlation was conducted and shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Correlation between reward strategy and implementation of TPAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TPAD</th>
<th>REST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPAD</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.176*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The findings reveal a correlation coefficient of r (180) = 0.176, P = 0.018 < 0.05. This shows that there is a weak positive relationship between reward strategy and implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development. This implies that as reward strategy increases, implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development goes up. The study also sought to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between reward strategy and implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development. The p-calculated was found to be 0.018, which was less than 0.05 level of significant. This led to rejection of the null hypotheses and conclusion that there is a significant relationship between reward strategy and implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development. This conclusion implies that Evaluation feedback is important in implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development.

A simple regression analysis was done between reward strategy and implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development. The results are presented in Table 9.
Table 9: Correlation on reward strategy and teachers’ performance appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TPAD</th>
<th>REST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.176*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation | .176*  | 1      |
| Sig. (2-tailed)     | .018   |        |
| N               | 180    | 180    |

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

The results indicate a positive correlation coefficient of $r (180) = .176$, $p (0.018) < 0.05$. This shows that there is a weak positive relationship between the two attributes. Therefore, there is a relationship between reward strategy and implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development.

A Simple Linear regression test was run to determine the predictive power of reward strategy on implementation of TPAD as shown in table 10.

Table 10: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), REST

Adjusted R squared is coefficient of determination which states the variation in the dependent variable due to changes in the independent variable. The value of adjusted R squared was 0.025 an indication that there was variation of 2.5 percent on implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development due to changes in reward strategy at 95 percent confidence interval. There is a positive relationship between changes in reward strategy and implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development as shown by 0.176.

The study examined the model’s significance through application of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) method and the outcome are illustrated in Table 11.

Table 11: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>5.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>31.344</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.341</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TPAD
b. Predictors: (Constant), REST

The F critical at 5% level of significance, 1d.f, 178 d.f was 3.89 while F calculated was 5.664, since F calculated is greater than the F critical (value = 3.89), this shows that the overall model was significant. The processed data, which is the population parameters, had a significance level of 0.018% since $p 0.018 < 0.05$ we reject the null hypothesis. This shows that there is a significant difference between reward strategy and implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development.

The study established the level at which introduction of reward strategies influenced implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development and the results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Coefficients
### Table: Unstandardized Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (Constant)</td>
<td>2.399</td>
<td>Std. Error: 0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>Std. Error: 0.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a. Dependent Variable: TPAD**

From the regression equation, it is clear that holding reward strategy to a constant zero, implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development would be at 2.399. A unit increase in reward strategy would lead to an increase in implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development by 0.21 units. At 5% level of significance and 95% level of confidence, reward practice was significant (p < 0.05). It is clear that holding reward strategy to a constant zero, implementation of TPAD would be at 2.399. A unit increase in reward strategy would lead to an increase in TPAD by 0.21 units. At 5% level of significance and 95% level of confidence, reward strategy was significant (p < 0.05). This result also shows the intercept of the regression line, Y = 2.399 + 0.210X. This means that when reward system increased by 1 unit, teachers’ performance increased by 2.8 units.

It was revealed from the interviews that TSC has also come up with a grading system based on the experience. Approximately 50 teachers were said to have been promoted since the inception of performance appraisal. The sub-county staffing officer further stipulated that rewarding of teachers is done through consideration of the efforts shown by teachers irrespective of the schools. Further, the interview revealed that TSC was at the time training teachers for the improvement of competency-based curriculum. The sub-county director revealed that there was a policy in place to ensure that all teachers are trained after every 5 years using training modules. However, the training had not commenced due to wrangles between TSC and KNUT.

### 4. Discussions

The study examined the relationship between feedback practices and reward strategy on teachers’ performance in secondary schools in Kieni East county. Majority of the teachers were over 41 years while majority of the head teachers were above 50 years. There were more female teachers than the male but more male head teachers than the female.

#### 4.1 Influence of Feedback delivery on Implementation of TPAD

The findings indicate a weak negative relationship between evaluation feedback and implementation of performance appraisal and development (r = -0.357, p < 0.05). The qualitative statements indicated that there could be some problems with the way feedback is given leading to resistance of teacher appraisal. This is because as the evaluation feedback increases, implementation of teachers’ performance appraisal development goes down. This implies that evaluation feedback is an important aspect of teacher appraisal. However, more attention should be given on manner in which evaluation feedback is given to teachers. Feedback can only be useful depending on the perception of teachers on the usefulness of that particular feedback. The findings concur with Dattner (2015), Baumeister et al., (2001), Bies, (2013) who underline the importance of feedback delivery on effective performance appraisal systems. The same author argues that each institution ought to promote its own customized approach in designing and implementing employee performance appraisal with focusing on informal feedback and specific evaluation criteria. However, feedback can be distressing and managers often fail to deliver feedback accurately because they find these discussions uncomfortable and fear that it would affect the well-being of an employee (Baumeister et al., 2001, Bies, 2013). In addition, Schaeper, Kern, Berger, Medvec, and Swaab (2018) reveals that managers communicate negative feedback ineffectively because they suffer from transparency illusions that cause them to overestimate how accurately employees perceive their feedback.

#### 4.2 Influence of reward Strategy on Implementation TPAD

The findings reveal a weak positive correlation between reward strategy and implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development (r = 0.176, p = 0.018 < 0.05). This implies that as reward strategy increases, implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development goes up. Therefore, evaluation feedback is important in implementation of Teachers’ performance appraisal development. The findings concur with Armstrong, (2006); Armstrong (2009) who found that both monetary and non-monetary rewards are
positively linked to performance as boosts a motivational environment. Michael and Brown (2010) argue that reward strategy helps to attract, retain and motivate the right people in an organization. The findings are also in line with Pichler, Varma, Michel, Levy, Budhwar and Sharma (2015) that exchange of information between a supervisor and supervisee has an impact on procedural justice and performance.

5 Conclusions
The success of any organizations depends on the performance output of the human resource management. Teachers constitute the most critical input in service delivery in education sector and as such their satisfaction and motivation should be at the forefront of managerial task. In regards to evaluation feedback, the findings indicate that the respondents had negative attitude on the effect of evaluation feedback on performance. The study found that reward strategy is quite effective in enhancing teacher performance in secondary schools in Kieni East Sub County.

6. Recommendations
The study suggests future research to focus on motivation to improve teacher performance Appraisal and development which will lead to better understanding of reactions regarding Teacher performance appraisal and Development and intentions.
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