



*The Cradle of Knowledge: African Journal of  
Educational and Social Science Research  
AJESSR - ISSN 2304-2885-p, 2617-7315-e  
Volume 12, Issue 4, 2024  
P.O. Box 555 (00202) Nairobi, Kenya  
editor@serek.or.ke*

**SOCIETY OF  
EDUCATIONAL  
RESEARCH  
AND  
EVALUATION  
IN KENYA**

## Teacher Preparedness in the Implement of the Teacher Performance Appraisal Development Tool and its implications on Learning Outcomes in History and Government in Kwale County, Kenya

Leonard Mwangangi Isika, Ondigi Samson & Bwire Adelheid  
Department of Educational Communication and Technology, Kenyatta University  
email: [isikaleonard@gmail.com](mailto:isikaleonard@gmail.com)

### Abstract

Teacher performance appraisals are designed to evaluate teachers' performance across various competencies such as lesson planning, instructional skills, classroom management, learners assessment and professional ethics. This promotes a culture of accountability among teachers. Kenya launched the Teacher Performance Appraisal Development tool in 2016. This study sort to establish levels of teacher preparedness in the implement of the Teacher Performance Appraisal Development tool in History and Government in selected secondary schools in Kwale County. Questionnaire and Key informant interview, were utilized to collect both qualitative and quantitative data. The study targeted 61 Sub County Public Secondary Schools in Kwale County, 61 Principals, 61 Heads of Subject and 100 History and Government teachers totalling to a target population of 222 participants. The study sample size was 15 Sub County Secondary, 15 Principals 15 Heads of Subjects and 30 History and Government teachers totalling sample size of 60 participants and respondents. Piloting was conducted in two public Sub County Secondary Schools not in the sample to validate the study tools. Quantitative data was analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences to generate descriptive statistics while qualitative data was run to get inferential statistics. The study finding revealed that teachers were not adequately prepared to implement the TPAD tool, gaps were identified in professional development programs. This study concluded that the TPAD tool implementation has gaps and challenges that have implications on learning outcomes. The study recommended a review of teacher preservice training to include performance appraisals, that teacher employer, collaborates with school administrators to prioritize targeted retooling, availing of sufficient resources, and reduce teacher workload to enhance preparedness.

**Key Words:** Teacher Performance; Appraisal; Development Tool; Preparedness

### 1. Introduction

Teacher performance appraisal is a critical component of educational quality assurance worldwide this has led the world, through United Nations Organization to develop global goal on education as outlined in United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organization (2015); sustainable goal no 4: which states that the world should ensure inclusive and equitable quality education that promotes lifelong learning opportunities for all. Many countries have adopted teacher evaluation systems to enhance accountability, professional development, and student learning outcomes. 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). In the United Kingdom, according to (Denley, 2024) Teacher performance appraisals focus on performance management linked to career progression and pay increases. In Finland as observed by (Tarhan et.al 2019) teacher performance appraisal focuses on trusting teachers by having limited formal evaluations, however placing emphasis on professional development and support. In India according to Adili, (2021), teacher performance appraisal has a strong link with students learning outcomes and is viewed as key consideration in increasing the quality of teaching and learning. However, teacher performance appraisal in India has gaps in that there is inadequate awareness and training on its role and India has no official tool to appraise teachers and provide them with feedback on their performance as teacher appraisals are done



at school levels. Teacher performance appraisal in Japan according to Katsuno, (2016) integrates performance appraisal with collaborative and peer feedback.

In Africa, Teacher performance appraisal varies from one country to another because of difference in education systems cultural practices and availability of resources. In Botswana, according to Monyatsi, Steyn & Kamper, (2006), teacher appraisal schemes were introduced in 1992 which over the years has been considered acceptable but face managerial and training gaps that need to be addressed. Botswanan teacher performance appraisal can be considered a programme evolving. The evolving nature of teacher performance appraisal has called for review which continues to characterize teacher performance appraisal in quest for effective curriculum content delivery and enhanced learning outcomes in all subject in school. Teacher Performance Appraisal in Egypt according to (World Bank Country Report, 2010) is goal oriented teacher performance appraisal with eight goals which includes; setting expectations for teachers, attracting the best into teaching, giving teachers useful training experience, matching teachers skills with students' needs, enabling principals to provide direct instructional support, monitoring students achievements, supporting teachers through professional development guidance and motivating teachers to perform. The gap noted in Egyptian Teacher Performance Appraisal is that though top performing teachers are rewarded, low performing teachers are rarely sanctioned, therefore leaving a gap in performance appraisal, World Bank Country Report (2016). In Ghana the Central Government has increased scrutiny and regulation of teacher appraisal with the aim of improving standards, quality and meeting students' expectations. However, studies by Danku, Soglo, Dordor & Bokor, (2015) have identified that Ghana's teacher appraisal has gaps of not considering opinion of staff, not availing needed resources and failure of those concerned to act upon teacher performance appraisal results.

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.

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. After the launch of the TPAD in 2016, a study by Kagemi and Irungu (2018) found out that the TPAD tool was unfavourable to teachers in terms of career advancement and performance of learners. Regina, (2019) found out that the TPAD tool was inconsistent evaluator with, mismatch between the TPAD tool rating and learning outcomes. Study by Tumusiime, Mwalwa and Okennasis, (2019) found that the TPAD tool has no clear strategy to support teachers' professional development which it envisages, while Khatete and Macharia, (2020) established that the TPAD tool tends to leave out important aspects such as identified gaps in teachers' performance of task. Mwangangi *et al* (2025) in a study revealed that teachers demographics were not taken into account in implementing the TPAD tool. This study aimed at establishing the teacher preparedness in implementing the TPAD in History and Government and its implications on learning outcomes in selected secondary schools in Kwale County.

## 2. Research Methods

The study employed descriptive survey design. According to Kothari, (2009). This method involves describing, recording, analysing 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' responses to relevant issues of study objectives; is appropriate as it points out characteristics, trends, frequencies and provides an in-depth 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.

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 km<sup>2</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> best in the TPAD tool compliance. The study was 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 and the TPAD tool is applicable only in public 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 Mahatima 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.

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. The 61 principals, 61 Heads of subject History and Government and 100 teachers of History and Government were targeted, totalling to a target population of 222. The 100 teachers of History and Government were the trained, registered and employed by TSC as the TPAD tool is applicable to all TSC registered teachers.

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.

The study utilized purposive sampling, simple random sampling and convenience sampling. The schools involved in this study were selected using simple random sampling procedure. Simple random sampling of schools involved getting a list of all the public sub county secondary schools in Kwale County. 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. The Principals, Heads of subjects History and Government and the History teachers in the sampled schools were purposively sampled as they are by virtue of their office crucial in the TPAD tool implementation. The principal will be purposively sampled because they plan the TPAD tool meetings, ensure, compliance to the TPAD tool calendar, observe the TPAD required lessons randomly and as agents of TSC, they also counter sign the TPAD tool appraisal. The Head of subject History and Government will be purposively sampled because according to TSC, (2019) they are the TPAD appraisers in History and Government and carry out lesson observations in History and Government and plan collaborate with History and Government teachers to ensure content delivery in the classroom and compliance to the TPAD tool requirements. The Principals and Heads of Subject responded to key informant interview (KII (History and Government teachers were



conveniently sampled in that the questionnaire for teachers was filled by the History and Government teachers who were in school when the researcher got to the sampled schools.

### 3. The findings and discussions of the study

#### Preparedness of teachers of History and Government in implementing the TPAD tool

The study objective sort information to establish the level of adequacy of teacher preparedness in History and Government to implement the TPAD tool. Hallinger (2011) says that Preparedness is readiness to perform tasks based on knowledge, skills and availability of supportive resources. To collect data on teacher preparedness a questionnaire was administered to History and Government teachers whose return rate is summarised below.

**Table 1: Questionnaire Return Rate**

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

The findings were summarized in Table 2 below:

**Table 2: Teacher Preparedness in Implementing TPAD tool**

| Questionnaire statement  | SA |      | A  |      | D  |      | SD |      |
|--|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
|  | N  | %    | N  | %    | N  | %    | N  | %    |
| Am aware of the TPAD tool  | 10 | 35.7 | 17 | 63.0 | 1  | 3.7  | 0  | 0.0  |
| During my preservice training I was trained on teacher performance appraisal processes I was well inducted into the TPAD tool implementation as was launched | 0  | 0.0  | 0  | 0.0  | 0  | 0.0  | 28 | 100  |
| I consider the TPAD tool Complex to implement  | 1  | 3.7  | 9  | 32.8 | 15 | 53.6 | 3  | 10.7 |
| I consider that new recruited teachers are well inducted on how to implement the TPAD tool.  | 12 | 42.8 | 15 | 53.6 | 1  | 3.7  | 0  | 0.0  |
| I have had opportunities to collaborate with other teachers  | 1  | 3.7  | 6  | 21.4 | 10 | 35.7 | 11 | 40   |
| I have had mentoring relationships in my teaching career   | 1  | 3.7  | 3  | 10.7 | 4  | 14.2 | 20 | 71.4 |
| TPAD tool implementation relates to learning outcomes  | 0  | 0.0  | 1  | 3.7  | 1  | 3.7  | 26 | 92.8 |
|  | 10 | 35.7 | 15 | 53.6 | 2  | 7.14 | 1  | 3.7  |

Data on levels of preparedness was collected using a questionnaire. The participants were History and Government teachers. based on the following indicators of adequacy of teacher preparedness as presented by Table 3 above is in line with Haittie, (2009) on the tenets of preparedness as, awareness, induction into TPAD tool and induction of new recruited teachers, Complexity in implementing the TPAD tool and teachers' experiences in implementing TPAD tool. National Centre for Education Statistics (1999) includes preservice training, teacher, induction into the teaching service, Professional development programme, teacher collaboration with other teachers, mentoring relationships and Teacher working environment as indicators of teacher preparedness. The study sought information on teacher awareness of TPAD tool and went forth to establish the preparedness of teachers in implementing the tool. Data was collected analysed and the findings are discussed as follows.



### **Teachers' awareness of TPAD tool and its implementation**

A question was asked on whether the teachers were aware of the TPAD tool. According to the study awareness was taken to imply having knowledge of a situation as explained by (Gacheru, 2010) in this regard teacher's awareness of TPAD tool and its implementation. From the collated data, 99% of History and Government teachers were aware of the TPAD tool and its implementation. On the same awareness a question was asked to KII who said: This high level of awareness of TPAD tool and implementation has been created by TSC through Circulars on TPAD tool implementation and Policy manual documents available at TSC website. The policy manual was also found in the TSC field offices across the country and in the schools through the identification and training of TPAD tool Champions for each school. The principals' attendance of conferences and workshops and sharing information on TPAD tool implementation with their teachers has also been instrument in the creation of awareness on the TPAD tool (KII 09).

These findings demonstrate high levels of awareness of the TPAD tool and implementation concurs with TSC, (2021) which stated that in 2016, 82.21% of all teachers were appraised on the implementation of TPAD tool, in 2017 87.53% of all teachers were appraised while in 2019, 95.3% of all teachers had been appraised. This demonstrates that, TSC has effective mechanism as an employer that made teachers aware of TPAD tool and other programs that they intended teachers to be awareness of. Regina (2019) concurred by stating that teacher appraisal systems had gained global attention in quest for quality education. On this high awareness of the TPAD tool, a (KII) was quick to caution that high level awareness, did not necessary imply ability to implement the TPAD tool as envisioned, (KII6) was quoted saying; Awareness does not mean doing what is expected by the TPAD tool for teachers have devised their own ways of complying with the TPAD tool to secure their jobs without burdening themselves. You see when there is too much expectation in terms of output of a tool and yet the teaching is every day, then one must learn how to go around the tool just to look like she/he is implementing the tool (KII6).

From the study findings on awareness and implementation of the TPAD tool it is evident that the teachers are aware of the TPAD tool and are implementing it in teaching. However, looking at the argument of KII6 it seems the implementation of the TPAD tool has challenges that need to be looked into to ensure adequate implementation. This is especially when the (KII6) talks about the need for teachers to "go around the TPAD tool to look like implementing it". A study by Monyatsi, Steryn and Kamper (2006) confirms these findings by outlining the challenges facing TPAD tool implementation and how teachers are coping.

### **Serving History teachers induction on the TPAD tool**

The study sought to map the preparedness of teachers to implement the TPAD tool. The aim was to check the ways in which the teachers were made ready to teach and assess students as guided by the TPAD tool. History and Government teachers at 65% expressed that they felt not adequately prepared to implement the TPAD tool. An interview with KII, 08 confirmed these findings when he said that the inadequate preparation was because training on TPAD tool implementation for all teachers was not conducted. The respondent indicated that the TSC used circulars, principals and TPAD champions to prepare teachers to implement a complex performance appraisal. TSC used circulars, principles, TSC field officers and TPAD tool champions to ensure teachers implement TPAD tool in their teaching, no induction for all serving teachers was conducted (KII08).

### **Pre-Service Training**

Pre- service teacher education is the education and training provided to student teacher before they undertake any teaching. Data from questionnaire and KII reveal that all the sampled teachers during preservice training were never trained on teacher performance appraisals process they only come to interact with such processes when they begin their career. KII03 observed;

"No training on teacher performance appraisal process is done during pre-service training in both teacher training colleges and universities. This is a very big problem that the teachers have to learn of this TPAD tool while already in the field. There is no semblance of the same tool even during teaching practice" (KII03).

This study noted that the lack of preservice training was a gap in implementation of TPAD tool. Preservice teacher education is crucial in fostering the belief, practice and professional commitments of the would-be teachers and enables teachers to be effective and confident practitioners in the teaching profession therefore the need to make teacher performance appraisal process part pre-service training. Studies by Global Partnership for Education (2024)





concurred with these findings by observing that many teachers had expressed dissatisfaction with their preservice preparations. One KII respondent indicated:

The professor lectured us for hours about making learning engaging, fun, and active for children they did not seem to see the irony of this. In my opinion, preservice was a lot of lectures with PowerPoint which did not help the teachers much (KII 02).

From the above quote it seems that preservice training was falling short of its requirements in terms of preparing teachers for service. It has to be noted that the main aim of higher education is to cultivate expertise ensuring graduates possess a strong foundation and skill set to excel in their chosen field. Well prepared graduates according to (NCES,1999) who enter the teaching force are more likely to feel competent, find fulfilment in their work and remain in the teaching profession therefore teacher education need to be upgraded to respond to the current issues in teaching and learning. Hallinger (2011) indicates that preparation and induction would make teachers willing to accept a program and develop capacity to implement it. Additionally, a fair appraisal by any tool serves to increase teachers' motivation and the spirit of mutual trust but only when they are involved in the development of the tool. A minority of the teachers 35% expressed satisfaction in terms of preparedness to implement the TPAD tool.

According to these teachers, the TPAD tool involved teaching and learning activities that they had trained on as teachers such as preparation of professional documents and actual classroom teaching. Most of the teachers (65%) who appreciated the TPAD tool were aged between 20 and 35 years. According to the findings from the interviews, it was established that these were teachers who were fresh in the field and were eager to apply any tool in the field. The elderly teachers, 40 years and above who had served from many years indicated that they had achieved high grades in the subject without the use of this tool which they termed as time consuming. They indicated that the tool consumed the time that they needed for checking student exercise books and doing research on preparation for teaching

### **Induction of newly recruited teachers**

Data from questionnaires indicated that (77%) participants felt that new teachers were not adequately inducted on the TPAD tool implementation. Reddy, Fabiano, Dudek and Hsu (2013) argue that induction of new teachers is crucial in service delivery as it serves the purpose of enabling a teacher to settle in the teaching profession. The study found out that the TSC had developed the Mentorship and Coaching Program (TIMEC) in the teaching service (TSC, 2020). According to the study findings, although TSC had put in place regulations and policies to guide teaching service there were challenges of teacher conduct and performance. According to the findings from interviews, TIMEC programme seemed to focus on preventive strategies to teacher misconduct with little or no attention to the implementation of the TPAD tool. One KII observed; During induction the main focus is on teachers Code of Conduct and TPAD tool is only mentioned as an expectation on the part of the teacher and some cohorts of newly recruited teachers are never inducted at any level (KII, 05).

The fact that the induction is mostly skewed towards teachers' code of conduct rather than TPAD tool shows that even the TSC do not take the tool seriously. One would expect that the induction on the code conduct would be followed by induction on the tools of teaching such as the TPAD. This argument concurs with UNESCO, (2024) who established that there is lack of consistency in the induction of new teachers among school heads due to absence of a comprehensive guiding document applicable to all schools as a guiding induction document.

The findings revealed that (23%) of the respondents indicated that induction of new teachers was adequate. However, Cameron, (2023) considers the response as a second thought based on the fact that issues of induction of new teachers are often mentioned by principals during meetings and in most cases when the results of students are out and a certain subject seems to be lagging behind. The study found out that there was no induction manual from the TSC and this finding aligned with Teshoma, (2018) who said that although the programme is not emphasized, it has a significant role in enhancing teachers' performance of their work refining their teaching skills and fostering a sense of moral dedication to the service. Most of the interviewed KII, indicated the need for the TSC to develop a compressive induction guide both at sub county and school level.



### **Complexity of the TPAD tool implementation**

The study sought to establish if there was complexity in the implementation of the TPAD tool. The data on complexity of the TPAD tool revealed that 96% of respondents considered the TPAD tool as complex. This was due to the tool having many parts which made it difficult to understand (TPAD tool standard appendix 15). The findings on the complexity of the tool contrast with Isore, (2009) who argues that a good model of teacher performance appraisal should not be complex. A study by Waudo & Ouya, (2010) showed that teacher performance appraisals have been cited as causing confusion and disillusionment to teachers as they were not seen to serve their purposes nor benefit the teachers. According to (Kagama and Irungu 2018) complex appraisal system, raises concerns on its validity and reliability. One KII informant observed: The TPAD tool is so complex that one just finds it a waste of time. Imagine of a teacher who has no computer skills and has to upload information on the tool. One has to seek the help of computer literate teachers, use his or her children at home or worst of all visit the cyber cafes for the service. Sometimes a teacher is computer literate but has no access to internet (KII, 05).

The TPAD tool has seven standards that each teacher must comply to according to (TSC, 2019). The uploading of evidence was found to be a challenge to many teachers and there is no clear mechanism of addressing gaps that teachers identified in the TPAD tool appraisal according to (KII14) “The TPAD tool standards are many and gaps identification and addressing is not clear in addition to having to upload the TPAD content on TSC portal. This study that established teachers did not get feedback on the appraisal process. The challenge of digital literacy among teachers is a concern where some teachers have not acquired digital literacy and relied on computer teachers to fill TPAD tool appraisal for them or paid cyber cafes to fill and upload for them their TPAD tool appraisal. Studies by Regina, (2019) concur by pointing out internet connectivity and digital literacy as some of the challenges facing TPAD tool appraisal process.

### **Teacher Collaborative activities**

The 21<sup>st</sup> century teacher is expected to have developed prescribed core competencies according to Kenya Professional Teaching Standards (KePTS, 2024). The teacher knows and promotes instructional leadership and administration, where the core competency of collaboration and team work is a requirement. The study established that History and Government teachers at 88% have not had teacher collaborations in their area of specialization. This was a gap in TPAD tool implementation because there is need for common planning periods for team teaching and regular scheduled collaborative activities to facilitate exchange of pedagogical and subject matter knowledge, thereby enhancing learning outcomes. Indeed, teacher networking with teachers outside the school is an indicator of teacher preparedness. (NCES, 1999) concurs with the finding by noting that teachers who recently engaged in various collaborative activities felt better prepared than their peers.

### **Teacher Mentoring relationship**

Mentorship according to Mwangangi, Ayot and Kiio (2015) is a process of nurturing in which a more skilled and experienced person serves as a role model by teaching, sponsoring, encouraging, counselling and befriending a less skilled and less experienced person for purposes of promoting professional development and efficiency. This study established that History and Government teachers at 93% confirmed to having not had a mentoring relationship in their teaching career and this could have implication on their preparedness. The study findings concurred with (NCES, 1999) which reveals that teachers who were mentored, felt well prepared for classroom requirements than their peers who were not mentored. Mentorship is crucial because teachers performed variety of duties in implementing the curriculum in schools, and these tasks could be difficult and stressful, therefore the need to support teachers in their duties through mentoring programmes. Mentoring relationships according to (NCES, 1999) may yield benefits to both the mentor teacher and those who are mentored and both feel well prepared for classroom requirements.

### **Implications of teacher’s preparedness on learning outcomes**

The study sought to establish the implications of teacher’s preparedness 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 years after (2018-2022) the TPAD tool implementation has been presented in Table 3. below.

**Table 3.: KCSE National History and Government Performance (2011-2015) five years before TPAD tool.**

| Year | Candidature | Mean       | Standard deviation |
|------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| 2011 | 115923      | P1 51.38   | P1 17.00           |
|      |             | P2 32.32   | P2 15.17           |
|      |             | 83.66/200  | 30.26              |
| 2012 | 293172      | P1 46.63   | P1 16.94           |
|      |             | P2 35.31   | P2 16.47           |
|      |             | 81.90/200  | 31.69              |
| 2013 | 309120      | P1 55.67   | P1 18.97           |
|      |             | P2 31.87   | P2 15.47           |
|      |             | 89.44/200  | 31.87              |
| 2014 | 333655      | P1 50.27   | P1 17.99           |
|      |             | P2 57.41   | P2 18.33           |
|      |             | 107.66/200 | 33.89              |
| 2015 | 394086      | P1 45      | P1 17.8            |
|      |             | P2 40      | P2 22.44           |
|      |             | 85.62/200  | 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 analysed mean and standard deviation for the period 2018-2022 five years after TPAD tool implementation as shown in Table 4.1 below

**Table 4: 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   | P1 19.30           |
|      |             | P2 36.68   | P2 19.30           |
|      |             | 82.42/200  | 39.74              |
| 2019 | 483678      | P1 45      | P1 19.29           |
|      |             | P2 39      | P2 20.45           |
|      |             | 84/200     |                    |
| 2020 | 508070      | P1 54.74   | P1 21.71           |
|      |             | P2 48.46   | P2 22.22           |
|      |             | 103.18/200 | 41.83              |
| 2021 | 566636      | P1 45.89   | P1 19.34           |
|      |             | P2 42.00   | P2 21.05           |
|      |             | 87.86/200  | 38.54              |
| 2022 | 599199      | P1 54.86   | P1 20.43           |
|      |             | P2 63.65   | P2 22.11           |
|      |             | 118.52/200 | 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

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

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

| YE<br>AR | ENT<br>RY |   | A    | A-    | B+   | B    | B-   | C+   | C    | C-   | D+    | D    | D-   | E    | X   | MEA<br>N<br>SCO<br>RE |
|----------|-----------|---|------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-----|-----------------------|
| 2011     | 3016      | % | 0.36 | 1.160 | 3.68 | 4.04 | 6.76 | 8.45 | 10.1 | 12.6 | 12.59 | 23.6 | 13.3 | 2.95 | 0.2 | 4.797                 |
|          |           |   | 47   | 48    | 04   | 51   | 39   | 49   | 13   | 99   | 95    | 07   | 29   | 09   | 32  | 607                   |
| 2012     | 3056      | % | 0.13 | 0.523 | 2.35 | 2.94 | 4.48 | 8.63 | 10.4 | 12.1 | 10.24 | 25.7 | 15.0 | 7.06 | 0.2 | 4.335                 |
|          |           |   | 09   | 56    | 6    | 5    | 3    | 87   | 38   | 4    | 21    | 2    | 2    | 81   | 95  | 74                    |
| 2013     | 3272      | % | 0.30 | 0.794 | 2.87 | 5.47 | 7.18 | 12.2 | 11.5 | 11.4 | 10.17 | 20.6 | 12.4 | 4.85 | 0   | 4.924                 |
|          |           |   | 56   | 62    | 29   | 07   | 22   | 25   | 22   | 91   | 73    | 6    | 39   | 94   |     | 205                   |
| 2014     | 3259      | % | 0.27 | 0.767 | 2.79 | 4.78 | 5.92 | 11.2 | 11.3 | 11.7 | 11.66 | 20.9 | 12.9 | 5.43 | 0.1 | 4.773                 |
|          |           |   | 62   | 11    | 23   | 67   | 21   | 92   | 53   | 52   |       | 27   | 18   | 11   | 23  | 272                   |
| 2015     | 3756      | % | 0.21 | 0.772 | 2.05 | 2.95 | 5.51 | 10.3 | 10.9 | 11.7 | 13.20 | 23.5 | 12.9 | 5.45 | 0.2 | 4.553                 |
|          |           |   | 3    | 1     | 01   | 53   | 12   | 3    | 96   | 41   | 55    | 09   | 66   | 79   | 93  | 004                   |

Source: Kwale County Education Office (2024)

**Table 6: History and Government K.C.S.E results for Kwale County (2018-2022)**

| YE<br>AR | ENT<br>RY |   | A    | A-    | B+    | B    | B-   | C+   | C    | C-   | D+    | D    | D-   | E    | X   | MEA<br>N<br>SCO<br>RE |
|----------|-----------|---|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-----|-----------------------|
| 2018     | 4761      | % | 0.75 | 1.176 | 2.604 | 4.99 | 4.89 | 6.42 | 7.77 | 7.01 | 6.553 | 25.4 | 19.6 | 12.3 | 0.3 | 4.145                 |
|          |           |   | 61   | 22    | 5     | 89   | 39   | 72   | 15   | 53   | 25    | 57   | 39   | 71   | 36  | 205                   |
| 2019     | 4379      | % | 0.63 | 1.164 | 2.900 | 5.11 | 8.70 | 6.98 | 7.78 | 7.10 | 7.924 | 22.0 | 21.7 | 7.55 | 0.3 | 4.465                 |
|          |           |   | 94   | 65    | 2     | 53   | 06   | 79   | 72   | 21   | 18    | 37   | 63   | 88   | 2   | 979                   |
| 2020     | 4492      | % | 2.29 | 5.387 | 9.52p | 9.68 | 10.6 | 6.56 | 4.87 | 5.40 | 4.341 | 16.3 | 15.8 | 8.25 | 0.9 | 5.684                 |
|          |           |   | 3    | 36    | er8   | 39   | 63   | 72   | 53   | 96   | 05    | 4    | 28   | 91   | 35  | 045                   |
| 2021     | 5769      | % | 0.78 | 1.560 | 3.068 | 4.45 | 7.34 | 7.64 | 7.92 | 8.23 | 7.713 | 25.5 | 16.5 | 8.64 | 0.4 | 4.496                 |
|          |           |   |      | 06    | 1     | 48   | 96   | 43   | 17   | 37   | 64    | 16   | 37   | 97   | 85  | 081                   |
| 2022     | 4791      | % | 0.08 | 2.337 | 3.986 | 5.28 | 7.32 | 9.35 | 10.1 | 10.5 | 9.935 | 21.6 | 11.4 | 2.83 | 0.2 | 4.834                 |
|          |           |   | 3    |       |       | 0    | 6    | 0    | 85   | 61   |       | 03   | 79   | 8    | 08  | 553                   |

Source: Kwale County Education Office (2024)



Table 6 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 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:

You know TPAD tool is good, and teachers were initially happy with the implementation of it in schools. But the problem is that it is complicated and wastes a lot of time. Teachers often wonder who came up with the tool. Was it made in the context of this country or it was adopted from another country. If the TSC actually developed this tool to improve on performance of subjects in schools, how come they never give us feedback on the same? (KII, 15).

This study additionally analysed 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 Mabuk, (2023) 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.

#### 4 Conclusions

On levels of preparedness in implementing the TPAD tool the study concluded that although History and Government teachers were aware of TPAD tool implementation, majority felt inadequately prepared to implement the TPAD tool as it was not part of their preservice training, they were not adequately inducted in its implementation, it was a complex teacher performance appraisal tool and the induction of new teachers focused more on teachers' code of conduct rather than the TPAD tool implementation. Teachers' collaborative activities and mentoring relationship among History and Government teachers are gaps in TPAD tool implementation.

#### 5 Recommendations

These study findings revealed that teachers were not adequately prepared to implement TPAD tool in History and Government due to lack of exposure to the performance appraisals during preservice training. This study recommended that teacher education curriculum to be reviewed to incorporate teacher performance appraisal as a unit of study to facilitate teachers in appraisal procedures. The study findings revealed that History and Government



teachers have limited collaborative activities and mentorship relationships. This study recommended that TSC in collaboration with MOE could partner together to support and facilitate termly teacher collaborative activities in teachers' area of specialization; and support mentorship relations for all teachers by selecting and training experienced and distinguished teachers as mentors based on merit. This study additionally revealed gaps in content delivery cutting across lesson preparation and lesson delivery this study recommends continue retooling of teacher on pedagogy and application of learner centered and interactive approaches to teaching and learning.

## 6. References

- 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(4), 240-256.
- Daniel, G. (2009). *Learning outcomes in secondary and preparatory school performance in West Zone of Oromia Regional State* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Addis Ababa University.
- Deborah, N., Gobor, H., Janet, L., Pauls, & Claives, S. (2011). *OECD review of evaluation and assessment*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264207707-en>
- Depa. (2024). *The Kenya professional teaching standards (KEPTS)-TPD*. Retrieved from <https://cbc.resources.co.ke/the-kenya-professional-teaching-standard-tpd/>
- Debora, D. (2022, June). Goal-setting theory: Why it is important and how to use it at work.
- Gacheru, R. G. (2010). *Impact of transformational leadership on performance of teachers in secondary schools in Nairobi West District* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Kenyatta University.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical management. *Journal of Education Administration*, 18(5), 292-296.
- Hargreaves, A. (2021). *Policy, teacher education, and quality of teachers*. Routledge.
- Isore, M. (2009). Teachers' evaluation: Current practices in OECD countries and literature review. *OECD Working Paper*, 23.
- Khatete, I., & Macharia, M. (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.
- Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI). (2024). *Teacher professional development*. Retrieved from <https://kemi.ac.ke/teacher-professional-development>
- Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC). (2023). *KCSE reports*.
- Kothari, C. (2009). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Age International Publishers.
- Mabuk, R., & Parpucu, H. (2023). The role of feedback in teacher professional development. *Journal of Effective Teaching Methods*, 1(4), 2-34.
- Maichomo, M., Karanja, T., Olum, M., Magero, J., Okech, T., & Nyoike, N. (2019). The status of donkey slaughter in Kenya and its implications on community livelihoods. *Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Organization*.
- Monyatsi, P., Steryn, M., & Kamper, G. (2006). Teachers' appraisal in Botswana secondary schools.
- Mwangangi, L., Ayot, H., & Kiio, M. (2015). *Mentoring secondary school teachers for effective teaching*. Retrieved from <https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/pdf>
- Mwangangi, L., Ondigi, S., & Bwire, A. (2025). Implications of demographics of History and Government teachers on the implementation of the Teachers Performance Appraisal Development tool and learning outcomes in Kwale County, Kenya. *ISAR Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 1-14.
- National Centre for Educational Statistics. (1999). *Educational statistics database*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/achievement>
- National Centre for Educational Statistics. (2014). *Educational statistics database*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/achievement>
- Ngeno, R. W. C., Bett, S., & Kimutai, C. (2013). The performance appraisal policy and tools used by Teachers Service Commission in Bomet Constituency.
- Nzyoka, M. B. (2009). *An investigation into teachers' opposition to the introduction of performance contracts in Masinga Division, Yatta District* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Kenyatta University.
- Pawson, M. (2019). Perceptions of effectiveness of teacher appraisal: A case study of two state-funded academies (Doctoral dissertation). *University of Reading*.



- Regina, P. M. O. (2019). Assessing the impact of the implementation of the 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(1), 16-28.
- Richu, M. (2007). *A survey of teachers' perception of performance appraisal practices in public secondary schools in Nakuru District* (Unpublished MBA Thesis).
- Rukwaru, M. (2007). *Fundamentals of social research*. Eureka Publisher.
- Saber Country Report. (2010). *Teacher appraisal in Egypt*. Retrieved from [www.worldbank.org/education/Saber](http://www.worldbank.org/education/Saber)
- Reed, M., & Challie. (n.d.). E., Vella, S., & Vente, J. (2017). A theory of participation: What makes stakeholders and the public engaged in environmental management work? Retrieved from <https://xxx>
- Sahaya, G. S. (2017). *Empirical research: A study guide*. Pauline Publications.
- Sultan, T. (2011). *Improving the impact of pupil achievement in the UK: Interim findings*. Retrieved from <https://www.sultontrust.com/wp-content/uploads>
- Tarhan, L., Karaman, A., Kemppinen, J., & Aerila, J. (2019). Understanding teacher evaluation in Finland: A professional development framework. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(4). Retrieved from <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol44/iss4/3>
- Teshoma, M. (2018). *Teachers' perception on the practice of performance appraisal and its associated challenges in secondary schools in Bole Sub-city, Addis Ababa* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Addis Ababa University.
- Teachers Service Commission (TSC). (2015). *Code of conduct for teachers*.
- Teachers Service Commission (TSC). (2019). *Teachers Performance Appraisal and Development Operational Manual*.
- Tumusiime, P., Mwalwa, S., & Okemasisi, K. (2019). Principals' implementation of the teacher performance appraisal and development tool and teacher performance in public secondary schools in Kikuyu Constituency. *African Journal of Emerging Issues*, 3(4), 1-22.
- UNESCO. (2003). *Teacher education and learning outcomes*. Retrieved from <http://learning>
- UNESCO. (2014). *EFA global monitoring report 2005: Education for all - The quality imperative*. Retrieved from <https://www.sustainable-developmentgoals#qualityeducation>
- UNESCO. (2021). *A study based on the UNESCO report of treasures within*. Retrieved from <https://www.nudeodo.com.br/educacao>
- UNESCO. (2023). *Gender equality in and through teaching*. Retrieved from <https://www.unesco.org/article/gender-equality-and-through-teaching>
- Waudu, J., & Ouya, E. (2010). *Total quality management in education: Making your school better*.
- Werugu, K. S. (2010). *Teacher perception on performance appraisal feedback in secondary schools within Bungoma East Sub-County, Kenya* (Master's thesis). Kenyatta University

