

## Secondary School Heads' and Teachers' Sensitivities about Performance Appraisal System

Riffat-un-Nisa Awan<sup>\*</sup>  
Sultan Sikandar<sup>\*\*</sup>  
Ghazanfar Ali<sup>\*\*\*</sup>

### Abstract

*This study intended to analyze the teachers' performance appraisal system (PAS) at secondary school level. Population was all secondary school educators, secondary school teachers and their heads in district Khushab. Sample for this study consisted of 189 teachers and 55 head teachers. The literature was reviewed comprehensively to bring to light all the relevant areas of PAS so that the effectiveness of PAS could be sensed for further improvement. For this purpose, two questionnaires, one for the teachers and other for heads were developed. The data were evaluated by computing percentages and by applying t-test and ANOVA for make different comparisons by using SPSS ver.20. Data for appraisers' attitude, feedback, motivation, appraisers' biasness and system effectiveness indicates overall positive response of secondary school teachers and heads. It can easily be deduced that secondary school teachers have their deep concern on the attitude of their head teachers. They were not satisfied with the feedback given to them. They were lacking motivation for enhancement of their performance. They demanded that evaluation should be done without any favor and fervor. They also desired changes in the current PAS and prevailing appraisal practices. It is recommended that effective feedback may be given to the teachers immediately after the performance appraisal is conducted. Moreover the whole process may be updated for using it as a tool to trigger the performance of the teachers.*

**Keywords:** Performance Appraisal, Appraisers' Attitude, Feedback, Motivation, Appraisers' Biasness, System Effectiveness

### Introduction

Evaluation of employees' performance and giving them feedback is a pre requisite for effective organizations. Performance appraisal is a system which assists the supervisor to detect deficiencies and motivates the employees to work with great zeal. It

---

<sup>\*</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, riffarukh@gmail.com (Corresponding author)

<sup>\*\*</sup> Headmaster, Government High School, Noorpur, Khushab, ssmalik777@gmail.com

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Lecturer, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, ghazanfar.ali@us.edu.pk

is a valuable tool for employees' evaluation and a yardstick for their performance. It gives feedback to the employees and supports them to comprehend needs or criteria of specific job needs (Varkky, Koshy, & Oburoi, 2008). Managers can increase employee engagement through robust performance management techniques and tools (Mone & London, 2018).

Effective appraisal is the process of assessing employees' performance in comparison to some already fixed organizational standards. Performance appraisal not only supports employees to understand their working abilities but it also helps the appraisers along with the organization as a whole and guides them to plan for the future. Patten (1982) suggests that performance appraisal is an administrative tool for planning and controlling the work so that the intended outcomes are achieved. Mone and London (2018) consider building trust, managing team learning, creating empowerment conditions and maintaining communications about performance, all are critical to employee engagement.

Research on PAS has long history and has been the topic of research in business and educational organizations for last 100 years (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). DeNisi and Murphy consider 1970-2000 as heyday of performance appraisal research. The worth of performance appraisal is increasing day by day and every organizational management is utilizing it as the most effective tool playing pivotal role in enhancing the performance of the employees.

Performance appraisal has numerous names according to its different attributes and functions like performance evaluation, performance review, employee appraisal, personnel rating and employee evaluation. Performance appraisal has also been described as any judgment that may affect the position of employees concerning their retention, transfer, termination, promotion, adjustment in salary or recommendation for further training.

Performance appraisal is indispensable in present times especially in education sector to meet teaching/learning standards. Appraisal system is also inferred by Stronge, (2002) that performance appraisal is communication, commitment and collaboration in disguise which supports to enhance teacher's work excellence. Similarly, Aguinis & Pierce (2008) opined that it is a system which measures and improves the achievements of teachers. According to Wilson (2005) PAS comprises of knowledge of teacher, motivation, assessment and perfections in diverse grey areas. Rewarded teachers accomplish their tasks in a better way than their colleagues. It motivates the employees and prepares them to perform better. It is a fact that motivated teacher causes effective learning and which is ultimate goal of education (Craig, 2011).

Appraisal in schools provides a source for intimating teachers about their work quality and detecting domains of work that still need to be improved. It helps heads in

controlling the work and using staff resources in most effective way. Moreover, performance appraisal documents help them for making decisions i.e. training needs, transfers, pay, promotions, continued employment, or terminations of employees etc. In several organizations appraisal results are being used to establish rewards i.e. pay or promotions and can also be helpful to identify the poor performers who need to be given some kind of counseling, demotion, dismissal or decreases in pay.

The existing techniques of performance appraisals in public sector schools of the Punjab are procedural and it is a fact that these techniques are not being utilized properly and effectively (Sikandar, 2015). There is a lack of cooperation and coordination among school leaders and teachers. Head teachers mostly do not have the skills and proficiencies required in this regard. Moreover, they do not give objective evaluation for avoiding conflicts and clashes.

During the last few decades private sector educational institutions are flourishing. Public sector high schools are not giving the desired results and hence focus of the community is shifting rapidly towards private sector. Research in the area reflects that public schools are having better physical facilities and highly qualified teachers as compared to private sector schools (Iqbal, 2012). Government is deploying its maximum available resources to uplift public schools but still the results are not satisfactory. Hiring and firing in private sector is always based on performance but in public sector, though performance is appraised but its results are not properly utilised. Shahzad, Bashir, and Ramay (2008) found a weak relation between performance appraisal and perceived performance of employees in Pakistani higher education institutions and same is the case of school sector. Effective Performance appraisal is a key element which if properly utilized in public schools, as is done in private institutions, can be very beneficial in achieving the targets set by the school education authorities.

The present study has focused on the analysis of teachers' PAS at secondary school level in district Khushab. The main objective was to explore the perceptions of secondary school teachers and heads about the dimensions of current performance appraisal practices (Appraiser's Attitude, Motivation, Feedback, System Effectiveness and Appraiser's Biasness) and to compare their perceptions demographically (i.e. gender and experience).

## **Methodology**

### *Population and Sample*

Population of the study consisted of head teachers and teachers of 117 Higher Secondary and Secondary Schools in public sector in District Khushab (44 female and 73 male). The researchers selected 30 boys' schools and 25 girls' schools, to make the sample more representatives, using random sampling technique and from these 55

schools, 120 male and 100 female secondary school teachers (4 from each school) were selected conveniently. Responses were received from 189 secondary school teachers (111 Males and 78 Females) and 55 Headmasters/Headmistress (30 Males and 25 Females).

### *Research Instrument*

The questionnaires were adapted (Khan, 2009) for secondary school teachers/educators and Headmasters/Headmistresses of schools separately. Changes were made according to need and some new items were also added in different dimensions. Some additional items related to their managerial aspects were also included. Expert opinion was taken for establishing validity. For the purpose of reliability questionnaires were administered in ten secondary schools of tehsil Noor Pur Thal. The instruments for secondary school teachers and heads were found reliable with Cronbach Alpha coefficient .826 and .851 respectively. The questionnaires were modified in accordance with the findings of pilot study.

### **Results**

The data were analyzed using percentages for exploring the teachers' perceptions regarding performance appraisal and t test was used for measuring the group differences, with the use of SPSS.

Table 1

*Percentages of teachers' perceptions regarding performance appraisal*

No	Items	(SD+D)	U	(A+SA)	Mean
	My Head Teacher				
1	gets annoyed at my average performance.	11.4	8.7	80.0	3.81
2	threats me at times about his /her authority.	78.7	2.7	18.6	2.25
3	affects negatively on my performance with unjustified attitude.	50	6.7	43.4	2.86
4	does not give due recognition to my excellent performance.	44.7	4.7	50.6	3.03

Data shows that 80.0% of respondents think that their Head Teacher gets annoyed at their average performance. Result shows that 78.7 % of respondents disagreed about the head teacher threats about his/her authority. About half of respondents disagreed that unjustified attitude of heads affect negatively on their performance and agreed that heads does not give due recognition to their excellent performance.

Table 2  
*Percentages of teachers' perceptions regarding feedback*

No.	Items	(SD+D)	U	(A+SA)	Mean
1	My Head Teacher conveys me performance evaluation results through my colleagues if they are poor.	56.6	6.0	37.4	2.72
2	I need more feedback about achievement of my job objectives.	2.0	2.7	95.3	4.15

Data indicates that 56.6 % of respondents disagreed, that their heads communicates their results of performance evaluation through their colleagues if they are poor. Data shows that 75.3% agreed that the feedback of my head teacher is sufficient to overcome my short comings. Data shows that 95.3% agreed that they need more feedback whether they are achieving their job objectives.

Table 3  
*Percentages of teachers' perceptions regarding motivation dimension*

No	Description	(SD+D)	U	(A+SA)	Mean
1	My Head awards me higher ratings in PER when I perform better.	10.7	3.3	86	3.93
2	I receive adequate recognition from my Head when I achieve my job objectives.	13.3	3.3	83.4	3.91
3	Achieving my objectives through best performance increases my chances of promotion.	34.7	4.7	60.6	3.39

Data reveal that 86.0% agreed that head teacher awards high ratings in Performance Evaluation Report (PER) when good performance is displayed. A big majority (83.4%) agreed that if they achieve their job objectives, they receive adequate recognition from their heads.

Table 4  
*Percentages of teachers' perceptions regarding appraisers' biasness*

No	Description	(SD+D)	U	(A+SA)	Mean
1	My Head ignores my good performance when he/she is angry with me on personal matters.	83.3	5.3	11.3	2.08
2	Biased attitude of my Head Teacher affects my performance negatively.	45.3	4.0	50.7	3.01
3	Unbiased attitude of my Head Teacher boosts me for higher level of performance.	18.7	5.3	76	3.65
4	Head Teacher treats all faculty members equally.	22	2.0	76	3.68

Data shows 83.3 % of respondents disagreed on item no 1. Data shows that 50.7% agreed that their heads biased attitude affect their performance negatively. Results show that 76.0% agreed that unbiased attitude of my head teacher boosts me for higher level of performance and 76.0% agreed that my head teacher treats all faculty members at equal levels.

Table 5  
*Percentages of teachers' perceptions regarding system effectiveness*

No	Description	(SD+D)	U	(A+SA)	Mean
1	The present PER Performa meets my performance evaluation requirements.	69.3	6.0	24.6	2.41
2	The existing PAS matches with my job description contents.	72	5.3	22.6	2.35
3	All aspects of my performance are reflected in the PER.	78.6	3.3	18	2.23

Data shows that 69.3% of respondents opined that the prevailing PER form does not meet their evaluation requirements and 72 % of respondents disagreed, that the existing PAS matches with their job description contents. Data also shows that 78.6 % of respondents disagreed that all aspects of my performance are reflected in the PER.

Table 6  
*Percentage, and Mean of Teachers and Head Teachers on all Dimensions of Performance Appraisal (N =Teachers 189, Heads 55)*

Variable	Respondents	(SD+D)%	(A+SA)%	Mean
Appraisers' Attitude	Teachers	38.01	57.61	3.25
	Heads	12.54	83.09	3.89
Feedback	Teachers	28.18	67.62	3.48
	Heads	14.54	75.31	3.82
Motivation Dimension	Teachers	11.94	84.78	3.92
	Heads	4.63	87.90	4.06
Appraisers' Biasness	Teachers	41.32	53.75	3.12
	Heads	25.62	63.31	3.41
System Effectiveness	Teachers	39.17	55.32	3.16
	Heads	24.15	64.80	3.48

Table 6 reveals that, for all dimensions, larger percentage of respondents is in agreement with the items asked. However, overall response on all the dimensions explicitly shows that head teachers have over rated themselves on all the dimensions whereas the teachers are less positive about their appraisal activities as compared to heads.

**Table 7**  
*Gender difference of PAS (N =male 111, females 78)*

Indicators	Variables	Mean	SD	t	Sig.
Appraiser's Attitude	Male	56.16	6.38	-2.662	.009
	Female	59.15	4.89		
Feedback	Male	23.91	4.11	-2.421	.017
	Female	25.64	2.78		
Motivation	Male	42.45	5.53	-2.766	.006
	Female	45.12	4.00		
Appraisers' Biasness	Male	34.56	3.54	1.127	.264
	Female	33.74	4.05		
System Effectiveness	Male	25.28	4.16	-.205	.838
	Female	25.41	2.78		

Results of t test tell that female teachers rated appraisers' attitude, feedback and motivation more positively than male teachers, there was also significant difference in mean scores appraisers' attitude of male teachers (M = 56.16), and female teachers for (M = 59.15), (t = -2.66, p = .009). Same was the case of Feedback (M = 25.64, t = -2.42, p = .017) and motivation (M = 45.12, t = -2.76, p = .006). For appraisers' biasness and system effectiveness results tell that both groups were not significantly different.

**Table 8**  
*ANOVA for differences among groups of teachers with different teaching experience*

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Appraiser's Attitude	Between Groups	189.35	3	63.117	1.687	.172
	Within Groups	5463.10	185	37.419		
	Total	5652.46	188			
Feedback	Between Groups	133.84	3	44.614	3.083	.029
	Within Groups	2112.99	185	14.473		
	Total	2246.83	188			
Motivation	Between Groups	255.90	3	85.302	3.173	.026
	Within Groups	3925.56	185	26.887		
	Total	4181.47	188			
Appraisers' Biasness	Between Groups	41.31	3	13.772	1.014	.388
	Within Groups	1982.95	185	13.582		
	Total	2024.27	188			
System Effectiveness	Between Groups	106.37	3	35.460	2.472	.064
	Within Groups	2094.26	185	14.344		
	Total	2200.64	188			

Table 8 shows that here was a statistically significant difference in feedback scores in scores for groups with different experience  $F(3, 185) = 3.083$ ,  $p = .029$  and motivation  $F(3, 185) = 3.173$ ,  $p = .026$ .

Table 9  
*LSD post-hoc test of multiple comparisons on feedback*

Dependent Variable	(I) Teaching Experience	(J) Teaching Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Feedback	0-5 years	11-15 years	2.882*	1.277	.026
		more than 15 years	1.863*	.839	.028
	6-10 years	11-15 years	2.480*	1.214	.044
Motivation	0-5 years	11-15 years	3.686*	1.741	.036
		more than 15 years	2.429*	1.143	.035
	6-10 years	11-15 years	3.506*	1.660	.036
		more than 15 years	2.250*	1.016	.028

LSD Post-hoc test indicated that the mean score of feedback and motivation for 0-5 teaching experience was significantly different from 11-15 and more than 15 years teaching experience group. Similarly teachers with 6-10 years teaching experience were significantly different from teachers with 11-15 years teaching experience and more than 15 years teaching experience.

### **Findings**

Major findings of the present study deduced from the analysis of the data are as under:

Majority of the respondents think that their head teachers get annoyed at their average performance and penalize them and gives them poor ratings in PER. They denied the threats by head teacher about their authority. Nearly half of the respondents said that unjustified attitude of their head teachers effect their performance negatively and their heads do not give due recognition to their excellent performance.

Head teacher does not convey poor performance evaluation results through colleagues. More than 95% teachers need more feedback about the achievement of job objectives.

Majority of the head teachers award high ratings in PER if good performance is displayed. Teachers receive adequate recognition from the heads if they achieve job objectives. Teachers denied increase in promotion chances on achieving job objectives through good performance



Teachers appreciated the heads for not being annoyed on personal matters, and consequently not giving poor ratings in PER by ignoring good performance. Half of them opined that biased attitude of heads negatively affects their performance. Not all of them agree that heads treat all faculty members at equal levels.

Teachers consider that the prevailing PER form does not meet their performance evaluation requirements. They think that it does not reflect all aspects of their performance and the existing PAS does not match with job description contents.

Data reveals that response of secondary school head teachers about themselves regarding appraisers' attitude, motivation, appraisers' biasness, feedback dimension and system effectiveness was positive. However, overall response on all the dimensions explicitly indicated that head teachers had over rated themselves whereas the teachers were less positive about their appraisal activities as compared to heads, although teachers had shown their agreement with appraisers' attitude, motivation, appraisers' biasness, feedback dimension and system effectiveness.

Both secondary school male teachers and female teachers were of the same opinion on appraisers' biasness, and system effectiveness whereas females were significantly different than males and more positive about appraisers' attitude, feedback and motivation. Males were more dissatisfied with appraisers' attitude and think that heads did not motivate them. They were also considering that feedback is not sufficiently given.

Groups of teachers with differing teaching experience in the sample were of the same opinion on appraisers' attitude, appraisers' biasness and system effectiveness while they have difference of opinion on feedback and motivation. More experienced groups were less positive about their heads in terms of their role as a motivator and they were dissatisfied with the level of feedback provided by the heads.

## **Discussion**

Performance Appraisal no doubt is the most effective factor which plays its pivotal role in the achievement of organizational goals (Akinbowale, 2013). Keeping in mind its importance and role, the researchers opted this topic for research. The first prominent finding indicates that mostly heads give positive appraisals about their teachers. This finding come to an agreement with the view point of Kamphorst and Swank (2012) stating that for a wide range of parameters the manager tend to give positive appraisals. This finding also expose that there is no difference in performance evaluation of high performers and low performers. Excellent performance by hard working teachers is not going to give them any extra increment or any other financial benefit. It does not increase their promotion chances.

Khan (2009) has conducted research on effectiveness of performance appraisal in technical institutes and colleges. Findings and results of this study assimilate with the current study. In another study Iqbal, et al., (2013) reflected a positively significant relationship between employee's performance, performance appraisal and motivation, which make the motivating role of heads more important as is the case in this research.

Adofo (2011) in his study revealed that appraisers did not give feedbacks to the employees being appraises. This study gives the same finding as teachers were not satisfied with the feedback dimension of appraisal. Feedback should be promptly given and properly discussed with teachers because it gives an opportunity to them for continuous improvement (Dechev, 2010) and positive feedback boosts their self-confidence (Kamphorst & Swank, 2012). Jabeen (2011) was also convinced that the employees' motivation was being effected by performance appraisal. This serves as a source of motivation for teachers who would in return do their utmost efforts to achieve maximum for their organization.

Results endorsed that secondary school head teachers had over rated themselves on all the five dimensions probably because they themselves opined that they were performing their responsibilities in an effective manner but the teachers' opinion was quite different. A research by Ishaq, Iqbal, and Zaheer (2009) in public and private organizations of Pakistan gives the same results where managers were having different view from employees about PAS effectiveness.

Teachers and head teachers consider that current Performance Evaluation Report (PER) Performa is not according to the professional standards for teachers of our country. Ikramullah, Shah, Khan, Hassan, and Zaman (2012) also stressed the psychometric soundness of rating form. In fact the performa was being used in all the departments of the Punjab Government. It is a reality that nature of job, working mechanism, job description and working standards are quite different in every department. It definitely cannot cover all the dimensions and aspects of teaching and learning. It can easily be deduced that secondary school teachers have their deep concern on the attitude of their head teachers. They are not satisfied with the feedback given to them. They demand evaluation without any favor and fervor. Both the heads and teachers also want revolutionary changes in the current PAS and prevailing appraisal practices.

### **Conclusion**

Data received from both heads and teachers made explicitly clear that all the secondary school teachers and head teachers had responded positively on all the five dimensions. Overwhelming majority of teachers was criticizing that their head teachers were not giving due recognition to their performance. Moreover, prevailing performance appraisal practices were just a routine matter in public schools. Head

teachers were very casual in their approach and were dealing with all teachers on equal basis.

It was recommended that training about performance appraisal might be imparted to both teachers and head teachers. Head teachers needed to be unbiased to achieve the desired and expected targets. Current PER Performa might be revised as per needs of teaching community for effective evaluation of performance. PAS prevailing in secondary schools needs great consideration in this regard and needs to be more objective.

### **References**

- Adofo, P. S. (2011). *An Evaluation of the Performance Appraisal System and its Effect on Employee Performance: A Case Study of Selected Senior High Schools in the Kwahu-South District*. Kwame Nkrumah University of Science And Technology.
- Aguinis, H., & Pierce, C. A. (2008). Enhancing the relevance of organizational behavior by embracing performance management research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(1), 139–145. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.493>
- Åkerman, J. (2009). A Plea for Pragmatics. *Synthese*, 170(1), 155-167.
- Akinbowale, M. A. (2013). (2013). *Performance appraisal policy and its impact on employee performance - a case study of guaranty trust bank in Nigeria*. Master theses, Durban University of Technology.
- Amaya, L. F. (2008). Teaching culture: Is it possible to avoid pragmatic failure? *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 21, 11-24.
- Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: an analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3), 385-405.
- Awanis, S., Schlegelmilch, B. B., & Cui, C. C. (2017). Asia's materialists: Reconciling collectivism and materialism. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(8), 964-991. doi: 10.1057/s41267-017-0096-6
- Banerjee, R., & Dittmar, H. (2008). Individual differences in children's materialism: The role of peer relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(1), 17-31.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 63(1), 68–86.

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2), 77-101.
- Brock, M. N., & Nagasaka, Y. (2005). Teaching pragmatics in the EFL classroom? Sure you can! *TESL Reporter*, 38(1), 17-26.
- Cap, P. (2010). Pragmatic, micropragmatics, macropragmatics. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 6(2), 195-228.
- Chan, K., & Prendergast, G. (2007). Materialism and social comparison among adolescents. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 35(2), 213-228.
- Chaney, L. (2005). *Intercultural Business Communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Chaplin, L. N., & John, D. R. (2007). Growing up in a material world: Age differences in materialism in children and adolescents. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34(4), 480-493.
- Chaplin, L. N., Hill, R. P., & John, D. R. (2014). Poverty and materialism: A look at impoverished versus affluent children. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 33(1), 78-92.
- Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. *Modern methods for business research*, 295(2), 295-336.
- Craig, W. (2011). *Better teacher appraisal and feedback: improving performance*. Grattan Institute, Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.grattan.edu.au>.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dean, L. R., Carroll, J. S., & Yang, C. (2007). Materialism, Perceived Financial Problems, and Marital Satisfaction. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 35(3), 260-281. doi: 10.1177/1077727X06296625
- Dechev, Z. (2010). *Effective Performance Appraisal: A Study into the Relation Between Employer Satisfaction and Optimizing Business Results*. Erasmus University.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of applied psychology*, 102(3), 421.
- Ellis, R. (2004). The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge. *Language Learning*, 54, 227-275.

- Gast, D. L. (2010). Applied research in education and behavioral sciences *Single Subject Research Methodology in Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 1-19). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gauker, C. (2008). Zero tolerance for pragmatics. *Synthese*, 165(3), 359-371.
- Goldberg, M. E., Gorn, G. J., Peracchio, L. A., & Bamossy, G. (2003). Understanding materialism among youth. *Journal of consumer psychology*, 13(3), 278-288.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Canonical correlation: A supplement to multivariate data analysis. *Multivariate data analysis: a global perspective. 7th edn. Pearson Prentice Hall Publishing, Upper Saddle River.*
- Ikramullah, M., Shah, B., Khan, S., Hassan, F. S., & Zaman, T. (2012). Purposes of performance appraisal system: A perceptual study of civil servants in District Dera Ismail Khan Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(3), 142.
- Iqbal, M. (2012). Public versus private secondary schools: A qualitative comparison. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, 6(1), 40-49.
- Iqbal, N., Ahmad, N., Haider, Z., Batool, Y., & Qurat-ul-ain. (2013). Impact of performance appraisal on employee's performance involving the Moderating Role of Motivation. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter)*, 3(1), 37-65.
- Ishaq, H. M., Iqbal, M. Z., & Zaheer, A. (2009). Effectiveness of performance appraisal: Its outcomes and detriments in Pakistani Organizations. *European journal of social sciences*, 10(3), 479-485.
- Jabeen, M. (2011). Impact of Performance Appraisal on Employees Motivation. *European Journal of Business and Management*. 3(4), 197-205.
- Kamphorst, J. J. A., & Swank, O. H. (2012). *The Role of Performance Appraisals in Motivating Employees*. (No. Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper, TI 2012-034/1).
- Kashdan, T. B., & Breen, W. E. (2007). Materialism and diminished well-being: Experiential avoidance as a mediating mechanism. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 26(5), 521-539.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 81-104.
- Kasser, T. (2005). Frugality, generosity, and materialism in children and adolescents *What do children need to flourish?* (pp. 357-373): Springer.

- Khan, A. (2009). *Performance Appraisal System It's Effectiveness And Impact On Performance And Job Satisfaction Of Technical Education And Manpower Training department's Faculty,(NWFP)*. Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar.
- Korn, J. (2004). Teaching talking: Oral communication skills in a law course. *Journal of Legal Education*, 54(4), 588-596.
- McCarthy, M. J. (2001). *Issues in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2018). *Employee engagement through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers*: Routledge.
- Murphy, H. A., Hildebrandt, H. W., & Thomas, J. P. (2007). *Effective business communication (7th edition)*: McGraw-Hill.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory (McGraw-Hill Series in Psychology)* (Vol. 3): McGraw-Hill New York.
- Orban, C. (1994). The multi-skills commercial second language curriculum meets the videocamera. *The French review* 67(3), 414-424.
- Othman, N. (2011). Pragmatic and cultural considerations of compliment responses among Malaysian-Malay speakers. *Asiatic* 5(1), 86-103.
- Parashar, S., & Jain, S. (2017). Effect of Demographics on Materialism: An Empirical Study. *Pacific Business Review International*, 10(2), 124-132.
- Patten, T. H. (1982). *A manager's guide to performance appraisal: pride, prejudice, and the law of equal opportunity*. New York: Free Press.
- Richins, M. L. (2004). The material values scale: Measurement properties and development of a short form. *Journal of consumer Research*, 31(1), 209-219.
- Richins, M. L., & Dawson, S. (1992). A consumer values orientation for materialism and its measurement: Scale development and validation. *Journal of consumer research*, 19(3), 303-316.
- Riddiford, N., & Joe, A. (2010). Tracking the development of sociopragmatic skills. *TESOL Quarterly* 44(1), 195-205.
- Rindfleisch, A., Burroughs, J. E., & Denton, F. (1997). Family structure, materialism, and compulsive consumption. *Journal of consumer research*, 23(4), 312-325.
- Roberts, J. A., Tanner, J. F., & Manolis, C. (2005). Materialism and the family structure–stress relation. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15(2), 183-190.

- Roebuck, D. B., Sightler, K. W., & Brush, C. C. (1995). Organizational size, company type, and position effects on the perceived importance of oral and written communication skills. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 7(1), 99-115.
- Rose, K., & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schick, A. (2002). Behavioral and emotional differences between children of divorce and children from intact families: Clinical significance and mediating processes. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 61(1), 5-14. doi: 10.1024//1421-0185.61.1.5
- Schober, M. F., & Clark, H. H. (1989). Understanding by addressees and overhearers. *Cognitive Psychology*, 21, 211-232.
- Schor, J. B. (2014). *Born to buy: The commercialized child and the new consumer cult*: Simon and Schuster.
- Seidel, H. (2011). The Effects of Socioeconomic Status and Materialistic Attitudes on Children's Self-Esteem: Viterbo University.
- Shahzad, K., Bashir, S., & Ramay, M. I. (2008). Impact of HR practices on perceived performance of university teachers in Pakistan. *International review of business research papers*, 4(2), 302-315.
- Sheldon, K. M., & Kasser, T. (2008). Psychological threat and extrinsic goal striving. *Motivation and Emotion*, 32(1), 37-45.
- Shrum, L., Lee, J., Burroughs, J. E., & Rindfleisch, A. (2011). An online process model of second-order cultivation effects: How television cultivates materialism and its consequences for life satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, 37(1), 34-57.
- Sikandar, S. (2015). *An analysis of teachers' performance appraisal system at secondary school level*. Unpublished Mphil Thesis. Department of Education. University of Sargodha.
- Stronge, J. H. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Thill, J. V., & Bovée, C. L. (2016). *Excellence in Business Communication*. New York, NY: Pearson.
- Van Boven, L., & Gilovich, T. (2003). To do or to have? That is the question. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 85(6), 1193.
- Varkky, B., Koshy, A., & Oburoi, R. (2008). *Apollo Unstoppable: the transformation*

*journey of Apollo Tyres Ltd. (No. IIMA No.208.).*

- Vega, V., & Roberts, D. (2011). *The role of television and advertising in stimulating materialism in children*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, New York, Retrieved May.
- Verma, S. (2009). Do all advertising appeals influence consumer purchase decision: An exploratory study. *Global Business Review, 10*(1), 33-43.
- Wilson, J. P. (2005). *Human Resource Development: 2nd edition*. London: Kogan Page
- Yule, G. (1996a). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996b). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaman, S., Shah, S. A. M., & Hasnu, S. (2016). Targeting young consumers: How family, friends and advertisement shape materialism in Pakistan. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 7*(4), 703.
- Zhang, J. W. (2018). Asian Americans and materialism: Exploring the phenomenon and its why and when. *Cultur Divers Ethnic Minor Psychol, 24*(3), 334-345. doi: 10.1037/cdp0000191.