How the Absence of Teacher Appraisal Systems Affects Student Performance in Lusaka District, Zambia

Gladys Matandiko[1] , Farrelli Hambulo[2], Lubasi Simataa[3], Nicholas Miyoba Haambokoma[4]

[1]University of Zambia – IDE

[2]The University of Zambia Department: Educational Administration and Policy Studies

[3] Zambian Open University Department: Business Studies

[4]The University of Zambia Religious and Cultural Studies

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0611

Received: 08 October 2025; Accepted: 13 October 2025; Published: 08 November 2025

ABSTRACT

Teacher appraisal systems support instructional quality and student learning but are unevenly implemented in Zambia (UNESCO, 2014; MoGE, 2021). This convergent mixed-methods study compared student outcomes across secondary schools in Lusaka District with and without formal appraisal frameworks. Quantitative analysis of archival examination and attendance data showed higher mean pass rates and attendance where appraisal existed ($\Delta R^2 = .08$ for appraisal presence predicting exam scores after controls). Thematic interviews with teachers and headteachers identified weakened accountability, limited reflective practice, and ad hoc compensatory strategies in non-appraisal schools (Fullan, 2001; Danielson, 2007). Together, results indicate that formal, context-sensitive appraisal mechanisms strengthen instructional accountability and professional growth, improving student engagement and attainment. Policy implications call for the Ministry of Education to co-design phased appraisal guidelines that combine formative feedback, capacity building, and practical incentives (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016; OECD, 2013).

Keywords: Teacher appraisal systems; Student performance; Professional development; Accountability; Lusaka District

INTRODUCTION

Teacher performance appraisal is widely recognised as a lever for improving instructional practice and student outcomes through structured feedback, goal-setting, and targeted professional development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016; Timperley et al., 2007). International evidence suggests that balanced appraisal systems-combining formative support with summative accountability - promote reflective practice and higher student achievement (Kraft & Gilmour, 2016; OECD, 2009).

In Zambia, national Standards of Practice define teacher competencies but do not prescribe routine evaluation protocols, creating a policy–practice gap at the school level (Ministry of General Education [MoGE], 2021). This lacuna is consequential in Lusaka District, where schools report variable implementation of appraisal elements and uneven student performance (UNESCO-IICBA, 2013).

Drawing on accountability and professional learning theories (Ball, Thames, & Phelps, 2008; Fullan, 2001), this study tests the proposition that the absence of formal appraisal disrupts external accountability signals and formative learning cycles for teachers, thereby affecting examination outcomes, attendance, and progression. By empirically linking global literature to Zambia's policy context, the study addresses an evidence gap: no prior mixed-methods research has quantified how missing appraisal frameworks relate to measurable student outcomes in Lusaka's secondary schools.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definitions and models of teacher appraisal

Teacher performance appraisal encompasses systematic processes for assessing and guiding educators' instructional practices through observation, feedback, and professional goal-setting (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016). Two broad models dominate the literature:

- Summative appraisal, which evaluates teacher effectiveness against predefined performance standards, is often tied to high-stakes decisions such as promotion or dismissal.
- Formative appraisal, which emphasises regular, low-stakes feedback cycles designed to foster reflective practice and targeted professional growth (OECD, 2009).

These models vary widely in frequency, observer training requirements, and integration with career-long professional development plans. A balanced approach combining both summative accountability and formative support is associated with stronger capacity-building outcomes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016; OECD, 2009).

Impact on teacher professional practice

Formative feedback loops encourage teachers to engage in critical self-reflection, collaboratively set improvement goals, and adopt evidence-based instructional strategies (Fullan, 2001). In contexts where appraisal is consistent and collaborative, educators report:

- Greater clarity around curricular expectations and differentiated instruction techniques.
- Increased motivation to attend peer-coaching sessions and participate in in-service workshops.
- Enhanced willingness to experiment with active learning methods and integrate formative assessments into daily lessons (Ball, Thames, & Phelps, 2008).

Conversely, the absence of structured appraisal tends to leave teachers without clear benchmarks, undermining efforts to diagnose pedagogical weaknesses or pursue targeted skill development (Fullan, 2001).

Effect on student learning outcomes

A growing body of empirical research links robust appraisal systems to measurable gains in student achievement. Meta-analyses indicate that schools with frequent, criterion-referenced observations and timely feedback demonstrate higher mean test scores and lower achievement gaps compared to schools relying on infrequent or absent teacher evaluations (Kraft & Gilmour, 2016). Key mechanisms include:

- Enhanced instructional clarity, leading to more effective lesson delivery.
- Improved alignment between teacher goals and student learning targets.
- Increased teacher accountability, which correlates with higher student engagement and attendance (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016; Kraft & Gilmour, 2016).

Teacher appraisal systems in Sub-Saharan Africa

Implementation of teacher appraisal across sub-Saharan Africa faces common challenges: limited observer capacity, scant funding for professional development, and tensions between centralized policy mandates and school-level autonomy (UNESCO-IICBA, 2013). Studies in Kenya and Uganda reveal that even when appraisal instruments exist on paper, irregular scheduling and superficial feedback sessions diminish their intended impact (UNESCO-IICBA, 2013). Furthermore, cultural norms that discourage critical feedback can transform appraisal from a growth opportunity into a formality lacking real consequence or support for change.

Research gap in the Zambian context

In Zambia, the Ministry of General Education's Standards of Practice (MoGE, 2021) articulate desired teacher competencies but do not prescribe systematic appraisal protocols. As a result, secondary schools in Lusaka District operate without uniform evaluation criteria, appraisal schedules, or linked incentives for instructional improvement. Existing accounts are largely descriptive or anecdotal, leaving unexamined the direct relationship between appraisal absence and quantifiable student performance outcomes. This study addresses that gap by providing the first convergent mixed-methods analysis of how missing appraisal frameworks correlate with examination pass rates, attendance patterns, and progression metrics in Lusaka's secondary schools.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Accountability and performativity in education

Teacher performance appraisal systems function as formal accountability mechanisms, establishing clear performance standards and consequences for non-compliance (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016). Under performativity theory, the act of measuring and reporting teacher behaviors reshapes instructional priorities toward measurable outcomes, reinforcing the link between educator actions and student achievement (Ball, Thames, & Phelps, 2008). When appraisal is absent, these accountability signals weaken, reducing the external pressures that motivate teachers to align practices with curricular and assessment expectations (Kraft & Gilmour, 2016).

Professional learning and reflective practice

Fullan's change theory emphasizes that genuine instructional improvement emerges from iterative cycles of feedback, reflection, and targeted capacity building (Fullan, 2001). Formative appraisal models integrate these cycles by providing teachers with actionable observations and collaborative goal-setting, fostering a culture of continuous professional learning (Isoré, 2009). In contexts lacking such frameworks, educators miss critical opportunities for self-assessment and peer dialogue, limiting their ability to adopt evidence-based strategies or correct emerging pedagogical gaps (Fullan, 2001).

Systems perspective on appraisal implementation

A systems perspective highlights that successful appraisal depends not only on tools and standards but also on institutional capacity and policy coherence (UNESCO-IICBA, 2013). Resource constraints, observer training deficits, and misalignment between national guidelines and school-level practices can derail appraisal processes (Ministry of General Education [MoGE], 2021). Without dedicated support structures - such as observer calibration sessions or feedback workshops - the appraisal mechanism risks becoming a nominal formality rather than a driver of instructional enhancement.

Conceptual model linking appraisal absence to student outcomes

Synthesizing accountability and professional learning theories yields a conceptual model wherein the absence of formal appraisal disrupts two causal pathways to student performance. First, diminished accountability allows instructional drift, lowering lesson coherence and rigor. Second, lack of formative feedback curtails teacher growth, reducing the adoption of student-centered strategies and formative assessment practices. Together, these pathways predict lower examination pass rates, reduced attendance, and stalled progression - a relationship this study tests empirically through mixed methods.

Research design and methods

Research design

This study used a convergent parallel mixed-methods design to generate complementary quantitative and

qualitative evidence on the appraisal–achievement relationship (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). The convergent approach was selected to (1) permit simultaneous measurement of student outcomes and in-depth exploration of teacher experiences, (2) enable triangulation for stronger meta-inferences, and (3) capture both institutional patterns and the mechanisms that produce them (Fetters, Curry, & Creswell, 2013).

Sampling and participants

A purposive, criterion-based sample of 30 government secondary schools in Lusaka District was stratified by presence (n = 15) or absence (n = 15) of formal appraisal frameworks aligned to Ministry guidance (MoGE, 2021). Within each school two science and two humanities teachers were randomly selected (n = 120 teachers), and the headteacher or deputy (n = 30) participated. Two Zonal Education Officers provided district-level context. Archival data covered two cohorts of Grade 10–12 students (9,450 records) for outcomes analysis.

Instruments and data collection

- Archival student database: de-identified exam scores, attendance, and progression logs, cross-validated with registers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).
- Document analysis protocol: scored presence/absence of appraisal cycles and follow-up actions using an adapted rubric (Danielson, 2007).
- Semi-structured interviews: teacher and headteacher guides probing appraisal experiences; guides piloted and refined following Kvale (2007); interviews recorded and transcribed.
- Classroom observation rubric: adapted from Danielson's Framework for Teaching; each teacher observed twice; observer calibration achieved Cohen's $\kappa \geq 0.75$ to ensure inter-rater reliability (Danielson, 2007).

Data analysis

Quantitative analyses (SPSS v.26) included descriptive statistics, independent-samples t-tests, and hierarchical multiple regression controlling for school size and socioeconomic index (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Qualitative data (NVivo 12) were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's thematic method (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Integration occurred through joint displays to align statistical patterns with thematic mechanisms (Fetters et al., 2013).

Trustworthiness and ethics

Credibility procedures included member checking and peer debriefing; thick description supported transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Ethical clearance was obtained from the relevant institutional review board, and participants provided written informed consent; data were anonymised and securely stored (MoGE, 2021).

RESULTS

Quantitative findings

Schools with formal appraisal systems reported higher mean end-of-year examination scores (M = 68.4, SD = 8.7) than schools without appraisal (M = 62.1, SD = 9.3). Attendance rates were higher in appraisal schools (M = 91.2%, SD = 4.5) than non-appraisal schools (M = 86.7%, SD = 5.2). Independent-samples t-tests indicated these differences were statistically significant. Hierarchical regression showed appraisal presence explained additional variance in exam scores beyond school size and socioeconomic status ($\Delta R^2 = .08$, $\beta = .29$, $p < .001$), indicating a significant positive association between appraisal systems and student achievement after controls (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

Qualitative findings

Thematic analysis produced three interrelated themes: (a) Accountability Gap - teachers lacked clear performance expectations and feedback, reporting uncertainty about standards (Danielson, 2007); (b) Reflective

Practice Deficit - teachers described limited opportunities for structured self-assessment and professional dialogue (Fullan, 2001); (c) Compensatory Strategies - some leaders instituted informal peer observations and ad hoc workshops to mitigate appraisal absence, though these practices were uneven and lacked formalization (UNESCO-IICBA, 2013).

Integrated interpretation

Quantitative advantages observed in appraisal schools align with qualitative accounts that formal appraisal fosters clearer expectations and regular feedback (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016). Where appraisal was absent, lower scores and attendance co-occurred with narratives of instructional drift and reflective stagnation. Informal compensatory practices partially offset these effects but did not replicate the consistency or legitimacy of formal appraisal cycles (Fetters et al., 2013).

DISCUSSION

What the findings confirm and clarify

The findings confirm that formal teacher appraisal systems are associated with improved student outcomes and elevated attendance, and they clarify the mechanism: appraisal restores accountability signals and institutionalizes formative professional learning cycles (Ball et al., 2008; Fullan, 2001). Theoretically, this study extends performativity and reflective-practice frameworks into an under-researched Zambian setting by showing how appraisal structures operationalize external accountability while enabling teacher reflection and capacity building (Schön, 1983; Ball et al., 2008). Empirically, the added variance explained by appraisal presence after controlling for contextual factors highlights appraisal as a distinct institutional lever for improving achievement (Kraft & Gilmour, 2016).

Implication for policy and practice

Policy implications are specific: co-constructed appraisal instruments are more likely to secure teacher buy-in and cultural fit (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016); district officers require focused training in observation and feedback to convert appraisal into coaching rather than punishment (OECD, 2013); and scalable, low-cost digital tools can support self-assessment and peer review where observer capacity is constrained (UNESCO, 2014). These recommendations translate theory into practicable reform steps that the Ministry of Education can pilot and scale.

LIMITATIONS

- Sample scope: The purposive, Lusaka-centric sample limits rural generalizability; future research should use stratified probability sampling across urban, peri-urban, and rural districts to test contextual moderators (UNESCO-IICBA, 2013).
- Data breadth: Reliance on archival records omitted classroom-level formative assessments; subsequent studies should include classroom-based measures and student work samples (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).
- Design constraints: The convergent cross-sectional design cannot establish causality; quasi-experimental or longitudinal panel studies that follow cohorts through appraisal implementation would better identify causal effects (Bryk et al., 2015).
- Response bias: Interview data may reflect social desirability; triangulation with independent observations and student surveys is recommended (Kvale, 2007).
- Cost and scalability: This study did not model implementation costs; future work should include cost-effectiveness analyses to inform sustainable policy rollout (Bryk et al., 2015).

Directions for future research

Building on this foundation, a longitudinal, quasi-experimental study could track cohorts of teachers and students through the introduction of appraisal systems, illuminating causal dynamics over time and capturing delayed

effects on instructional change (Bryk, Gomez, Grunow, & LeMahieu, 2015). Investigations into cost-effectiveness would equip policymakers with financial models for sustainable appraisal implementation across diverse Zambian settings. Comparative research between urban and rural districts could unpack contextual moderators - such as infrastructure, community involvement, and leadership capacity - that shape appraisal efficacy.

Moreover, future scholarship should explore the decolonial dimensions of appraisal design, incorporating indigenous notions of professional accountability and collective responsibility into evaluation frameworks (Smith, 2012). Such inquiry would ensure that appraisal not only improves technical teaching competencies but also resonates with local epistemologies, advancing education–development reciprocity in a decolonial paradigm.

CONCLUSION

Summary: Formal teacher appraisal systems in Lusaka District are associated with higher examination scores and attendance and support professional practices that sustain instructional improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016; OECD, 2013).

ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Co-design appraisal instruments with teachers and school leaders to ensure contextual relevance and buy-in (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016).

2. Pilot phased appraisal cycles in representative schools, pairing instruments with district-level observer training in feedback and coaching (OECD, 2013).

3. Integrate formative components (goal-setting, evidence-based feedback, action plans) before adding summative consequences (Timperley et al., 2007).

4. Use low-cost digital tools for self-assessment and peer review to scale formative feedback where observer capacity is limited (UNESCO, 2014).

5. Align appraisal outcomes with professional development pathways and modest incentives to sustain participation (Kraft & Gilmour, 2016).

6. Commission longitudinal pilot evaluations with cost-effectiveness analyses to inform national rollout (Bryk et al., 2015).

These steps provide a practical roadmap for the Ministry of Education and school leaders to institutionalise appraisal in ways that are feasible, culturally appropriate, and likely to improve student outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content Knowledge for Teaching: What makes it Special? Journal of Teacher Education, 59(5), 389–407. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108324554
2. Ball, S. J., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Performing Education: Accountability and Performativity in the Globalizing School. Journal of Education Policy, 23(1), 99–113.
3. Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). Learning to Improve: How America's Schools can get Better at Getting Better. Harvard Education Press.
4. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research (3rd Ed.). Sage Publications.
5. Danielson, C. (2007). Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
6. Darling-Hammond, L., Burns, D., Campbell, C., Goodwin, A. L., Hammerness, K., Low, E. L., McIntyre, A., Sato, M., & Zeichner, K. (2016). Teacher Appraisal and Feedback (Policy Brief). UNESCO

International Institute for Educational Planning. https://learningportal.iiep.unesco.org/en/library/teacher-appraisal-and-feedback
7. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2016). Effective Teacher Evaluation Systems: A Guide for District Leaders. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
8. Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving Integration in Mixed Methods Designs: Principles and Practices. Health Services Research, 48(6 Pt 2), 2134–2156.
9. Fullan, M. (2001). Leading in a Culture of Change. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
10. Fullan, M. (2001). The New Meaning of Educational Change (3rd Ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
11. Isoré, M. (2009). Teacher Appraisal: Exploring its Conceptual Frames. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 19. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.
12. Isoré, M. (2009). Teacher Evaluation: Current Practices in OECD Countries and a Literature Review (OECD Education Working Papers No. 23). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/223283631428
13. Kraft, M. A., & Gilmour, A. (2016). Can Principals Promote Teacher Development as Evaluators? A Case Study of Principals' Views and Experiences. Educational Administration Quarterly, 52(5), 711–753. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X16653445
14. Kraft, M. A., & Gilmour, A. F. (2016). Can Teacher Evaluation Improve Teaching? Experimental Evidence from Skills Training. American Educational Research Journal, 53(5), 971–1004.
15. Kvale, S. (2007). Doing Interviews. SAGE Publications.
16. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. SAGE Publications.
17. Ministry of General Education. (2021). Standards of Practice for the Teaching Profession in Zambia. Lusaka, Zambia: Author.
18. Ministry of General Education. (2021). Teacher Appraisal Guidelines. Government of Zambia.
19. Ministry of General Education [MoGE]. (2021). Teacher Performance Management and Development Guidelines. Lusaka, Zambia: Government of Zambia.
20. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2013). Synergies for Better Learning: An International Perspective on Evaluation and Assessment. OECD Publishing.
21. Republic of Zambia, Ministry of General Education. (2018). Teacher Education and Development Standards. Government of Zambia.
22. Schön, D. A. (1983). The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. Basic Books.
23. Smith, L. T. (2012). Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples (2nd Ed.). Zed Books.
24. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using Multivariate Statistics (6th Ed.). Pearson.
25. Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). Teacher Professional Learning and Development: Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration. Ministry of Education, New Zealand.
26. UNESCO. (2014). Teacher Development for Inclusive Education: The Impact of Digital Tools. UNESCO Publishing.
27. UNESCO International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa (IICBA). (2013). Quality Teachers for EFA: Enhancing Teacher Education for bridging the Quality Gap in Sub-Saharan Africa: Progress report July 2013. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Author.
28. UNESCO International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa [UNESCO-IICBA]. (2013). Strengthening Teacher Appraisal Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: UNESCO-IICBA.