

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

PERCEPTION OF SENIOR STAFF OF UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION,
WINNEBA, ON THE USAGE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

DORIS LOGOGYE

2010

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

PERCEPTION OF SENIOR STAFF OF UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION,
WINNEBA, ON THE USAGE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

BY

DORIS LOGOGYE

Thesis submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and
Administration of the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast,
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for award of Master of
Philosophy Degree in Administration in Higher Education

AUGUST 2010

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own original research and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature.....Date.....

Name: Doris Logogye

Supervisors' Declaration

We hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of this thesis were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Principal Supervisor's Signature.....Date.....

Name: Dr. Y. A. Ankomah

Co Supervisor's Signature.....Date.....

Name: Dr. G. K. T. Oduro

ABSTRACT

This study, a descriptive survey, was undertaken to find out the perception of senior staff of the University of Education, Winneba on the usage of performance appraisal in the University. It also sought to find out the various ways in which Performance Appraisal affects workers motivation and work performance. It was to help university authorities evaluate the current appraisal system, review and address any challenges confronting it. Research questions were formulated to guide the researcher. Literature was reviewed to provide a focus for the study and a basis for assessment of findings. The sample covered 112 senior staff of the University of Education, Winneba.

Questionnaire was the main instrument used. The questionnaire had both open ended and close-ended questions. The questionnaire return rate was 93.3%. The data gathered was coded and analysed in frequencies and percentages. The findings revealed that staff appreciate an appraisal which is used for both evaluative and developmental purposes. Their perception of the university's appraisal however suggests that the university's Appraisal system is mainly evaluative in nature. The findings also revealed that the University's Performance Appraisal system has little effect on workers performance since it is mainly evaluative than developmental. Hence the need for the University to adopt a more developmental approach towards performance appraisal.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest appreciation goes to the following very special persons. My supervisors Dr. Y. A. Ankomah and Dr. G. K. T. Oduro of the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration, (IEPA) for painstakingly correcting my work and offering suggestions. I also wish to say thank you to all the lecturers of IEPA who in one way or the other contributed to the success of this work.

I am also grateful to all the senior staff of University of Education Winneba who took time off their busy schedules to answer my questionnaires. Sister Becky of the English Department U.E.W. needs special mention for helping me distribute and retrieve my questionnaires. Mrs. Ekua Abedi Boafo, thank you for the help you gave me with the coding and Analysis of this work I am very grateful.

I lack words to express my gratitude to my parents Mr. and Mrs. Logogye for their support, prayers and financial assistance. May the good Lord continue to bless you and preserve you from all evil. Finally, I cannot fail to acknowledge the assistance given me by all siblings especially Cynthia for the encouragement and assistance throughout the programme.

DEDICATION

To my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Logogye.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	
Background to the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions	7
Significance of the Study	8
Delimitation	8
Limitations	9
Definition of Terms	9
Organization of the rest of the Study	9
2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
Performance Appraisal	12
Performance Management	14
History of Performance Appraisal	16
Theoretical Framework on Performance Appraisal Effectiveness	17
Purpose of Performance Appraisal	24
Formative Performance Appraisal	25
Summative Performance Appraisal	26

Models of Performance Appraisal	30
Usage of Performance Appraisal	39
Studies on Perceptions of Performance Appraisal	47
Performance Appraisal in Higher Education	57
Feed-Back Instruments	62
Summary of Literature Review	69
3 METHODOLOGY	71
Research Design	71
Population	72
Sample and Sampling Procedure	73
Research Instrument	76
Pilot Testing of the Instrument	79
Data Collection Procedure	79
Data Analysis	80
4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	84
Background Information	83
Research Question 1: What is the Perception of Senior Staff of University of Education, Winneba on the Uses of Performance Appraisal?	84
Research Question 2: What is the Perception of the staff on the use of Performance Appraisal in the University?	86
Research Question 3: How does the Performance Appraisal System of the University Promote Career Development as Perceived by Senior Staff?	89

Research Question 4: In What Ways does Performance Appraisal Improve Staff Performance from the view point of Senior Staff?	96
Summary of Discussion	99
5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	101
Summary	101
Conclusions	104
Recommendations	105
Suggestions for Further Research	107
REFERENCES	108
APPENDIX	
A. Questionnaire for Senior Staff	121

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Gender of Respondents	74
2 Age of Respondents	74
3 Qualification of Respondents	75
4 Length of Service of Respondents	76
5 Perception of Senior Staff on the Uses of Performance Appraisal	84
6 Perception of Staff on the Use of Appraisal in the University	87
7 Extent to which Respondents' Agree or Disagree that Appraisal Promotes Career Development	90
8 Respondents' Perception on the Frequency of Appraisal Feedback	91
9 Extent to which Staff Agree or Disagree with the Assertion that Opportunities are Provided for them to Discuss Appraisal Results with Heads of Department	93
10 Courses Workers Attended after Appraisal	95
11 Staff Views on Ways Performance Appraisal has Improved their Job Performance	96

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

The contribution of an organisation's human resource to productivity is very difficult to measure but it can be assessed in terms of work outputs over a specified time period. The establishment of performance standards, performance appraisal, career planning for the employee, and discussing their development needs are part of an organization's performance management system (Rudman, 2003). A typical performance management system according to Macky and Johnson (2000) would include:

- 1 The organization communicating its mission/strategies to its employees'
- 2 The setting of individual performance targets to meet the employees' individual, team and ultimately the organization's mission/strategies;
- 3 The regular appraisal of these individuals against the agreed set targets;
- 4 The results are used for identification of development and/ or for administrative decisions; and
- 5 The continual review of the performance management system to ensure it continues to contribute to the organization's performance, ideally through consultation with employees.

Cole (2001) defines performance appraisal as formalized, systematic assessment and discussion of an employee's performance and his or her potential and desire for development and training. Rudman (2003 p.432.)

refers to performance appraisal as “performance planning or review” and he sees it as a “process of planning an employee’s future work goals and objectives, reviewing job performance and work behaviours, assessing progress towards the predetermined work goal, and discussing the employee’s training and development.” Australian Universities Quality Agency (2004 p.56) defined performance Appraisal as “a Process of preparing, reviewing, discussing and giving feedback on the work performance of employees and also planning and agreeing to future performance goals and development activities”.

According to Baker (1988) performance appraisal can be the most powerful tool that managers have for improving productivity. When designed and used properly, it can assist organizational decisions on reward and promotions, assist employees in their development and career planning and may even increase employees’ motivation, commitment and satisfaction, especially if the performance appraisal system is aligned with the organization’s stated objectives (Wright, 2002).

Generally, performance appraisal aims at determining the contribution of each employee to organizational goal attainment, ways of rewarding them, developing staff potential and giving feed back for employees to know how they are performing. Edmonstone (1996) posits that performance appraisal is often used synonymously with performance management. According to Valance and Fellow (1999) it has also been referred to as performance assessment, performance review, and performance evaluation and performance management.

Performance appraisal could be used for different things in different situations. It could be used to determine employees' performance, evaluate administrative decisions and policies and also provide information for staff development. Evaluative, administrative / judgemental appraisals are often used to exert control by providing feedback that is used to make decisions on employee's promotion, discipline, termination of employment, demotion, salary increases et cetera. Typically this involves the negotiation of individual performance objectives aligned to organisational objectives or macro performance parameters that provide guidance about how to apply work efforts for the organisation's benefit (Storey and Sisson 1993). The individual is assessed against these on an annual cycle basis.

Appraisals which are development oriented focus on helping workers to grow in their careers by providing ongoing feedback that helps in the personal development of the employee, identifying strengths and weaknesses and providing training and development needs of employees.

Employees are often encouraged to learn through setting 'stretch objectives,' taking on new areas of work or acquiring new capabilities that enable them to demonstrate additional skill or knowledge.

In many organizations conflicts of interest usually arise as to what appraisal should be used for. In other words, should appraisals benefit the organization, by helping it to assess employee performance, and evaluate administrative decisions? Or should it benefit the employees by providing information and opportunities that help in staff development? Or yet still, should the appraisal results serve a dual purpose; this involves using appraisal for both the organisation's benefit by helping to evaluate employee

performance as well as providing information that helps workers to continue to grow in their careers. Shelly (1999) suggests that appraisal can be broadly categorized as developmental appraisals focusing on both training to address short-term issues and on long-term career needs and evaluative approach focusing on management control and judgment.

There are those who opine that in order to prevent conflicts as to who appraisal should benefit or what it should be used for, the various uses of appraisal should not be put together in one appraisal but should be separated. However, many educational organizations do not have different uses. One appraisal is usually conducted with the intention of using it both for the benefit of the organisation and the employee. This usually results in conflict of interest. Mostly the results are used to take decisions which favour the organisation like dismissals as a result of poor performance, promotion for good performance etc. In a study conducted by the American Management Association (1984) of 588 managers, (as cited in Dean, Kathawala and Wayland, 1992) more than 85 percent of the respondents reported that performance appraisal was used commonly for compensation purposes.

What is usually done in relation to senior staff appraisal in the university of Education, Winneba, is that appraisal forms are developed by the Human Resource department of the University and passed unto immediate heads to appraise the performance of those under them. These heads of departments, who may also be choked by both administrative and academic duties, fill the forms and put them in the employee's folder. The forms are usually called for when information regarding the employee is needed

especially when critical decisions such as promotion, transfers or discipline are being taken.

Upon interactions with some senior staff of the University of Education, Winneba, regarding performance appraisal, the researcher perceived a lack of regular feedback. Some of these senior staff who have worked in the university for quite a number of years have never received any form of feedback on their appraisal. Regular feedback provides information for employees to identify their strengths and weaknesses so that they can draw up plans for personal development. When it is missing, staff may not be able to identify their weaknesses and hence draw up a personal plans to overcome them. It also makes appraisal more of an evaluative tool than a developmental one. According to Edmonstone (1996) feedback; whether positive or negative play a significant role in employee development and sadly this is seldom given.

Unfortunately, the views of employees is how appraisal is used are seldom sought by management Simmons (2002). The quality of an organisation depends on the quality of the workforce. It is therefore important that the views of employees on some human resource activities such as appraisal are sought in order to ascertain how worthwhile such human resource activities are.

That is why the researcher deems it important to find out from senior staff how wide spread the lack of appraisal feedback is in the university, how they think appraisal is used in the university and their perceptions on how appraisal has contributed to their job performance. Perhaps when the management realises that workers feel appraisal could be used in a better way

to enhance staff effectiveness some adjustment could be made to make appraisal a worthwhile exercise.

Statement of the Problem

People are an important resource and like all resources they must be managed properly so as to assist them to perform at their peak Wright (2001). Higher Education institutions have been under unremitting pressure to develop results oriented and efficient policies and practices that demonstrate accountability, value for money and contributions towards higher productivity (Boyne, 2003; Gibbons, 1998). Performance appraisals have therefore often been carried out in these institutions in order to streamline workers performance for the attainment of organisational goals. This is usually done to measure employee performance and if possible put up plans to help improve performance.

In the University of Education, Winneba, appraisal forms are filled yearly by the immediate heads of department and placed in employees' folders only to be made use of when there is an interview for promotion or when vital decisions concerning an employee are being taken. The researcher had the opportunity to interact with some senior staff of the University on performance appraisal. These workers who have been in the university for at least four years had never received any feedback on their appraisal. This led the researcher into asking herself the following questions: What is the use of appraisal in the university? Is it an evaluative exercise or does it make provision for staff development? Do the staff perceive any improvement in their performance as a result of appraisal? These were the puzzling issues this study sought to investigate.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of the study was to find out how senior staff of University of Education, Winneba, perceive the performance appraisal system of the university in terms of how it is used and specific ways in which performance appraisal improves staff performance.

The specific objectives were to:

- 1 Find out the perception of senior staff of University of Education, Winneba on how performance appraisal should be used.
- 2 Find out the perception of the senior staff on how appraisal is used in the university.
- 3 Examine how performance appraisal promotes career development as perceived by the staff.
- 4 Examine specific ways in which performance appraisal improves staff performance from the view point of senior staff.

Research Questions

The following were the questions that guided the researcher in finding out the perception of senior staff on the use of performance appraisal:

- 1 What is the perception of Senior Staff of University of Education, Winneba on the uses of performance appraisal?
- 2 What is the perception of the staff on the use of performance appraisal in the university?
- 3 How does the performance appraisal system of the university promote career development as perceived by senior staff?
- 4 In what ways does performance appraisal improve staff performance from the view point of senior staff?

Significance of the Study

Information gathered from the study if adopted, can help higher educational institutions to develop and implement more effective performance appraisal systems to enable workers perform better for the attainment of institutional goals. It will also bring about positive staff perception about performance appraisal hence, become supportive and co-operative in order to derive maximum benefits from appraisals.

The study will also help the University of Education to identify lapses in its performance appraisal system and devise measures for correcting them. The study could also be of great help to future researchers who would like to conduct a study on performance appraisal in higher education institutions. Also, the results of the study could be relied upon to improve upon the quality of teaching and learning in higher educations. This is because an effective appraisal will enable the individual identify his/her strengths and weaknesses; for training to be provided where necessary and those who are doing well can also be motivated to enhance commitment which will eventually improve upon the quality of education.

Delimitation

The study is delimited to senior staff of University of education Winneba. These include senior administrative assistants and research assistants. The study is also delimited to the Winneba campus since the other campuses have similar structures and have quite insignificant numbers in terms of staff strength. In terms of scope the study basically covers issues relating to evaluative and developmental appraisal and how these kinds of appraisal affect staff motivation and performance.

Limitations

Some respondents failed to provide answers to one or two items in the questionnaire either due to an oversight or because they did not want to answer those questions especially those that were open ended. It is also possible that some respondents hurriedly answered the questions without taking time to read the questions and may therefore provide unreliable responses. These could affect the validity of findings since they may not reflect the main issues on the ground. Literature on performance appraisals in Ghanaian higher education was also limited.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and acronyms used in the work are defined below.

Valence- affective orientations toward a particular outcome

Instrumentation- the link between an outcome of the action performed and the outcomes that stem from the outcome attained by performing the action.

Expectancy- momentary belief concerning the likelihood that a particular act will be followed by a particular outcome.

Definition of Acronyms

BAS- Behaviourally anchored scales

BOS- Behavioural observation scales

GRS- Graphic rating scales

PM- Performance management

Organisation of the rest of the Study

The study is organised in five chapters. Chapter one introduced the study through its background information, which included the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, and delimitation of the study. Chapter two covers the review of relevant literature on the study while chapter three discusses the methodology employed in the study. The results of the study are presented and discussed in chapter four. Chapter five presents a summary of the main findings of the study, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions that may lead to future research on the related areas of study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, a review of related literature has been presented; the review explained certain concepts such as performance appraisal and performance management, as well as the history of performance appraisal. It also highlights the various ways in which performance appraisal has often been used and previous studies on the use of performance appraisal. The chapter ends with a summary of the reviewed literature.

The following are the themes under which literature was reviewed.

- 1 Performance appraisal and performance management
- 2 History of performance appraisal
- 3 Theoretical framework on the effectiveness of performance appraisal
- 4 Formative and summative performance appraisal
- 5 Models of performance appraisal
- 6 Purpose of performance appraisal
- 7 Use of performance appraisals
- 8 Perceptions on performance appraisal
- 9 Performance appraisal in higher education institution
- 10 Feed-back instruments
- 11 Performance appraisal in higher education

Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal has been described as the process of reviewing and evaluating how well employees are performing their tasks relative to the required performance standards (Khoury & Analoui, 2004). It also involves identifying the barriers to performing at the optimal level (Gilchrist, 2003), providing feedback with the aim of eliminating performance deficiencies (Mondy, Noe & Premeaux, 1999) and motivating employees to improve and develop their potential for the benefit of the organisation.

It is furthermore seen as a means of articulating levels of individual performance and their own career path contribution, so that strong performers are encouraged to maintain their high performance levels and poor performers to do better (Scott, 2001). It is a key mechanism by which an organisation defends against individuals who legally challenge the validity of management decisions relating to promotions, transfers, salary changes and termination (Stone, 2002).

It is common organisational practice to hold performance appraisal discussions at interviews conducted on an annual basis. Of all the activities in Human Resource Management, performance appraisal is arguably the most contentious and least popular among those who are involved. 'Managers do not appear to like doing it, employees see no point in it and personnel and human resource managers as guardians of the organisation's appraisal policy and procedures have to stand by and watch their work fall into disrepute' (Bratton & Gold, 1999). Some of the less positive descriptions of appraisal are summarised below.

Edwards Deming, the founder of Total Quality Management described appraisal as ‘nourishing short-term performance, annihilating long-term planning, building fear, demolishing teamwork and encouraging rivalry and politics—at best unnecessary and worst damaging’ (Deming, 1989). Others have described it as a management tool that promises much but delivers little, a policy that acts to reduce staff morale, job security, professionalism and career development, undermining mutual trust and the social contract between employee and employer and increasing occupational stress; an overall counterproductive exercise for those attempting to build organisational performance and individual commitment (Grint, 1993).

Some of the most trenchant criticisms of performance appraisal originate from organisations that have historically based collegial and collaborative norms (for example schools, universities, human services and public sector organisations) and highly unionised environments. In such cultures ‘performance appraisal and pay for performance are seen as focusing on the individual, thus creating a competitive culture, coercing higher output and promoting management by control’ (Stone 2002, p. 265).

Townley (1992) argues that performance appraisal plays a key role in communicating organisational norms, values and culture and is just a thinly veiled scientific management technique for handling labour relations, with the real intent of monitoring and controlling today’s more sophisticated employee by emphasising trait rating rather than job-based criteria.

A recent study based on 100 interviews with Hong Kong Chinese line managers examined attitudes to performance appraisal in their organisation. Alarming, line managers felt that performance appraisals did not add value

or help to achieve business objectives. Additionally they thought that the forms, guidelines and standards used to evaluate performance were inadequate. In particular, appraisal training was seen as having no impact (Wright, 2001).

Performance Management

The Report of the Management Advisory Committee on Performance Management practices across the Australian Public Service defines PM as “the use of interrelated strategies and activities to improve the performance of individuals, teams and organizations” and locates it as an essential tool for all levels of management (Management Advisory Committee 2001, p. 7). It specifically refers to the need to assess both means and ends when it comes to performance and gives an excellent summary of the key features of modern PM systems reflected in the broader body of literature on this topic. According to this report PM can involve:

- 1 clarifying performance objectives (this could include tasks, outcomes, behaviours and values based systems or a combination of these) and linking these with organizational business plans;
- 2 periodic performance appraisal of individuals or teams against the achievement of these objectives;
- 3 feedback from this appraisal;
- 4 recognition or reward for performance, including performance pay, salary progression guided by performance or non-pay reward systems;
- 5 team and individual development to build capabilities;
- 6 counseling, or other action to deal with poor performance;

- 7 establishing a link between the development of capabilities with organizational and business planning (i.e. not only cascading down from corporate and business planning outcomes but also having a system that feeds back up; and
- 8 evaluating the contribution of individual, team and organizational performance.

Armstrong (1996) suggests that Performance Management systems, as opposed to performance appraisal systems, provide stronger emphasis on collaborative communication including giving and getting feedback to forge agreements on accountabilities, expectations and development plans. Other authors also draw this distinction and view the provision of ongoing feedback and performance dialogue as a major factor in establishing robust PM processes as opposed to the annual appraisal interview that is often experienced and perceived as an administrative chore (Autry, 2001).

In order for Performance appraisal to be more than just a ‘cosmetic’ process, Management’s commitment is vital (Regal & Hollman, 1987). One tangible sign of commitment is when senior managers implement a new PM process by undertaking their own reviews first with their manager. The practice of running parallel yet separate systems for managerial and non-managerial staff is a common organisational practice, although it is often perceived by staff as elitist and divisive that large corporations do so (Commerce Clearing House, 2000). Additionally, studies have shown that the amount of time dedicated to PM activities, the status managers accord it and the attitude they model towards it, all have an impact (McAdam, Hazlett & Casey, 2005).

A recent review of PM practices found that when senior management adopt an advocacy role for a system this acts as a key shaper that influences both speed and success of system introduction. There needs to be an acceptance that performance management (encompassing appropriate assessment and feedback) is more than a faddish mantra that will, in practice, be abandoned in the pursuit of day-to-day tasks. A key is to ensure that senior and middle managers see themselves as part of a leadership team, that they accept their management roles and responsibilities and are equipped to carry them out (Management Advisory Committee, 2001). Conversely, when junior managers observe that those above them in the organisational hierarchy fail to complete performance reviews, frequently change appointment times for meetings in favour of other operational tasks and abrogate their responsibility to provide ongoing feedback, the value placed upon the PM system is clearly communicated.

History of Performance Appraisal

According to (Fidler & Cooper, 1992) appraisal was first applied in industry and commerce. Stauss cited in Fidler and Cooper (1992) explain that the process was concerned with the performance of an employee as demonstrated by the extent to which they achieved targets to which they were committed. The philosophy underpinning this approach to appraisal has its origins in early management thinking, in which control was perceived to be one of the most important functions of management. The early 20th century industrialist, Henri Fayol, for example, placed considerable store by control, i.e. "to see that everything is done in accordance with the rules which have been laid down and the instructions which have been given". In a similar vein,

Taylor, the father of scientific Management theory as cited in (Hoy & Miskel, 1991), believed that people could be programmed to be efficient machines.

In line with classical management thinking early attempts at employee appraisal were viewed as representing an autocratic philosophy of supervision, where employees were seen as appendages of management and as such were employed to carry out pre-specified duties in accordance with the wishes of management (Sergovianni & Starrat, 1988). I characterise the early philosophical understanding of staff appraisal as being similar to the scientific management approach - with its machine metaphor.

Theoretical Framework on Performance Appraisal Effectiveness

Vroom (1964) in his fundamental book “Work and Motivation” describes an expectancy theory of motivation. He describes motivation as an outcome of valence, instrumentality, and expectancy. Valence is the “affective orientations toward particular outcomes”; instrumentality is the link between an outcome of the action performed and the outcomes that stem from the outcome attained by performing the action. Expectancy is the “momentary belief concerning the likelihood that a particular act will be followed by a particular outcome”. Therefore if a person desires a given outcome (valence) they will have high motivation to work toward that outcome if the outcome is associated with other desired outcomes they want (instrumentation) and if they also perceive that their efforts are likely to bring about the initial outcome (expectancy). Expectancy theory suggests that the motivation behind a supervisor accurately and effectively completing the performance appraisal process with a given employee is dependent on the degree to which the supervisor perceives that effort put into the performance appraisal process will

result in an accurate performance appraisal rating (expectancy), the degree of the supervisor's perception that an accurate performance appraisal rating will produce performance appraisal effectiveness (Instrumentation), and the value that the supervisor places on an effective performance appraisal (valence). These three supervisor perceptions, valence, instrumentation, and expectancy, are discussed below.

Valence

Expectancy theory assumes that individuals desire some outcomes over others and that individuals are able to choose their actions. It is a strong departure from behaviourism and hedonism (Higgins, 1997; Vroom, 1964) because it assumes that individuals reflect and select actions not because they are avoiding pain and seeking pleasure, but because they desire different outcomes and make rational choices on the best methods to achieve those outcomes.

In a performance appraisal setting, a supervisor must make a cognitive decision on how accurately he or she will complete the performance appraisal process as outlined in the organizations performance appraisal program. The basis for this decision is the level of importance that the supervisor views the performance appraisal. If the supervisor views the performance appraisal as extremely important (high valence) it is likely that the supervisor will put forth great effort to complete the performance appraisal accurately. If the supervisor does not value the performance appraisal (low valence) he or she will likely not put forth much effort in completing the performance appraisal accurately.

In addition to the supervisor's perception of the importance of the performance appraisal, the justice the supervisor views in the organization's performance appraisal system will also affect the effort the supervisor puts into completing the performance appraisal accurately. Research in organizational justice has been a subject of scholars of organizational science for some time and has increased in recent years (Cropanzano & Greenberg 1997).

Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997) review much of the theoretical and empirical work on the organizational justice and identify two areas of justice research. First, distributive justice is the idea that the rewards in the organization are spread throughout the organization with justice. Rewards, raises, promotions are all factors that can be perceived by employees as having been distributed with or without justice. Second, procedural justice is the concept of justice in the processes used in the organization. Distributive justice deals with the 'ends' of a reward system while procedural justice deals with the 'means' (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). These theories have been tested in many situations including groups (Tyler, 1989), during pay cuts in organizations (Greenberg, 1990), and in retaliatory situations in the workplace (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

Folger and Cropanzano (1998) suggest that academics believe that a 'test' metaphor best describes the process of performance appraisal, but, in reality a political metaphor is what happens in practice. Rather than use performance appraisal as an instrument, organizations use it politically to get to their desired ends. Folger and Cropanzano suggest a trial metaphor is the middle ground between the ideal and what happens in practice. Managers

should use the balance of evidence in performance appraisals to come to conclusions. It is suggested that this trial metaphor will produce the higher perception of justice than is now observed in many performance appraisal settings.

Instrumentation

Instrumentation is the idea that the direct results of an individual's actions are linked to other desired results toward that individual which has a degree of valence (Vroom, 1964). As the supervisor in a performance evaluation setting decides the level of effort that he or she will put into completing a performance appraisal accurately, they also must take into account the link between performance appraisal accuracy and the desired results of the performance appraisal. This link between performance appraisal accuracy and performance appraisal effectiveness is highly dependent on the performance appraisal system in the organization. Clearly different appraisal tools and systems will produce different results (Tziner, Kopelman & Livneh, 1993; Lam & Schaubroeck, 1999; Tziner, Joanis, & Murphy, 2000). But, accuracy in completing the performance appraisal instrument itself (whatever the desired result) is expected to produce a more effective performance appraisal than not completing the performance appraisal process is related to performance appraisal effectiveness.

Expectancy theory suggests that the motivation behind a supervisor accurately and effectively completing the performance appraisal process with a given employee is dependent on the degree which the supervisor perceives that effort put into the performance appraisal process will result in an accurate performance appraisal rating (expectancy), the degree of the supervisor's

perception that an accurate performance appraisal rating will produce performance appraisal effectiveness (Instrumentation), and the value that the supervisor places on an effective performance appraisal (valence). These three supervisor perceptions, valence, instrumentation, and expectancy, are discussed below.

The supervisor's perception of the link between performance appraisal accuracy and performance appraisal effectiveness is critical. If a supervisor believes that the performance appraisal process itself is important and that it is just for the employee, it is hypothesized that the supervisor will put forth effort to complete the performance appraisal accurately. Also, if an accurate performance appraisal positively relates to an effective performance appraisal, it is likely that the supervisor will put forth effort to complete the performance appraisal accurately. But, if the supervisor believes that an accurate performance appraisal does not positively relate to an effective performance appraisal. It is likely that the supervisor will not put forth the effort to complete the performance appraisal accurately.

The discussion to this point suggests that as a supervisor enters a performance appraisal interview, the supervisor brings with him or herself certain motivations that will impact the effectiveness of the performance appraisal process. These include the supervisor's perception of the importance of the performance appraisal, the supervisor's perception of a link between performance appraisal accuracy and performance appraisal effectiveness. A discussion of expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) hypothesized how these variables are projected to be related to performance appraisal effectiveness as outlined by the organization.

Employee

Like the supervisor, the employee brings certain characteristics to the performance appraisal process. Social learning theory argues that an individual's behaviour is based on a balance between "Organizational Behaviour Modification" and traditional motivation theories" (Bandura, 1977). Social learning theory suggests that an individual's behaviour is a result of an interaction among situations, persons, and components of the environment. This theory finds the middle ground between extrinsic motivation theories such as behaviorism (Skinner, 1953) and intrinsic motivation theories such as expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964).

Social Learning theory suggests that an employee enters an organization with individual traits and characteristics that may change or adapt depending on the work environment. The employee's motivations, behaviours and the environment all have an impact on how the employee acts. Particular to performance appraisal, individual employees develop attitudes about the performance appraisal process based on their own motivations as well as their work environment. Two learned employee behaviours that will impact the effectiveness of an employee's performance appraisal are the employee's organizational commitment and the justice the employee perceives in the performance appraisal process.

If an employee cognitively believes that he or she is tied to the organization, it is likely that the employee will have a more positive perception of the performance appraisal process. If the performance appraisal system in an organization intends to produce certain outcomes in employees (organizational commitment, organizational goal alignment, etc) it is likely

that employees who have high organizational commitment will accept the performance appraisal system of the organization and fully participate in the performance appraisal process. The employee's level of organizational commitment will therefore positively correlate with the effectiveness of the performance appraisal process.

An employee's perception of justice in the performance appraisal process will also affect the effectiveness of the performance appraisal process. In a performance appraisal setting, a lack of justice in one area is predicted to have the same effect as a violation of justice in all areas. If an employee perceives that the system processes are fair, the supervisor's efforts to distribute rewards and punishments based on outcomes of the process, and that the employee is treated fairly, the employee's perception of justice will be high. Therefore if an employee perceives that there is justice in the performance appraisal system, the performance appraisal will be more effective in achieving the goals of the organization.

The supervisor and the employee each have perceptions of the organization in which they work. They each have perceptions of the systems that the organization implements to control and manage human performance in the organization. The above model is an attempt to identify some of the cognitive characteristics of supervisors and employees that will explain some of the variance in performance appraisal effectiveness within an organization.

Purpose of Performance Appraisals

Stone (2002) grouped the major purposes of Performance appraisal as follows:

Discrimination: Enabling managers to objectively differentiate between those who are Contributing to the achievement of the organisation's strategic business objectives and those who are not and thus to deal with inadequate performance as well as differentially Reward exemplars;

Reward: Determining performance-based rewards that may include piecework payments, commissions, incentives, bonuses or other forms of merit pay plans and are 'at risk' rewards, based on the continual achievement of job goals (Bruce, 1999). Stone notes that linking employee contributions and rewards encourages performance oriented behaviour and a performance-oriented culture whilst also ensuring that the organization gets maximum value for its compensation dollar;

Development: Fulfilling the manager's role responsibility to help each employee to continue to grow and develop by removing blocks to performance, building on employee strengths and over-coming weaknesses.

Feedback: Communicating clear, specific expectations and giving both positive and negative feedback that enables employees to know how they are doing (Tyler, 1997) although research evidence demonstrates that feedback norms are heavily influenced by national culture (Chow, 1994; Whitehall, 1992).

These four groupings reflect one of the most intractable divisions that are debated in the literature, between appraisal for formative or staff development purposes (development and feedback) and appraisal for

summative, judgemental or administrative and evaluative purposes (discrimination and reward). This is an age-old dilemma that is seldom managed well by organisations. Thus many organisations whose mission statements emphasise the development and empowerment of their staff implement a PM system heavily based upon judgemental appraisal centred in an instrumental or 'hard' HRM philosophy. This signals an ambiguous message for staff regarding the way in which their contributions are recognised and the way in which they are valued by the organisation. It is relevant then to consider these antithetical.

Formative Performance Appraisal

The primary purposes of 'formative' performance appraisal systems are the development of individual employees and the provision of feedback that enables them to continue to grow and advance personally and in their careers. Historically, formative appraisal has been more characteristic of professional and knowledge-based organisations where it is more acceptable to individuals who largely manage their own performance (Lonsdale, 1996). Employees are encouraged to learn through setting 'stretch objectives,' taking on new areas of work or acquiring new capabilities that enable them to demonstrate additional skill or knowledge for the organisation's advantage.

Research indicates that the use of 'stretch' goals—if they are accepted by the employee as constituting an achievable challenge within areas for which they are directly responsible—tends to result in better performance than if goals are perceived as 'soft' or too easy (Tully, 1994). This is also seen to be mutually advantageous; enhancing an employee's personal competence and

thus expanding their employability and career advancement (Roberts, 2002). Most valuable, perhaps, is that developmentally oriented performance appraisal creates opportunities for dialogue between a manager and his or her staff about both individual and organisational objectives and needs. All PM systems exist to provide feedback—whether it is predominantly about development and growth (formative) or about negotiating and assessing achievement of performance-based objectives—and thus are largely reliant upon the quality of skill in giving and receiving feedback. The ability to listen to people, to interpret their responses accurately and sensitively and to react appropriately to their needs and demands is vital.

The importance of line management's role in providing ongoing feedback as an instrument to engender motivation and improve productivity is often discussed. "A well integrated and aligned performance management system can still face major credibility problems if the process of feedback is not handled well by the immediate manager" (Management Advisory Committee 2001, p. 38). Thus, an international study of more than 8000 respondents found that nearly half felt their manager 'was not clear, frank or complete in telling them what they thought of their work performance (Pickett, 2000).

Summative Performance Appraisal

'Summative' or 'administrative performance appraisal' (Fisher et al. 1999) is based upon the rational business model of organisations and associated with judgemental appraisals. Proponents of summative systems argue that PM should measure and reward behaviours which support the organisation's strategic objectives, (Armstrong & Baron 2000) and that

companies that link rewards and remuneration through their PM practices witness substantial gains. Typically this involves the negotiation of individual performance objectives aligned to organisational objectives or macro performance parameters that provide guidance about how to apply work efforts for the organisation's benefit (Storey & Sisson 1993). The individual is assessed against these on an annual cycle basis.

Assessment decisions made during summative performance appraisals commonly cross-inform other key administrative decisions such as salary increases or bonuses, access to training, success in promotion, transfers, discipline, or termination of employment (Longenecker & Gioia 1988) and are more typical of 'hard' HRM cultures. Summative PM systems thus serve as a major vehicle for employee acculturation and control (Townley, 1992), assessing who has performed well and distributing valued organisational rewards (especially money) for employees who comply with desired behaviours.

However, many practitioners and researchers argue that it is naive to expect individuals to be candid about their failure to reach specified objectives or results, and about the areas in which they require development when there are salary or advancement opportunities in the balance or where the potential for dismissal exists (Dunphy, 1987; Lansbury, 1988). Under these circumstances Anderson (1993) states that, appraisees will feel apprehensive about being appraised, and will behave defensively, appraisers will devote little time and effort to performance appraisal reducing it to a meaningless ritualistic exercise, and top management in the organisation will fail to show enthusiasm for it, and to give it their whole hearted support.

Lewis (1993, p. 13) points out that under these circumstance, the “relationship between appraisees and appraisers is fraught with many problems”. Formative appraisal rests upon the ‘presumption of joint determination to negotiate the personal, development-driven aspect of appraisal, and is qualitatively different from the contentious bargaining nature of the pay-related appraisal”. It seems evident that developmental feedback would be better facilitated where a relationship of mutual trust, negotiation and a problem solving orientation exists.

For this reason it is often argued that performance appraisals and pay discussions should be separate, so that employees can focus on the appraisal feedback that identifies what they have done well or need to improve, rather than on any monetary amount for which they may be eligible (Lansbury, 1988). Splitting the two conversations is common organisational practice so that appraisal discussions are held at an initial meeting followed up by a shorter meeting to discuss pay at a later date. Practice, however, indicates that very few organisations are prepared to introduce a Performance appraisal system minus a performance-related pay link.

Training

Pfeffer (1998) argues that many organisations do not have robust feedback processes and assessment criteria in place to support performance-related pay initiatives, nor do they adequately train those to be involved, making performance-related pay fraught with serious problems and frequently ineffective. In this respect, training is critical if managers are to develop the confidence and ability to provide feedback to staff that is candid and constructive, and if staff are genuinely empowered to question, challenge and

contribute to the negotiation of the performance standards and individual objectives to which they will be held accountable.

Given the importance of effective feedback in Performance appraisal there is an ongoing need for training to achieve high levels of competency. Skills to support summative appraisals should also include goal setting, communicating performance standards, observation of staff performance, coaching, giving feedback, negotiating system documentation, and conducting reviews. In a recent Australian study of training for appraisers, 77% per cent of responding organisations indicated that they provided formal training for all their appraisers, using skill development workshops, although it was common for training to occur at system implementation with little or no follow up.

Interactive methods, focused on conducting the interview and providing formal and ongoing informal feedback, using the appraisal forms, setting performance standards, and avoiding rating errors, have increased (Commerce Clearing House, 2000); this is in line with overseas research (Mathis, 2004; Thomas, 1997). Didactic training (for example lectures and videos) received decreasing support (59% which is down from 84% five years ago) (Commerce Clearing House, 2000). Typically the topics covered in appraiser training will also include an overview of system processes and timing, ongoing documentation of performance, when and how to discuss training and development goals, and practice in conducting the compensation review where there is a link to pay (Mathis 2004, p. 38).

Preparation of staff generally receives less attention in terms of the time allowed to provide training although the number of organisations training employees has increased (Commerce Clearing House 2000, p. 3). Given the

inherent power imbalance between managers and staff that exists in any hierarchical workplace (which most still are), training for staff is critical if they are to receive feedback positively and provide constructive upward feedback. Training can also be used to build managers' conceptual understanding and commitment to an overall PM framework. Without this, 'managers may feel that performance appraisals take too long, are too complicated and do not serve any real purpose' (Management Advisory Committee 2001, p. 33).

Models of Performance Appraisal

The models that I will discuss are the following: accountability, developmental, managerial and collegial. The first two models are regarded as traditional models and the last two are regarded as the emergent trends of appraising employees.

Accountability Model

Osborne (in Davies, Ellison, Osborne & West-Burnham, 1990) and Craft (1996) postulated that accountability is regarded as one of the two routes that has developed from the 'great era debate'. This is evident in (Bennet, Lister & McManus, 1992) where Callaghan stated: "To the teachers I would say you must satisfy the parents and industry that what you are doing meets the requirements and the needs of their children". (Bennet, Lister & McManus, 1992) and Craft (1996) specified that the suggestion made by Callaghan's speech laid the philosophical groundwork for the whole movement towards efficient and effective use of resources for society's good, where teachers and schools were accountable to the wider society. This model emphasised that

teachers and schools should account for how they effectively make use of the resources that are made available to them. This encourages teachers to be responsible for their actions.

This is similar in some ways to (Bollington, Hopkins & West, 1990) belief that appraisal was being regarded as a response to the desire to bring a greater degree of accountability into public services. However, Elliot *et al.* as cited in (Wragg, Wikeley, Wragg, & Haynes 1996) does not share the same sentiment: Teachers feel most accountable at a local level, to their pupils, fellow teachers and children's parents. To wider constituents, such as governors, committees and local authorities, accountability may be seen as more remote and thus more legal and formal in nature ... However many teachers probably see the head as the person [to whom] they are most accountable.

In the same vein Burgess (1993) emphasised that: Head teachers have all the accountability of teachers, and more. It is through them that accountability of schools is expressed. They answer to local authorities, government and parents to point out managerially the head answers both to the governors and to local authority ... the parents may question the exercise of functions not only of the governors and the local authority but also of the head teacher, and they must pass resolutions on the head's activities.

Teachers in general think that they are only accountable to the principals and not to the wider constituents i.e. the community, parents and the pupils.

Developmental Model

The developmental approach tends to identify the needs of staff and allocate resources in order to address those needs. A study conducted by

Turner and Cliff cited in Bell and Day (1991) revealed that one of the main differences between appraisers and appraisees in staff development was whether appraisal should serve institutional or individual needs. For the most part they found out that if appraisers were senior members of staff, the desired outcomes were concerned with the maintenance and improvement of the institution as a whole and that appraisal and staff development were viewed as a management tool. This is further evidenced in (Bollington, Hopkins & West, 1990) who claim that appraisal can be seen as a culmination of a series of moves that are designed to improve the professional development of workers and to identify more precisely their in-service training needs.

Turner and Cliff (1988) found that most organisations focus on staff development as the main aim of appraisal. Drummond (in Bell & Day 1991) takes a different view that professional development must not only focus on staff development but must also take into consideration the personal development of an individual employee. It is through the developmental approach to staff appraisal that the needs of employees can be identified.

In comparing the two traditional models i.e. the accountability and the developmental model, Goddard and Emerson (1993) stated that the compatibility of the two models depends on the attitudes which workers are likely to adopt in undergoing appraisal in each of them. The authors explained that in the professional development model, appraisal is a genuine two-way process between the appraiser and the appraisee. This model takes place in an atmosphere of trust and confidentiality. For the professional development to succeed, it requires openness, honesty, a self-critical disposition, willingness to comment frankly on their perceptions of their own strengths and

weaknesses and those of the management, openness to constructive criticism and to pointers to self-improvement.

The authors explain that the accountability model, on the other hand, fosters defensiveness. It encourages the employees to defend their own positions, to hide weaknesses, and to blame managers and others for deficiencies in their performance. When employees have to set targets they will be looking at their own interest rather than those of the organisation. In commenting on their own performance, teachers will tend to inflate their actual achievement.

These two models are not compatible because their perceptions differ, in the sense that the development model takes place in an atmosphere of trust between the appraiser and the appraisee. The appraisee can reflect back on his or her own performance after being critiqued by the appraiser. The accountability model encourages employees to be self-centred and to believe that they are not at fault but to blame others for their weaknesses.

Hewton (1990) observed that the two models lead in different directions. He explained that the developmental model is more concerned with the development needs of individuals, appropriate in-service training activities, providing broad-ranging work experience, and job satisfaction. The accountability model, on the other hand, is more concerned with the assessment of standards. It is linked to the overall evaluation of the organisation's performance.

Turner and Cliff (1988) argued that there is a belief that appraisal systems should be based on the developmental rather than the accountability model, and would be concerned with the improvements of practice by

identifying strengths, weaknesses, needs and interests. Unlike the accountability model which emphasises that teachers need to be accountable to how they efficiently and effectively make use resources, the developmental model goes a step further and first of all identifies the needs of teachers and then allocates resources according those needs.

Managerial Model

Bollington, Hopkins and West (1990)) postulated that although appraisal has sprung from the two routes, it is also linked to attempts to develop the management of the organisations. Fidler and Cooper (1992) claimed that the managerial model addressed the tensions which inevitably existed between the accountability and the developmental model and between the needs of the organisation and those of individuals. Simons and Elliot (1990) contend that according to the managerial model the appraisal of employees is to be conducted by senior and middle management. Fidler and Cooper (1992) are of the opinion that: the evaluative aspect of the manager's job is to identify those that are performing well, acknowledge and reward their efforts both financially and with praise, and to help maintain and further develop a continuing high standard. Equally, it is a part of the manager's job to identify those who are not performing well, and to provide them with opportunities through which their performance might be improved.

Poster and Poster (in Kydd, Crawford & Riches, 1997) argued that each individual comes into the organisation with a unique set of needs and objectives. They further argued that the problem of organisations is to harness the unique talents of individuals and coordinate their activities towards the achievement, by effective and efficient means, of organisational objectives.

Poster and Poster (1991) further argued that individuals need to be provided with essential information if they are to achieve the organisational objectives. (Beare *et al.* as cited by Poster and Poster in Kydd *et al.* 1997) stated that: Every organisation has a particular culture, determined by the individual values and experience which each person brings to it, the way in which people act and interact and the footprints they leave behind them. This implies that appraisal must be of benefit to both the school and the individual. In order for appraisal to meet both the needs of the organisation and of the individual there must be a management of appraisal. The authors further defend themselves by stating that: the evaluative aspect of the manager's job is to identify those who are performing well, acknowledge and reward their efforts. Equally it is the manager's job to identify those who are not performing well, and to provide them opportunities through which their performance might be improved.

Collegial Model

Simons and Elliot (1990) postulated that an alternative model for conducting appraisal might be a collegial system where colleagues in an institution (from different status positions) might begin to examine their own practices. I support the notion that colleagues have to work together and that the management must create an atmosphere whereby employees can discuss openly and share ownership of the problems and jointly find solutions. Management must ensure that employees see themselves as part of the team and by so doing trust will develop among colleagues. The collegial model is more like a mentorship whereby an experienced employee might work hand-in-hand with an inexperienced employee in showing him/her the ropes.

The collegial model and the developmental model are related because both focus on the needs of the individual. They differ in the sense that the developmental model identifies the needs of individuals and based on those needs, resources are allocated, whereas the collegial model is based on the fact that colleagues must examine their practice. Both the collegial and the developmental models are ongoing exercises. By this I mean that at every stage the needs of the employees have to be realised and at the same time they must examine their practices.

Responsibility for Appraisals

Generally it is the employee's direct supervisor or line manager who evaluates performance, as well as providing feedback to engender motivation and improve productivity (Bernardin , 2003; Gilchrist 2003; Martey, 2002).

Line management's role in the appraisal process is extensively discussed in the literature although the concept of 'line management' in academia is a contentious and relatively new one resulting from ongoing reforms in higher education sectors. This is an issue that will be further discussed in subsequent sections on 'performance management in higher educational environments.'

The line manager is usually the immediate manager of the employee, who maintains an ongoing supervisory relationship with the individual and possesses firsthand knowledge of the individual's performance (Compton, 2005; Nankervis & Leece, 1997), although other sources of relevant input may be obtained. In large organisations, research from the US shows that it is the employee's immediate supervisor whose 'opinion provides one-half to three-fourths of the weight that determines the final appraisal' and who is thus the key evaluator of performance (Thomas & Bretz ,1994, p. 31).

The greatest disadvantages of line manager appraisal lie in the potential for subjective ratings and discrimination if there is a personality (or other) conflict, or if the manager is unskilled in the appraisal and assessment process (Bernardin & Pence, 1980; Austin, Villanova, Kane & Bernardin, 1991; Stone, 2002). Organisations generally attempt to ameliorate these problems by training managers, ensuring the employee has a right of appeal against any ratings made and/or requiring ratings to be reviewed by a third party, such as the manager's manager (Robbins 2000, p. 492).

Armstrong argues that human dynamics will inevitably affect the objectivity of on-the-job performance appraisals, so that they 'will inescapably be a mix of subjective judgements, reactions, emotions, flashbacks to experiences that reinforce or dispel, and all the expectations and anxieties that frame the appraisal session itself' (1996, p. 10).

Anyone with sufficient knowledge and understanding of the job responsibilities as well as sufficient opportunity to observe the employee in the performance of their duties may, however, be able to competently appraise performance, or contribute valuable perspectives to that appraisal. Team appraisal models and peer evaluation have been found to be particularly suited to organisations with flatter hierarchies and team-based or quality based cultures. Peer pressure can act as a powerful motivator to improve performance, and collegial familiarity with each other's performance may produce more accurate, reliable and valid feedback, thus increasing team members' commitment and productivity.

McKirchy (1998) referred to the capacity for peer evaluation to build accountability amongst peers if problems around commitment to the appraisal

process and the veracity of ratings could be managed. Research indicates, however, that effective team and peer appraisals require a high level of trust among team members, a non-competitive reward system and frequent opportunities for colleagues to observe each other's performance (Stone 2002, p. 275). Edwards and Ewen (1996) suggest that multi-source assessments can create stronger accountability and service to all stakeholders, as opposed to more traditional appraisal systems that tend to reinforce service to a single source (typically the employee's manager).

So-called '360-degree' appraisal (McCarthy & Garavan 2001) and techniques such as the Balanced Scorecard approach (Kaplan & Norton 1992) broaden the focus and number of sources consulted for input in assessing individual performance. Their intent is to provide a more rounded set of perspectives on the individual's performance than can be achieved from a single source and to more comprehensively reflect the range of qualitative and quantitative dimensions that affect organisational outcomes (Kaplan & Norton 1996). By reducing the reliance on a single source or focus, such approaches may ameliorate the effects of possible idiosyncratic biases or personality clashes between manager and employee on performance ratings and provide a stronger bridge between organisational and individual employee goals.

Recent studies present conflicting views regarding the use of multiple data sources in evaluating employee performance, with some sufficient opportunity to observe the employee in the performance of their duties may, however, be able to competently appraise performance, or contribute valuable perspectives to that appraisal. Team appraisal models and peer evaluation have been found to be particularly suited to organisations with flatter

hierarchies and team-based or quality based cultures. Peer pressure can act as a powerful motivator to improve performance, and collegial familiarity with each other's performance may produce more accurate, reliable and valid feedback, thus increasing team members' commitment and productivity. McKirchy (1998) referred to the capacity for peer evaluation to build accountability amongst peers if problems around commitment to the appraisal process and the veracity of ratings could be managed. Recent studies present conflicting views regarding the use of multiple data sources in evaluating employee performance, with some reporting a trend towards increased incidence (Bracken, 1994; Commerce Clearing House, 2000; Compton, 2005; Yammarino & Atwater, 1997) but others finding little evidence that it is used to any significant extent, nor that it significantly influences performance rating (Nankervis & Leece, 1997; Thomas & Bretz, 1994, p. 31). There is however a marked increase in the usage of self-assessment as a component of performance appraisal (Compton, 2005; Thomas 1997, p. 52).

Usage of Performance Appraisal

It seems apparent that performance appraisal is very much alive, but the main issue is who does it benefit-the organization or the individual? McGregor (1972) concluded that performance appraisal had multiple uses and it was designed to meet three needs, one for the organization and two for the employees: Bowles and Coates (1993) study on the other hand found that the main use of the performance appraisal process was to achieve work goals, as an accountable and control mechanism aimed at the individual employees and not as a training tool to benefit the employees. They also found secondary

usages of the process which included relationships building, benchmarking of performance, and identifying development and training needs. In New Zealand (NZ), Taylor and O' Driscoll (1993) conducted a study to investigate how and why NZ organizations undertook the appraisal process, and what difficulties they encountered during implementation. (They randomly selected 89 private and public organizations each with at least 300 employees.) They found that:

- 1 the primary function of a performance appraisal system is to provide performance feedback to employees, recognizing good performance and identifying strengths and weakness;
- 2 Many organizations use their performance appraisal system to serve two functions, administrative and developmental and they felt that there was no conflict in meeting both;
- 3 Private organizations were more likely than public ones to use performance appraisal information in decisions concerning terminations, layoffs, transfer and new assignments;
- 4 Public organizations were not likely than private ones to use performance appraisal information to meet legal requirements, which is likely to reflect the impact of stronger Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) legislation in the public sector;
- 5 Virtually all respondents indicated that pay was informally linked with performance appraisals;
- 6 Most of the organizations conducted a yearly appraisal but interestingly a large proportion conducted appraisal discussions more than once a year;

- 7 for most organizations the appraisee's manager is the main contributor to the performance ratings (appraises themselves to play a significant role, however peers and customers do not play a formal role);
- 8 They believed their systems were, on average, only somewhat effective and most mentioned modification that they had made recently or were considering in the near future.

Taylor and O' Driscoll (1993) concluded that performance appraisal systems in large NZ organizations appeared to be working with some success in achieving developmental and administrative purposes. In general there was no sign of a conflict between the purposes and therefore there was no cause for separate processes, but some improvements were warranted.

It would seem that the primary reasons for performance appraisal is fundamental to a number of important organizational (administrative) decisions regarding pay and promotion, and the process allows an organization to measure and evaluate an individual employee's behaviour and accomplishments over a specific period of time (Spinks, Wells, & Meche, 1999; Wiese & Buckley, 1998). Ultimately, this raises employees' performance to ensure that the organization achieves its aims and objectives and to give it a competitive edge (Harrison & Goulding, 1997), and as a control device (McGregor, 1972).

Bowles and Coates (1993) believed that the growth of performance appraisal was attributed to the 1980s where organizations had to be seen to have the competitive edge whereby its main objectives were to operate effectively and efficiently and to provide quality service/products. They believed that performance appraisal was used to control employees to achieve

these objectives. Wright and Race (2004) concur that a well-administered and fair performance appraisal which consisted of agreed measurable objectives and development needs for employees will help an organization to achieve a competitive edge, however, they cautioned that any action plans discussed, must be followed through to ensure that the system does not lose credibility.

Bowles and Coates (1993) noted that performance appraisal is gaining in importance as a tool in the management process; its use is also being adopted by the public sector and covering different occupational groups including the blue-collar and secretarial employees. From their June 1992 postal survey of 250 West Midlands (in the United Kingdom (UK) large companies from all industries, they found that these companies were experiencing problems with their performance appraisal, but considered the system beneficial (in order of priority) :

- 1 In the process of communication between employer and employees;
- 2 In defining performance expectations; and
- 3 In identifying training needs.

Redman, Snape, Thompson, and Yan (2000) undertook a case study on the National Health Service Trust hospital (UK) in 1996/7 to examine the effectiveness of performance appraisal in a public sector context. They found that very few managers and professionals suggested that performance appraisal should be discarded altogether as they felt that the process did have some overall value.

The wider adoption of performance appraisal in the public sector is also happening in the UK (Harrison & Goulding, 1997; Redman et al., 2000). Harrison and Goulding commented that in the last 20 years the public sector

has become more market oriented and successive governments have sought to make the public sector more accountable to the electorate and tried to raise the quality of services by developing targets and standards which public services needed to achieve and to maintain.

As a control device Henderson (1980) found that performance appraisal influences practically all human resources functions such as identifying job responsibilities, and expected tasks output, determining appropriate and fair methods and instruments for appraising performance. Providing feedback to employees on their performance, identifying employees' skills and knowledge, assisting in establishing an appropriate training and development plan that will link individual employees' requirements to organizational demands, therefore it frequently influences one-off performance bonus payments, terminations, demotions, transfers, promotion and learning opportunities.

Henderson added that the manager conducting the performance appraisal is then put in the position of judging the employee and acting on their judgments. This inevitably involves the possibility of rater errors exacerbated further if there is a personality conflict between the manager and employee (Arnold & Pulich, 2003; Bryson, Burns, Hanson, Lambie, & Ryan, 1999). Rater errors include:

- 1 Hom effect (where one negative aspect of an employee or their performance is used to generalize into their overall poor appraisal rating);

- 2 Halo effect (the opposite of horn effect where one positive characteristics of an employee or their positive performance is used to generalized into an overall high rating);
- 3 Similar-to-me-effect (whereby an appraiser rates someone perceived accurately or inaccurately to have the same characteristics as them);
- 4 Tendency towards the mean or extremes (appraising employees as “average” or may be too strict or too lenient in their assessments);
- 5 Status effect (where managers are rated more highly than lower graded employee); and
- 6 Biases such as gender, age and ethnicity (Arnold & Pulich, 2003; Bryson et al., 1999).

Somewhat more controversially, Longenecker, Sims and Gioia (1987) claim that behind the mask of objectivity and rationality, management undertaking performance appraisal deliberately distort and manipulate appraisals for political purposes. They added that performance appraisal system is indeed a political process, and that few ratings are determined without some opinionated consideration. From their study, they found that the appraisers view their actions as discretionary, to help them manage people more effectively, to avoid unnecessary conflict, therefore using the organization’s bureaucratic processes to their own advantage and minimizing the extent to which administrative responsibilities create barriers between them and their subordinates.

They carried out in-depth, semi-structured interviews with 60 executives from seven large organizations represented by 11 functional areas, and their goal was to “conduct a scholarly investigations of the cognitive

processes executives typically use in appraising subordinates” (Longenecker et al., 1987). Their study concludes that accuracy is not the primary concern when conducting appraisals, but how best to use the process to motivate and reward staff and Tziner and Murphy (1999) added that to achieve specific goals such as self enhancement or enhancing relationships with subordinates. Longenecker et al. cautioned that if the organizational culture supports the political behaviour, this will tend to cascade down. However, it is impossible to eliminate politics from performance appraisal and furthermore at times it is necessary, but what an astute manager needs to do is to effectively manage it.

Also, Spinks, Wells and Meche (1999) commented that in recent years, performance appraisal is becoming a tool to discipline or dismiss staff and used when there is an organization restructuring. This suggests that performance appraisal is seen as a tool to control employees, and sadly according to Edmonstone (1996) empirical evidence suggested that this is true, and that development of staff are often ignored. Wilson and Nutley (2003) agreed that appraisal can be seen as one of a number of indirect forms of control, which work by emphasizing the need for staff to be committed to what the organization wants them to do. It is no wonder that there is uneasiness towards performance appraisal. To overcome this, McGregor (1972) suggested that the setting of performance goals and appraising should be the responsibility of the appraisees.

Besides assisting organization in compensation decisions, performance appraisal is also used as a development tool for employees (Anderson, 2002), and according to Johnson (1995), in New Zealand (NZ) and the UK, the dominant use of performance appraisal was to assess training and development

needs and promotability, and that its use for remuneration was largely an American practice. Wilson and Western (2001) also commented that performance appraisal is widely regarded as the main instrument for identifying training and development needs at the individual level. However, even though their findings from a case study taking the perspectives of the appraisees pointed that performance appraisal was used to identify training and development it concluded that:

- 1 There are varying degrees of involvement and commitment to the appraisal process;
- 2 Majority of training and development plans were directly related to the requirements of the short-term job requirements rather than long-term development and advancement and only a small proportion were involved with general personal development;
- 3 Some of the training and development plans were unachievable because they were inappropriate, too expensive, lack of time for or indifference and apathy towards the plans; and
- 4 It is viewed as another task completed and can be forgotten until the following year.

Clearly, research has shown that performance appraisal has many uses as suggested by McGregor, Cleveland, et al., Dean, et al. this is also true in the hotel industry, where a study conducted by Woods, Sciarini and Breiter (1998) of the hotel industry (of 389 US hotels), concluded performance appraisal was used to serve the four categories identified by Cleveland, et al. However, Rudman (2003) remarked that because of the many and broad uses, conflicts arise and the two major conflicts are: (1) the different goals that individual

employees and organizations have; and (2) the conflicting roles that the manager as the appraiser is to take of a judge and helper. These conflicts may prevent the performance appraisal process attaining its full usefulness to the organizations, and may even result in negative behaviour amongst employees ultimately affecting the organization's performance (Boswell and Boudreau, 2000).

To minimize these conflicts, Rudman (2003) suggested that an organisation's performance appraisal should attempt to only be used as either for development or administrative purposes. Those who continue to use performance appraisal need to be aware that the system is imperfect as it continues to rely primarily upon human information processing and judgment and even though the process is unsatisfactory it serves a number of valuable organizational purposes as our culture believed that people should be rewarded for outstanding performance (Wiese & Buckley, 1998). It can be a useful tool to manage resources, to reward employees appropriately and to ensure the performance gap (the gap between desired performance and actual performance) is as close as possible (Mani, 2002).

Studies on Perception of Performance Appraisals

Thus far, the review of literature has attempted to look at the usage of performance appraisals, and that researchers, theorists and practitioners agreed that it could be a useful tool to manage resources (people) but what of the effect of the process on employees and their perception? Investigations of performance appraisal instruments have focused primarily on their psychometric properties, but little research has been undertaken on employee

effect, that is on the extent to which the use of an appraisal instrument fosters improvement in work-related attitudes such as job satisfaction and the organizational commitment of the appraisee (Tziner & Latham, 1989).

In a study undertaken by Johnson (1995) in 1992, to examine the attitudes of nearly 32,000 American federal employees toward performance appraisal, he concluded that the employees were dissatisfied with the way performances appraisal was conducted and that less than one-fifth felt that the process motivated employees to perform well. He claimed however that there is no empirical evidence that performance appraisal itself is undesirable, because from his study almost half (46 per cent) liked the concept of the process as it gave them an indication where they ranked among co-workers.

In 1997 Watson Wyatt Worldwide, a consulting firm with global interests undertook a national survey of 2,004 cross-section Canadian workers (Davies & Landa, 1999). The study looked at the internal systems within organizations acknowledged to be intrinsic to its success. The key findings were that less than two-thirds (60%) said that they understood the measures used to evaluate their performance, even fewer (57%) thought that their performance was rated fairly, less than half (47%) said that their managers clearly expressed goals and assignments, even fewer (39%) reported that their performance review was helpful in improving their on –the-job performance, and 19% report a clear, direct and compelling linkage between performance and their pay. At its best, most employees saw the process as a highly stressful process with little or no perceived connection to their compensation, and at its worst as a symbolic whip in the hands of management. The study did not conclude that the process be removed, but that practitioners must recognize its

weaknesses and also a need to foster upward communication in the organizations.

Redman, Snape, Thompson and Yan (2000) undertook a study in 1996/7 to examine the effectiveness of performance appraisal in a public sector context. The study consisted of 30 in-depth semi-structured interviews of 23 line managers and professionals drawn from a wide variety of backgrounds. The interview explored the participants' experiences as an appraiser and an appraisee (in a sense looking at employee effect). They also administered 270 structured questionnaires with a return rate of 49%, to senior and middle managers and professionals. The questionnaire focused on the experience of being appraised and general attitudes toward appraisal.

Their study found that employees viewed the process as beneficial, and that the managers and professionals also found the process of overall value, with very few suggesting it should be discarded altogether. However, problems identified from the study included patchy application, uneven managerial commitment, lack of continuity between appraisal, the links with performance related pay and teamwork, and the appropriateness of individual performance review for lower-graded staff merit further attention.

The link between individual performance review (IPR) and pay was a key cause for concern as there was a general negative perception of its effects. The findings found a strong theme of those who were appraised and how positive they were about IPR that this process represented quality time or meaningful one-on-one time between the manager and subordinate. Appraisees welcome constructive feedback in providing direction and helping to boost confidence, and also valued critical feedback, but rarely received this

as the IPR emphasized positive ness. To ensure a positive individual performance review (IPR) event and harmony within their work teams, around a third of the respondents said they often tempered their feedback. A large of respondents felt that their managers do not reward favourites, they were confident that appraisers were objective and that having a sound personal relationships with the appraiser was not necessary in order to obtain a good appraisal.

The survey found that appraises are actively involved in the objective-setting process and in this respect the objectives they set for themselves were more challenging (and interesting) than those produced by their managers. However, there are those who have accumulated experience of objective setting and set less challenging objectives for themselves, whilst others felt the objectives were “imposed” on them but most accepted that this is part of the job. They also found that:

- 1 Appraisers used performance appraisal to exert managerial authority, and sometimes appraises, according to some managers perception used the process on them to complain about managerial inadequacies;
- 2 About two thirds of appraisers and appraisees felt that performance appraisal process contributed positively to their personal motivation and job satisfaction, but other managers/appraisers in relation to lower staff, considered a waste of time and a lot of “hot air”.
- 3 Even though training and development is strongly emphasized in the performance appraisal process, in reality is takes second place to work objectives, and even when discussed is done mechanically using a

check list, rather than identifying the need for training and development from discussion of performance;

- 4 Generally respondents reported overall positive experience, at least for managers and professionals; and
- 5 Most view the process' relation to pay as largely negative, as they considered the process a lot of hassle for little reward, more influenced by quotes than real performance, was unfair, highly subjective and detrimental to professionalism and undermined the developmental focus of the system.

As a motivational tool, Mani (2002) found from the East Carolina University (US) study (assessing the attitudes and opinions of a limited number of lower graded employees-grounds workers, library clerk III, patient relations representative IV, and medical records assistant V), that many employees were motivated by factors that did not relate to the performance management system, that many were self motivated or motivated by the enjoyment of their work (intrinsic rewards), and pay, an extrinsic reward, ranked third among the things that motivated these employees. However, she warned that this self motivation and enjoyment of work will cease if employees pay is not adequately increased, as increases in pay was also seen as a symbol of recognition. Ultimately, the lack of pay increase may result in these employees leaving the university.

However, while the supervisors that took part in this study ranked pay as a main motivator they also recognized that recognition and self motivation were other factors. Mani also found that the employees were dissatisfied with the performance management system because they perceived the system as

unfair because they alleged that others were getting higher ratings when they didn't deserve this and untrustworthy as some had not receive monetary rewards even after receiving high ratings.

The level of trust and satisfaction employees felt towards their supervisors also determined if they were satisfied with the system. Mani suggested that if the appraisal system did not seem to motivate these employees, supervisors needed to evaluate their own relationships with them. If supervisors have given feedback to employees that they perceived as not credible thereby not increasing their motivation to improve. Not surprisingly, Mani's study found that the supervisors were satisfied with the system.

Interestingly, a study conducted by Simmons (2002), to gain academic staff perspectives and expectations of performance appraisals, found that appraisees' views of the performance appraisal did not see the process motivated them in improving their performance after the appraisal discussion, nor did they see that their pay should be linked directly to an assessment of their performance. However, the appraisers believed that the appraisal interviews conducted have a far greater motivational impact than do their appraisers. (The academic staff members were from the Higher Education, Further Education, Colleges and University sectors in the UK.). Yet, the appraisal interview is the "Achilles heel" of the entire process as managers were often reluctant and anxious to carry out the face-to-face mainly because they feel that they lacked the skills in performing this task (Kikoski, 1999).

According to Rudman (2003), research has shown that employees were more satisfied with pay decisions that were directly linked to decisions about performance and development. He argued that the challenge was to make this

a close relationship, in both time and cause-without making employees defensive about their performance or their training and development needs if they think this will adversely affect their remuneration. The focus must be kept on performance, not pay. However, Henderson (1980) stated performance appraisal has some psychological effects on employees. He suggested that:

- 1 Employees perceived that an average performance result will limit their promotional opportunities, and a below-average result is a stigma that will remain with them for the rest of their career in the organization;
- 2 Recommendation of training and development is perceived as being a marginal employee;
- 3 If used as a criteria for hiring, selection and promotion, employees perceived that their qualifications are borderline; and
- 4 If their performance is superior that may be ostracized by fellow employees.

It has been suggested that performance appraisal could be used to improve performance. Pettijohn, Pettijohn, and Taylor (1999) conducted a survey of retail salesperson and retail sales managers in a south-central metropolitan area (USA). Their study was to investigate if properly conducted performance appraisals would affect sales force productivity and turnover. They concluded that when an organization focuses on performance by having more appraisals, that the process has clear criteria to measure performance, and that desired levels of performance are rewarded, an organization can expect to receive higher levels of performance. Furthermore, if there was open discussion on the appraisal results, to use this to improve performance; sales

people were less likely to leave. This would be viewed as support given to them by their managers and thereby the sales staff would be more committed to stay.

One of the many uses of conducting a performance appraisal is the development of employees. To find out about employees perceptions, Bozionelos (2001) conducted a study to investigate the perceptions of career development in a downsizing organization (one of the tools that tend to be used as career advancement for survivors of downsizing was Performance Management and Appraisal scheme, and the aim of this is to determine levels of financial compensation and identifying development needs. What Bozionelos found was that the majority of the respondents expressed negative views, citing that:

- 1 There is no coherent planning for employee career development;
- 2 Commitment to career development depend on willingness and ability of the manager; and
- 3 Organizational agents considered career development to be applicable only to core, key or high-fliers.

In an earlier study conducted by Boswell and Boudreau (2000), it was found that employees were more likely to be satisfied with the performance appraisal process if it was for career advancement and training and development. Their study brought renewed support for the importance of individual development in the performance appraisal process. When performance appraisal is used for development it is a way to support employees' growth, but more importantly according to Boswell and Boudreau,

it can directly influence employees' attitudes. These attitudes may in turn influence turnover, absenteeism and the performance of the organisations.

Boswell and Boudreau surveyed 128 manufacturing employees investigating the relationship between employee perceptions of performance appraisal use, specifically evaluative (salary, promotion and identifying poor performers) and developmental (performance feedback, identifying training needs, determining of transfers assignments) use, and employee attitudes towards both the appraisal and appraiser. Interestingly, they suggested that because employees expected that the appraisal is used for evaluation therefore the process did not influence attitudes one way or another. They concluded that when used for development, the appraisal process promoted positive attitudes, whereas when used for evaluation the process may not be well received. Fletcher (1993) argues that the days of the traditional and very large appraisal system are numbered, and even the term appraisal has in some ways outlived its usefulness, due to flatter organizational structures, teams working across organizations and/or boundaries, and employees having professional and technical qualifications.

However, in a study undertaken by Wilson and Nutley (2003), they found that people wanted to be appraised. Their study was to assess how appraisal systems may be hindering or facilitating women's progress in Scottish universities and found that (1) there was a general decline in the use of appraisal schemes in Scottish universities but women were still being subjected to a disciplinary technology such as performance appraisal, and (2) this technology tends to cast women as "other" and a disadvantage to them as a group, but more importantly these women wanted to be appraised. They

wanted to be appraised because they still want the feedback and guidance that appraisal could potentially provide, and that they also needed more encouragement to put themselves forward for promotion. They interviewed 30 women consisted of administrative staff but mainly of female academic staff, and chose only to study female staff because (1) gender has been neglected in the study of appraisal, (2) little research has been done in university settings on the subjective experience of appraisal, and (3) there were fewer women at the top of the academic career structure.

This is supported by an earlier study conducted by Wilson (2002) of the appraisal systems used in British universities on women, whereby one of her findings was that many individuals perceived a need for regular feedback, as it was seen to be helpful in induction and development in career progression indicating that people did want to be appraised. From that study she also found that (1) there were clear conflicts of interests both within and between appraiser and appraisee, and (2) judgment appeared inevitable as it was needed to help develop realistic expectations and objectives.

Ultimately, according to Henderson (1980), the most important issue for all employees in any appraisal of performance is job security, as they recognize that their survival at the organization and the extent of promotional opportunities are dependent on the judgment, consideration and feelings of the immediate manager and others holding a position of authority. Harrison and Goulding (1997) also agreed that if the appraisal system is used for pay, it will be associated with judgment and retribution, rather than with personal development. All these will result in an ineffective performance appraisal process compounded by poor rating skills of the manager. It is surprising to

find that many organizations do little to motivate or prepare managers to conduct effective appraisers.

Few organizations conduct rigorous, skills-based training, instead most either hand performance rating forms and corresponding instructions to managers and tell them to evaluate their subordinates by a specific date or hold a short meeting to explain the rating purpose and procedure and to answer any questions that managers might have (Fink & Longenecker, 1998). They go on to say the reasons why organizations fail to train managers are that: they assume managers know how to conduct appraisals; they do not want to take the time; training is not an organization priority; they are over-reliant on trial and error learning; they are not wanting to spend the money; there is no formal training plan/programme; they fear offending the managers; the lack of skilled trainers; the human resource departments are ineffective; and there is a lack of clear skill set.

Performance Appraisal in Higher Education

In a study conducted by Simmons (2002) in 22 universities in UK, the results indicated that the acceptability on effectiveness of performance appraisals is the degree to which those appraised regard the performance criteria used as under their control, view the appraisal interview as a motivational experience and believe that the outcomes of performance review are used in a developmental way.

Simmons describes universities as representing the apogee of knowledge-based organisations for which intellectual capital has the greatest significance. The academic staff at their core are arguably one of, if not the key, organisational resource strength so the motivation, development and

career management of these knowledge workers is thus of particular importance (2002). He suggests that understanding the characteristics and features of PM that will engage Professionals in knowledge-based organisations is a significant issue, but one that is Under-researched.

Khoury and Analou (2004) in a study of 22 universities in UK found out staff of universities are often not comfortable with performance management systems because of:

- 1 too much emphasis is often placed on student evaluations,
- 2 top management failed to adequately support the process,
- 3 unclear performance standards,
- 4 secrecy and lack of feedback.

Khoury and Analoui's study, one of the few empirical studies of how performance appraisal Processes are experienced by faculty members in universities, concluded that poorly conducted appraisal processes result in low morale, de-motivation and dissatisfaction (2004).

Lonsdale reviewed international developments in relation to the use of incentives, rewards and sanctions in higher education and concluded that university administrators increasingly favour appraisal as a means of ensuring accountability, assisting staff management and improving efficiency—and that they directly associate appraisal with rewards and sanctions, despite active resistance from academic unions (1993). This increasing emphasis on evaluative appraisal in modern performance management systems confronts a key element of the academic role, long held as inviolate: the concept of academic freedom.

Proponents of PM in universities see it as a means of providing increased accountability and incentive for higher performance in a system lacking such mechanisms because employment has traditionally been ensured through tenure, regardless of performance (Aper & Fry, 2003). They suggest that it will enhance professional development, motivation and productivity although there is little evidence to support that this is the case (Leatherman 2000; Lonsdale & Varley 1995; Miller, 1999).

Tenure, or the notion of secure employment until retirement, is highly valued by academic staff as a primary means of preserving freedom from administrative interference into work that may contradict the views of their employer. Unless the institution can prove professional incompetence or other serious breaches of the employment contract such as moral turpitude, violations of the law, insubordination or dishonesty in teaching or research, a tenured academic's continued employment has been virtually guaranteed (Giano & Kleiner 2001).

Simmons (2002) summarises some of the many objections to attempts to introduce the broader practice of PM into universities as an effort to transpose corporate managerialist approaches to performance appraisal within the education sector, antithetical to a self governing community of professionals, an infringement of academic freedom, based on a top-down approach to research and teaching which severely restricts creativity and self development, or a covert means of introducing greater governmental control of the HE and FE [Further Education] sectors and the remuneration of those who work in them (Barry, Chandler & Clark 2001; Henson 1994; Holley and Oliver 2000; Townley 1990, 1992).

Others add that PM processes are excessively costly in time and money needed for other important endeavours and compromise faculty collegiality (American Association of University Professors 2001; Bennett & Chater, 1984), given the ‘monitoring or review of individual academic staff performance by a hierarchically superior manager’ (Hort, 1997)

Findings from the literature indicate that the response of academic staff to the implementation of comprehensive PM practices into universities is remarkably similar to that of teachers in school environments.

Schools-based research indicates that teaching staff are not averse to appraisal but dislike the summative forms of it that they feel have been imposed upon them. Similarly, research studies or reviews of PM in higher education assert that academic staff accept appraisal as a necessary and constructive process (Morris 2005; Moses 1988, 1995; Paget et al. 1992; University of Tasmania (2001), although they generally then go on to present findings that outline the exact opposite! The key difference between the reactions of educational staff in schools and universities seems to centre on the issue of academic freedom (Anderson et al. 2002; Encel 1990; Marginson 1993; Meek 1991; Williams, 1990) which is logical, given the traditionally greater flexibility inherent in the academic role, especially with respect to research.

The concept of hierarchical line management is similarly contentious in higher educational environments where academics are often more strongly affiliated to their professional discipline than to their organisation or Head of Department. Middle Hurst (1993) identified the ambiguous role Heads of School assume in trying to act as both an academic colleague and a manager.

Many academics do not see themselves as belonging to a structure that has to be managed at all; they are highly individualistic with no strong sense of corporate identity either to the department or to the university. Heads of departments in universities have no effective managerial power and operate by inspiring or engineering consent. This theme is referred to in recent literature that notes the lack of leverage and Authority University managers have to deal with performance issues, whether it is rewarding exemplars or sanctioning poor performance (Jackson, 1999).

The academic faculty in universities traditionally lacks a strong management culture and various surveys (Meek & Wood, 1997; Taylor et al. 1998) as well as informal reports indicate that senior staff often views management tasks and functions as disadvantageous to their career and an area of professional weakness. Comments such as those from academic staff in a forum on PM practice illustrate this, for example 'management is a full-time occupation (Dickenson, 1997), 'university managers are ill-equipped or trained to be effective managers' (1997, p. 74), and selection criteria for department heads do not include capacity and experience in staff development.

Further forum comments suggest that assuming managerial duties may actually compromise a departmental head's academic career. Universities do not reward managerial skills. If an academic takes on a managerial role, and then returns to the academy they have killed their promotional opportunities, are not as attractive for research funds, and not going to have a recent history of refereed articles, (Dickenson, 1997). Other research suggests that heads of department are rarely appointed for their managerial abilities and are largely untrained in this regard (Jackson, 1999). Training courses for new heads of

departments are infrequent limited and do little to assist them in managing staff performance (Bone & Bowner, 1998).

Feed-Back Instruments

How then are these employees being measured? The instruments being adopted can be objective (Macky & Johnson,2000). Objective involve the direct quantitative measurement of performance within a specified time period (Macky & Johnson, 2000). Examples of Objective instruments include key performance indicators (KPIs), pay-for-performance incentive remuneration. Subjective instruments (most commonly used) involve the appraiser exercising qualitative judgement focusing on the results on the outcomes of the employee and/or focusing on the process on how the outcomes were achieved. This means that the appraiser needs to be knowledgeable of and/or have observed the performance they are judging (Macky & Johnson, 2000,p.335). Due to its subjective nature, these methods are highly susceptible to human errors such as leniency, strictness, central tendency and halo effects, as well as being amenable to appraiser manipulating both for or against the person being appraised (for example giving high ratings to maintain harmony or as a means to motivate staff) (Cole, 2001; Macky & Johnson, 2000; Murphy, Cleveland, Skattebo, & Kinney, 2004).

Subjective instrument include the critical-incident method (as the term suggest the recording of important incidents, both positive and negative occurring during the appraisal period); the essay method (whereby the manager writes a few paragraphs about the employee using a set of guidelines);employee comparison methods (ranking employees from lowest to the highest or pairing employees then deciding which one of the pair

perform better and rank them); competency assessment (using the job description to determine if the employee have achieved the expected outcome or target set); 360-degree feedback or multi-source feedback and the rating-scale method (Cole,2001; Macky and Johnson,2000). The last two of the subjective instruments will be reviewed in details as follows.

Three Hundred and Sixty Degrees Feedback

This is also known as multi-source feedback, multi-rater assessment, upward appraisal, co-worker feedback, multi-perspective ratings, and full-circle feedback (Fletcher and Bailey, 2003; Garavan, Morley, & Flynn, 1997). The process typically involves a questionnaire being sent to supervisors, peers, line managers or subordinates, and (internal and external) customers who asked to the rate the employee's performance on a variety of performance dimensions or competencies (Fletcher & Bailey, 2003; Garavan et al., 1997; Macky & Johnson, 2000).

There are varying forms of 360-degrees feedback, such as 180-degree which consists only of supervisors or line managers and peers (Macky & Johnson, 2000). He emphasised that if feedback focusing on developing and its subjects are usually in management positions (Rudman, 2003). It has been chiefly oriented to target manager's development and has taken place in the context of management development or leadership courses (Conger and Toegel, 2003; Fletcher & Bailey, 2003). At the core of this feedback is the cognitive process of self-reflection, which increases self-awareness (Conger and Toegel, 2003). Also, Groeschl (2003) commented that which an organization encourage 360-degree feedback, it is in effect showing a

preference to increase employee's participation on all organizational levels in organizational procedures and process and thereby empowering its employees.

360-degrees feedback has spread quickly (Fletcher & Bailey, 2003), because of its perceived benefits, and these included:

- 1 Fairer and more accurate as it offers a more rounded assessment of the individual;
- 2 Seen as an empowering mechanism by subordinates and peers as they (the appraisers) are seemed to be given some influence on the way the appraisee is being a manager and a team member;
- 3 Enhances awareness of the organization's competency framework;
- 4 If used sensitively and with the right kind of support, can have a powerful development and learning potential;
- 5 It brings about a culture change whereby individuals become ready to seek, give and accept feedback in a constructive manner thereby enhancing communication and openness.
- 6 It increases self-awareness, that self-assessment is congruent with colleagues perception;
- 7 It can help uncover and resolve conflict;
- 8 It gives individuals the chance to praise or criticize their colleagues anonymously (Fletcher & Bailey, 2003; Garavan, Marley & Flynn, 1997).

360-degree has its drawbacks and (Garavan, Marley & Flynn, 1997) pointed out that these limitations include: relying on individual's memory to describe past performance and this can be incomplete; the appraiser maybe

unable to interpret the behaviour to be rated; appraisals may feel threatened and upset by the assessments; organizations may feel saturated with forms; appraisals are it is time-consuming to fill in forms and questionnaires more so when the appraisers have to undertake this for several people and as a result could be expensive. Though 360-degrees gets feedback from a broader view, the main conflict of this is when the employee feels that the people evaluating them are not qualified to give an opinion mainly because they have not been able to observe the performance (Arnold & Pulich, 2003). According to Garavan, Marley and Flynn, (1997) 360-degree feedback is best used in a developmental context, specifically for executive development, career development, and remedial training and self-development purposes. Increasingly, it is becoming part of the formal, annual appraisal process to include administrative decisions such as promotions (Conger & Toegel, 2003; Fletcher).

From his literature research of 360 degree feedback, Fletcher (2001) has found that managers valued the developmental aspect, but did not see it as appropriate for pay and promotion decisions as it was more lenient, less reliable and less valid as different rater groups tend to make somewhat different assessments from their own subjective standpoints, and its psychometric qualities may not be any better than top-down appraisal. He goes on to say that, more research would need to be conducted on what 360-degree can achieve and under what conditions.

Rudman (2003) and Conger and Toegel (2003) claim that if used for appraisal purposes (1) the rater may adjust assessments to make it more favourable, (2) “game playing” (Rudman, 2003) or “strategic self-

presentation” (Conger & Toegel, 2003) may occur, where it involves manipulating someone’s opinion to get favourable feedback, and (3) in some organisations employees boycott this process which means the participation rate is low making the feedback less useful for development and evaluation. Conger and Toegel (2003) go on to say that if used for both development and administrative purpose, it not only changes from a cognitive process of self-reflection to self-presentation strategies, but also the motivation on how the feedback is processed and used. There is also the tendency to emphasise the quantitative aspects (for administrative decisions thereby becoming performance outcome oriented) and neglect the qualitative ones (targeting developmental and competence oriented). Toegel and Conger (2003) believed that there should be two complementing 360-degree assessment tools and processes, one to serve development decisions thereby more qualitative goals (therefore more quantitative).

Another challenge to practioners in adopting 360-degree appraisal as pointed out by Groeshl (2003) is the impact on culture; how people interpret and understand the appraisal process based on their national culture-described as the customs, values traditions and social institutions often shared by individuals that distinguish a society (Fletcher,2001; Vallance & Fellow, 1999). He suggested that in undertaking a 360-degree feedback, this more likely to pose a problem for those who have been exposed to high respect for authority and age (such as China) thereby hindering the two- way communication. Further consideration for practitioners is that when 360-degree incorporates self-assessment, it has been found that women are less likely to overestimate their performance their performance, whereby they are

likely to rate themselves lower to what their managers have rated them (Fletcher, 1999). Despite its drawbacks 360-degree appraisal continues to be used and the trend is towards using it for multiple purposes.

The Rating-Scales Methods

Rating scales are the most widely used (including in NZ) subjective measures of performance (Macky & Johnson, 2000). The appraisers rate “Specified job-related skills and abilities of each employee on a defined scale” (Cole, 2001, P.773). Bacal (1999) described it as a “workplace report cards”, consisting of two parts: a list of characteristics, areas, or behaviours to be assessed and some scale or other way to indicate the level of performance on each item. He went on to say that advantages of these methods include bringing in some uniformity and consistency to the performance appraisal process, and that the process can be done quickly with minimum effort. As it is easy to use. The disadvantages are that the manager can forget why it was carried out and /or that it may not help in planning performance, preventing problems, protecting the organisation, or developing employees because it so vague. He suggested that managers supplement this method of feedback with regular discussions with each employee. The main rating scales (Macky & Johnson, 2000; Tziner, Joanis, & Murphy, 2000) are:

- 1 Graphic scales (non-behaviour), where appraisers record their judgement of ratees’ performance on a specific area. The judgement is on one or more continuous scales that may be anchored at various points with adjectival labels such as “good”, “poor”, “satisfactory” and so on.

- 2 Behaviourally anchored rating scales (BARS) where appraisers are encouraged to regard performance as a continuum, and to focus on observer able behaviour. Behavioural statements are used to illustrate rating levels. It is however, time consuming to develop and research had shown that there is no evidence that it is any better or develop or worse than other subjective format in terms of appraiser bias and error; and
- 3 Behavioural observation scales (BOS), similar to BARS. Rather than just providing a range of behaviour indicative of good or poor performance, BOS scales ask appraisers to focus on specific examples of behaviour and rate whether these behaviours have occurred or not, and if so, to what degree. It also time consuming and difficult to complete for appraisers who do not have ample opportunity to observe the behaviour the behaviour of the employee they are appraising. It is useful when setting goals to motivate employees and for legal reasons, as it is more to appraisers and to lawyers who may have to defend it in court.

Tziner and Latham (1989) examined the behaviour observation scale (BOS) and graphic rating scale (GRS) on job satisfaction and organisational commitment. They found that:

- 1 The use of BOS-based appraisal increased work satisfaction significantly more than the use of GRS-based appraisal;
- 2 Feedback followed by goal setting resulted in significantly higher work satisfaction and organisational commitment than feedback alone regardless of the appraisal scale that was used; and

3 The combinations of the BOS-based appraisal, feedback and goal setting led to significantly higher work satisfaction than was the case in other experimental conditions. It must be noted that in conducting this study, the raters were well trained in how to be objective, in ways to provide feedback, and two of these conditions also show to set goals with employees.

In a later study, Tziner, Joanis and Murphy (2000) found that BOS and GRS when used as a tool for feedback and development were superior to BARS in terms of ratees' satisfaction with the appraisal process, goals set from the process were clearer and more specific and these goals were more directly observable. BOS were significantly superior to GRS in setting specific goals as "in theory BOS provide information about behaviours that have occurred, which makes it more likely that developmental goals will be structured around improving specific behaviours". Both GRS and BARS represent a manager's evaluation of what occurred. (Their study examined the effect of rating scales on several variables (ratees' satisfaction with appraisal the characteristics- clarity, acceptance and commitment of goals that are developed from the appraisal process) when used as a developmental tool. They evaluated 96 police officers employed in a large metropolitan area of Quebec (Canada) using one of the three rating scale formats (GRS, BOS, and BARS).

Summary of Literature Review

Performance appraisal has been around since the third century (Johnson, 1999; Valleng & Fellow, 1999). Its usage has grown over the years, both in the private and public sectors (Bowles & Coates, 1993; Harrison

& Goulding, 1997). Broadly it has two uses, for administrative and developmental purposes, but also as a system to meet legal requirements (Dean, Kathawala & Wayland, 1992). Administrative applications include such activities as promotion, salary increases, demotions or terminations (Cleveland et al., 1989; Dean et al., 1992). As a developmental tool, it is used to identify training and staff development needs (Cleveland et al., 1989; Dean et al., 1992). It has also been claimed that performance appraisal can be a motivational tool (Fletcher, 1993; Wilson & Western, 2001).

Conflicts arise when performance appraisal process is used for both purposes, and the best way to avoid this is to use the process to serve only one purpose, either for a developmental or an administrative purpose (Rudman, 2003). Even though organisations claimed that their performance appraisal is used for developmental purposes, in reality, this often takes second place (Redman et al., 2000). Training and development needs were generally not identified from the discussion of performance.

However; while practitioners need to be aware that performance appraisal is imperfect, it can still serve a number of valuable organisational purposes such as assisting in pay, promotion and to identify training and development opportunities. (Mani, 2002; Wiese & Buckley, 1989).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The study is about performance appraisal in the University of Education, Winneba. The purpose of the study is to find out staff perception on the use of performance appraisal in the university and the ways in which appraisal contributes to staff performance.

Research Design

The descriptive survey design was used for the study. Descriptive survey specifies the nature of a given phenomenon. It determines and reports the way things are, it involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or answer research questions concerning the current status of the study (Gay, 1992). Descriptive research is concerned with the relationship that exists between variables, hypotheses testing and the development of generalizations, principles or theories with universal validity (Best & Kahn, 1989).

In a descriptive survey the conditions or event either already exist or have occurred and the researcher merely selects the relevant variables for an analysis to establish their current status. The purpose of this research was to describe and document the perceptions of staff in relation to the usage of performance appraisal in the university in terms of how it affects their career development, motivation and job performance. Issues raised by respondents were therefore documented and described.

However, there are certain disadvantages noted by Fraenkel and Wallen. These are the dangers of prying into the private affairs of respondents and thereby the likelihood of generating unreliable responses which can affect the findings. It is easily influenced by distortions through the introduction of biases in the measuring instruments, for instance, errors due to the use of questionnaires or interviews. The researcher therefore took time to explain the purpose of the research to respondents to reduce the danger of biases which can affect findings.

In spite of the above disadvantage, the researcher deemed it useful to employ the research design to find out the perception of university of education staff on the use of performance appraisal because it employs the method of randomization so that errors may be estimated when population characteristics are inferred from observation of samples. Besides, responses from respondents, a reliable basis for the researcher to pay attention to specific questions of interest are its importance.

Population

Roscoe, cited in Mouton (1996), defined a population as a collection of objects, events and individuals having some common characteristics that the researcher is interested in studying. The population for this study was 174 senior staff; comprising 130 senior administrative assistants, 12 senior research assistants, and 32 senior technical assistants. The University of Education operates a multi-campus system, which is made up of Winneba campus, Kumasi campus and Mampong campus. The main campus which is Winneba campus was used for the study; since the other campuses have similar structures.

Sample and Sampling procedure

Out of the 174 total population, a sample size of 120 was selected for the study. This is because; according to Sarantakos (1993) a sample size of 120 is appropriate for a population size of 174. The sample was made up of 90 senior administrative staff, 22 senior technical assistants and 8 senior research assistants.

Quota sampling technique was used to select the subgroups making up the sample. Quota sampling involves dividing the entire population into a number of homogenous groups in the proportion in which they occur in the population (Amedahe, 2002). The sample for each stratum was therefore chosen according to their proportion in the population. To get the sample for the senior administrative staff that numbered 130, the researcher divided the total number of senior staff in the population by the total population which was 174 and multiplied it by the sample size which was 120 and this gave her 90 (that is $130/174*120 = 90$). The same procedure was used in selecting the senior research assistants and the senior technical staff. For senior research assistants, it was $32/174*120 = 22$ and that of senior technical staff was $12/174*120 = 8$ altogether making up the sample of 120.

Background Characteristics of Respondents

Background information on the sample was collected to help the researcher gain more insight on respondents. This included their gender, age, educational qualification and the number of years they have worked in the university.

Table 1

Gender of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	66	58.9
Female	43	38.3
No response	3	2.7
Total	112	100

From Table 1, the respondents in the study were predominantly male forming 58.9 % of the total number of respondents. The female respondents were only 38.3% of the total number of respondents. Those who did not indicate their gender were 2.7%.

Table 2

Age of Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percent
22 – 30	40	35.7
31-36	33	29.4
37 – 42	30	26.7
43 – 58	9	8.0
Total	112	100

The University of Education Winneba has an adult administrative force. Out of the 112 respondents 72 or 64.1 % had obtained age of 30 years or more. Whiles 40 or 35.7 % of the respondents were within the age range of 22-30. It is therefore evident that the bulk of administrative professionals were above 30 years.

Table 3

Qualification of Respondents

Qualification	Frequency	Percent
Diploma	32	28.6
Bachelors	60	53.6
Post graduate diploma	5	4.5
Masters	15	13.3
Total	112	100

From the information in Table 3, 20 or 17.8 % of the respondents had more than one qualification. Graduate Diploma holders were 4.5% whiles 13.3 % had masters' degrees. The findings also show that majority of the respondents comprising 53.6% of the total number of respondents had a university degree. Those with Diplomas and or professional qualifications were 28.6%.

Table 4

Length of Service of Respondents

Years	Frequency	Percent
2-5	58	51.8
6-10	32	28.6
11-15	16	14.3
16-20	6	5.4
Total	112	100.0

Table 4 indicates that Majority of the respondents as many as 51.8% have worked in the university from 2-5 years, 28.6% of the respondents have worked from 6-10, 14.3% has worked from 11-15 years and just 5.4% of the total respondents have worked from 16 – 20 years. The researcher insisted that those who were included should have gone through an appraisal and so should have been in the university for at least one year.

Research Instrument

The main data-gathering instrument used for the collection of data for the study was the questionnaire. The instrument was used because the participants can read and write and it is also less costly to administer. It is also believed to produce the required information and personal opinions relevant to the study. The Questionnaire consisted of three sections made up of both structured and unstructured items. The first section (section A) sought to collect information on the personal characteristics of the respondents. The second section (section B) dealt with issues regarding the perception of staff on performance appraisal. Section C was on how performance appraisals

promote career development while section D was on ways in which performance has promoted staff motivation and job performance.

The questionnaire was developed from secondary data and the literature gathered on the topic. According to Cozby (1993), some of the advantages of using questionnaires is the fact that they can be administered in groups, answered by respondents at their time of convenience and also be mailed to people. They also allow anonymity of the respondents which makes it easier for respondents to volunteer information without the fear of victimisation. The researcher chose this instrument because the respondents can read and write and also because of their busy schedules.

However, questionnaires require that the respondents can read and understand. In a situation where respondents do not understand questions asked, the researcher may not get the appropriate responses from the respondents. In addition, many people find it boring to sit by themselves to read questions and then write down answers; thus, there may be a problem of motivation. There is therefore the likelihood that people will not provide accurate responses. To reduce the effects of the above disadvantages, the researcher took time to explain the items on the questionnaire to respondents.

Validity of the Research Instrument

According to Yin (1994) some research studies may be of poor quality and the results questionable simply because an inattentive researcher fails to address carefully matters related to validity and reliability. Each concern requires a specific plan to ensure that data obtained are credible and confirmable. Internal validity has to do with whether the findings can be shown to be valid for the problem that is being investigated. The data

collected, the models and theories used all have to be relevant to the problem and the purpose of the thesis otherwise there will be low validity (1994). To establish the face and content validity of the instrument, three experts in education and five graduate students were asked to review it. According to Yin (1994) content validity can be determined by expert judgement. The suggestions made were used to improve the questionnaire items.

Reliability

Reliability concerns the issue of consistent results of the study if it was replicated. A good guideline for reliability is to make sure that if someone did it again the same results would be gotten. Reliability is an important requirement for doing descriptive survey and the goal for reliability is to minimize biases and errors in the research. A prerequisite for reliability is that all the documentation is in order and can easily be found (Yin, 1994).

To test for the reliability of the instrument the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was employed. The Cronbach's co-efficient alpha measure of internal consistency was used in determining the reliability of questionnaires for the main study since the majority of the items in the questionnaires were multiple-scored especially on the Likert scale. The Cronbach's co-efficient alpha was the appropriate reliability test to resort to. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1990) have noted that, Cronbach's alpha is used when measures have multiple-scored items such as attitudinal scales. The reliability test was conducted with the Statistical Product for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0 after data had been fed into the computer. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the questionnaire was .883.

Pilot Testing of the Instrument

Before administering the questionnaires to the respondents a pilot test was conducted. Johnson (1994) explained that the experience of pilot respondents is used to improve and amend the questionnaire before sending it out to the main research population. The pilot test was carried out at the University of Cape Coast.

The University of Cape Coast was chosen because it possess similar characteristics with the institution under study. The researcher used 20 Administrative staff randomly selected for the study. The researcher interacted personally with the respondents to find out from them what they had to say about the questionnaire items. This was done with the view to checking ambiguity and inconsistency which may be associated with the drafting of the questionnaires.

This pre-test was carried out with the hope that valuable issues may come up which will be helpful in the final study. The researcher collected data from senior administrative staff, senior technical staff and senior research assistants during the first semester 2009/2010 academic year. Views expressed by the respondents were used to update the questionnaire.

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher obtained a letter of introduction from the institute of educational planning and administration (IEPA) of the University of Cape Coast where the researcher is a student to enable her go to the University of Education, Winneba to collect information for the study. The letter of introduction which introduced the researcher was given to the various Deans and the heads in the departments in the University of Education, Winneba and

this enabled the researcher get the necessary permission to visit their outfit for the study.

Data collection started on the 15th of January and ended on February 6th 2010. The 120 questionnaires were distributed in accordance with the number of respondents in the various categories. The researcher gave out 22 questionnaires to senior technical staff, 90 to senior administrative assistants and 8 to senior research assistants.

The questionnaire was given to the respondents by the researcher in their respective offices after the researcher had explained to them vividly the nature of the research and what the researcher was seeking to find. This was followed up by personal contacts since it is likely that some respondents may forget to answer them, others may also leave them at home after completion. The researcher therefore had to remind them occasionally. As a result of their tight schedules the researcher left the questionnaire with them for three weeks after which she went back for the completed questionnaires.

After the first week, 50 questionnaires were retrieved, in the second week, 30 were retrieved and in the third and last week of data collection 22 questionnaires were retrieved. In all a total of 112 questionnaires were retrieved from the respondents.

Data Analysis

After collecting data, the results must be summarised, organized and analysed. As such all returned questionnaires were examined for completeness and accuracy. When data was collected from the field, it was processed for analysis. The preparation included gathering, editing, coding and entering them in the programme designed for their analysis. Data preparation ensured

accuracy of data and also converted data from their crude form to classified forms that made the analysis possible and more appropriate.

The researcher first and foremost, edited the raw data to detect errors, omissions and commissions and corrected them where possible. This ensured accuracy and consistency and made it possible to ensure simplicity in data coding tabulation. Before the data can be analysed it must be coded. The researcher systematically took the responses from the questionnaires, assigned numbers to them. For example, responses to yes/no questions were entered as 1= Yes and 2=No. Those that were put on the Likert scale were coded in the following ways strongly agree = 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1. It is important to note that the value assigned to each response is just for identification it is not an attempt to rank the responses in any way. The open ended responses were analysed thematically. Where respondents fail to answer a question or complete a scale, the researcher used IC to denote the incomplete data. The Statistical Product for Social Science (SPSS) version 16.0 for windows was used for analysing the data after data had been fed into the computer.

The responses were summarized according to each variable and presented in the form of tables and graphs. The rates, ratios and percentages were calculated. Frequencies and percentages were used to illustrate the directions of the responses necessary for the analysis and discussion of issues raised. Interpretation was based on majority views and the prominent variables emerging from the outcomes.

Research question one for instance had four items which sought to find the perception of senior staff on the uses of performance appraisal.

Frequencies and percentages were generated from the responses given and presented in a table. The discussion was based on the direction of responses. Research question two sought to find senior staff perception on the usage of performance appraisal in the university. Frequencies and percentages were also generated from the responses and presented in tables. The discussion was also based on the direction of the responses.

Research question three solicited views from senior staff on how performance appraisal promotes career development. The responses were also converted into frequencies and percentages and presented on tables. Interpretation and discussion was based in majority views.

Research question four sought to find senior staff perception on ways in which appraisal promotes their job performance. Frequencies and percentages were generated from the responses and presented in tables. The discussion was also based on the direction of the responses.

The researcher decided to use frequencies and percentages because the study was to document and describe issues as they are. There was therefore the need to find the frequencies of the number of people who agreed or disagreed with the issues raised so that credible conclusions can be drawn.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results and discussions for the study. The results and discussion are based on the research questions that guided the research. The general purpose of the study was to find out how staff perceive the performance appraisal system of the university in terms of how it is used- whether developmentally or evaluatively and how it affects their career development, and job performance.

To answer the various research questions that guided the study, the responses to each of the research questions were recorded in simple frequency and percentage tables to enable the researcher determine how senior staff perceive the use of performance appraisal. Conclusions drawn are based on the results obtained.

Background Information

The study was conducted at the University of Education, Winneba- specifically the Winneba campus from the 15th of January 2010 to the 6th of February 2010. The recovery rate was 93.3%. Out of the 120 questionnaires distributed to senior staff, 112 were retrieved. Hence 112 senior staff took part in the study.

Research Question 1: What is the Perception of Senior Staff of University of Education, Winneba on the Uses of Performance Appraisal?

Performance appraisal has two broad uses; development or evaluation. If it is for evaluation, the emphasis is on finding out how well employees are conforming to organisational standards. The perception of staff regarding the use of appraisal determines how they evaluate the use of appraisal in the university and to some extent their attitude towards the system. This question therefore sought to ascertain the perception of staff on how performance appraisal should be used, that is whether for development or evaluation. Table 5 shows how senior staff perceive the uses of performance appraisal.

Table 5

Perception of Senior Staff on the Uses of Performance Appraisal

Perception on appraisal use	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Provide feedback to help me discover my strengths and weaknesses	75(67%)	30(26.8%)	7(6.3%)	-
Used to identify employees for salary increase and promotion	22(19.6%)	26(23.2%)	43(38.3%)	21(18.7%)
Identify employees for lay off or demotion	-	30(26.8%)	8(7.1%)	74(66%)
Used to identify staff training needs	75(67%)	30(26.7%)	7(6.3%)	-

From the responses in Table 5, a total of 105 (93.8 %) of the respondents thought that performance appraisals should be used to provide feedback which will enable them discover their strengths and improve upon their weaknesses. This is because appraisal feedback is a useful tool for staff self appraisal. Just as Edmonstone (1996) opined, that appraisal feedback is a useful tool for staff personal development.

More than half of the respondents, 64 in number, and representing 57% did not agree that appraisal results should be used to determine promotion and salary increases. Whiles less than half of the respondents, 48 (42.8%) thought appraisal should be tied to promotion and salary increase. This sometimes can happen when staffs feel they are working harder than others and so they should be rewarded better than others. However, a disadvantage of using appraisal for pay as identified by Harrison and Goulding (1997) is that it will be associated with judgment and retribution rather than with personnel development. To him it will result in an ineffective performance appraisal process.

A significant number, 82 (73.1%) of the respondents felt appraisal should not be used to identify employees for lay off and demotion. With just 30 (26.8%) saying it should be used for such purposes. Almost all the respondents, 105 (93.7%) of the respondents are of the view that performance appraisal should be used to determine training and development needs of staff. From the statistics in Table 5 the overriding perception of the staff on the use of performance appraisal is that it should be developmentally oriented. In other words, their perception of performance appraisal use is that it should be

able to help them grow in their career by removing obstacles to high performance through the provision of constant feedback and creating opportunities for staff to undertake further training.

This finding supports an earlier study by Boswell and Boudreau (2000) to investigate the relationship between employee perceptions of performance appraisal use and employee attitudes towards both the appraisal and appraiser. They found out that employees were more likely to be satisfied with the performance appraisal process if it was for career advancement and training and development. They concluded that because employees perceived the process was used for evaluation it did not influence attitudes one way or another. In as much as organizations seek to satisfy their objectives the development of staff should also be considered since they cannot achieve their goals without an up to date work force.

Research Question 2: What is the Perception of the Staff on the use of Performance Appraisal in the University?

The perception of staff on the use of the university's appraisal system affects the level of seriousness and commitment they attach to the system and this goes a long way to determine the effectiveness of the system. If the focus of the university's appraisal system is developmental, then emphasis will be placed on identifying and providing training and development needs, reviewing and updating work descriptions amongst others. On the other hand if it is evaluative, then emphasis will be placed on reward and punishment, lay-off, discipline, etc. The results to this question are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Perception of Staff on the Use of performance Appraisal in the University

Perception on university's appraisal system	Strongly agree	agree	disagree	Strongly disagree
Determination of increments and promotion.	41(36.6%)	52(46.4%)	12(10.7%)	7(6.3%)
Setting work objectives	14(12.5%)	24(21.4%)	40(35.7%)	34(30.4%)
Transfer decisions	26(23.2%)	21(18.8%)	36(32.1%)	29(25.9%)
Identification of training needs	12(10.7%)	16(14.3%)	47(42%)	37(33.0%)
For lay off decisions/discipline	36(32.1%)	44(39.9%)	19(17.0%)	13(11.7%)
Reviewing, updating job description	14(12.5%)	22(19.4%)	40(35.7%)	36(32.1%)

A total of 93 (83.0%) of the respondents said the University's appraisal system is used in identifying employees for salary increases and promotion with just 19 (17.0%) thinking otherwise. An indication majority think performance appraisal is done to discriminate hardworking employees from those who aren't and to reward them accordingly. This perception supports Stone's (2002) claim that performance appraisal is for discrimination; which is enabling managers to objectively differentiate between those who are contributing to the achievement of the organization's strategic business objectives and those who are not and thus to deal with inadequate performance as well as differentially reward exemplars.

Only 38 (33.9 %) think the process is done to help in setting work objectives with as many as 74 (66.1 %) disagreeing. Using performance appraisal results to set work objectives is a way of helping employees develop professionally because feedback will help them set targets for themselves as to what they want to achieve at the next appraisal. But from the statistics so far feedback does not seem to be forthcoming hence, employees are right to think it is not done to help in setting work objectives.

Less than half of the respondents, 47 (42%) think appraisals are conducted to enable the institution transfer people from one department to the other while 65 (58%) think otherwise. Transfers could be used in both developmental and evaluative ways. It is evaluative when it is used as a way of punishing workers but it is developmental when it is done to enable people learn new things from others who are more knowledgeable than they are.

Only 28 (25 %) think appraisal is conducted to identify training and development needs while majority representing 84 (75%) disagreed. Workers don't think the appraisal is developmentally oriented. In Rudman et al's (2000) study on the effectiveness of performance appraisal in a public sector context. They found out that even though training and development is strongly emphasized in the performance appraisal process. A total of 80 (72%) think the university's appraisal is used as a way to discipline people in the form of demotion, and lay-off and as a way of exerting control on workers. A total of 36 (31.9%) think appraisal used for reviewing and updating job descriptions while a majority 76 (67.8%) think it is not.

Generally, the results affirm Armstrong and Baron's (2000) assertion that Performance appraisal should measure and reward behaviours which

support the organization's strategic objectives. The implication here is that the organization's goals are paramount to career needs of employees and hence performance appraisal should be used as a tool to ensure satisfaction of organizational objectives. The underlining perception of the university's appraisal leans towards the evaluative pattern which is identifying people for promotion and rewards and also for punishment and discipline.

Very few of the respondents perceive the performance appraisal system of the university in a developmental way. This could rob the system of its effectiveness because it can make workers feel it is just an administrative requirement which does not play a role in their career development. This also means that appraisal may not have an impact on worker's motivation and performance since very little is done to help workers grow in their career as perceived by staff. Boswell and Isoudreau (2000) pointed out that when employees perceive that the appraisal process doesn't help in their development, for example by offering them opportunities for training it does not promote positive attitudes towards the system.

Research Question 3: How does the Performance Appraisal System of the University Promote Career Development as Perceived by Senior Staff?

The researcher then wanted to find out from respondents the extent to which the appraisal system of the university is beneficial to their career development of the staff. An appraisal system which is development oriented provides certain conditions such as regular and constant feedback, providing an opportunity for staff to discuss appraisal results with their heads of departments, providing regular in-service training amongst others.

Tables 7, 8 9, 10 and 11 present are data on perception of staff on how appraisal promotes their career development.

Table 7

Extent to which Respondents' Agree or Disagree that Appraisal Promotes Career Development.

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	4	3.6
Agree	10	8.9
Disagree	64	57.1
Strongly disagree	34	30.4
Total	112	100

From Table 7, 4 (3.6 %) of the respondents strongly agreed that appraisal was beneficial to their career development, 10 (8.9 %) agreed, as many as 64 (57.1%) disagreed and 34 (30.4%) strongly disagreed with the assertion. It is clear from the table that staff do not think that the appraisal process is beneficial to their career development. This could be attributable to a number of factors; they are either not given regular feedback, do not get opportunities to discuss the appraisal report with their manager/head of department or no opportunities are offered for staff to undertake further training to enhance their competence after an appraisal..

The researcher therefore decided to find out from the respondents how often they received feedback on their appraisal. This is necessary because

feedback will help them identify their strengths and improve upon their weaknesses. The results gotten are presented in the Table 8.

Table 8

Respondents' Perception on the Frequency of Appraisal Feedback.

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Most often	4	3.6
often	7	6.3
seldom	10	8.9
Never	91	81.3
Total	112	100

From Table 8 only 4 (3.6 %) of the total respondents claimed they most often received feedback, 7 (6.3 %) received feedback often, 10 (8.9 %) seldom or rarely received any feedback; in other words they do not remember the last time they received any feedback. In all 21 (18.8 %) of the respondents have ever received some form of feedback with as many as 91 (81.3 %) never receiving any form of feedback on their appraisal.

The findings support an earlier study by Rudman (2000) to examine the effectiveness of performance appraisal in a service trust hospital (UK). He found out that Appraisees welcomed constructive feedback in providing direction and helping to boost confidence, and also valued critical feedback but they rarely received it. Feedback is a key player as far as staff development is concerned. In the first place it helps workers to identify their strengths and their weaknesses and based on that they can draw a programme

that helps them to grow on their own. Just as Tyler's (1989) assertion that communicating clear specific expectations and giving both positive and negative feedback enables employees to know how they are doing. A lack of regular feedback will make it difficult for employees to know how well or poorly they are performing and the necessary adjustments they need to make. Organisations should not only concentrate on using appraisal to evaluate employee performance but also to help them develop in their careers.

The lack of feedback has several implications on how employees perceive the relevance of the appraisal process: They may see it as a cosmetic process and it can also kill workers confidence in the system. Just as Mani (2002) found out in a study of lower graded employees in the East California University, (US) that incredible feedback or a lack of it demotivates staff and makes them loose confidence in the process. Likewise, the management advisory committee (2001) supports the assertion that a well integrated and aligned performance management system can still face major credibility problems if the process of feedback is not well handled.

Overall, a lack of feedback in any appraisal process suggests that the process is jeered towards merely evaluating employees without an intention of helping them develop. A combination of the evaluative and developmental aspects will produce a better productive workforce.

Still in a bid to find out from respondents how developmentally oriented the appraisal is to staff, the researcher decided to find out from those who received feedback whether they had the chance to discuss the report with their heads of department. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Extent to which Staff Agree or Disagree with the Assertion that Opportunities are provided for them to Discuss Appraisal Results with Heads of Department.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	1	4.8
Agree	3	14.2
Disagree	4	19.0
Strongly disagree	13	61.9
Total	21	100

From Table 9, a total of 4 respondents (19.0%) said there was an opportunity to discuss the appraisal report with the head of department while as many as 17 (80.9%) of the respondents said there was no opportunity to discuss the report with their heads. The implication is that even majority of the few who had feedback (80.9%) did not get the opportunity to discuss the report with their heads.

Developmentally oriented performance appraisal is supposed to create opportunities for dialogue between a manager and his / her staff about both individual and organizational objectives and needs. This according to Roberts (2003) is advantageous because it helps in enhancing an employee's personal competence and also in expanding their employability and career advancement. However as indicated by statistics in Table 9, staff perceive very little emphasis on career development because activities that are supposed to help in staff development are not given prominence.

When employees get the chance to discuss the appraisal report with their managers, it is a sure way of helping them develop in their career. Since their strengths and weakness will be made known to them and they can ask the managers for clarification which will help improve upon their skills at work. It also affords heads the opportunity to congratulate their staff on satisfactory performance which goes a long way to boost their morale.

However, as it stands now majority of the staff do not get the opportunity to discuss the report with their heads. In such a situation mistakes will go uncorrected and an opportunity to learn new ideas is often lost. PettiJohn, Pettijohn and Taylor (1999) discovered the importance of having an opportunity to discuss the appraisal report with one's manager in a survey of retail salesmen and retail managers to find out whether properly conducted appraisals would affect sales force productivity. They concluded that if there was open discussion on the appraisal results with one's manager, it could improve performance of sales people. Heads of department in Universities are often preoccupied with other activities to the extent that they scarcely make time for such activities. There is therefore the need for management to allot time for heads to undertake such activities and if possible supervise these processes.

Still in a bid to find out how the appraisal process helps in staff development, the researcher decided to find out from staff the kind of training programmes that they attended after their appraisal as a way of helping them improve upon their skills. The emphasis here is on courses staff were made to attend after the appraisal results revealed that they lacked skills in certain areas. The results gotten are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Courses Workers Attended after Appraisal.

Responses	Respondents	Percent
Training programmes offered by UEW	18	16.1
External courses	13	11.0
Others	7	6.3
None	74	66.1
Total	112	100

The responses in Table 10 indicate that, 18 (16.1%) respondents attended training and development courses offered by the University after their appraisal. those who attended external courses were 13 (11.0%), 7 (6.3%) attended other courses and 74 (66.1%) did not attend any course after their appraisal. The implication is that training programmes are rarely organized for staff after an appraisal.

This is in line with Bowles and Coates (1993) finding in their survey of 250 West Midlands (USA) of large companies from all industries. They found out that when the benefits of appraisal are ranked in order of priority, identifying training needs of employees was the least beneficial among other benefits of appraisal as perceived by the staff. This finding is however in contrast to Wilson and Western's (2001) assertion that performance appraisal is widely regarded as the main instrument for identifying training and development needs at the individual level.

Research Question 4: In What Ways does Performance Appraisal Improve Staff Performance from the view point of Senior Staff?

Every human resource activity is usually jeered towards improvement of the organisation. Appraisals should not therefore be conducted for their sake but have an impact on workers performance and their motivation to make it worth while. The views of staff on the various ways in which appraisal contributes to staff performance and motivation is presented below.

Table 11

Staff Views on Ways Performance Appraisal has Improved their Performance

Ways appraisal improves performance	Strongly agree	agree	disagree	Strongly Disagree
Improved my skills at work	10(8.9%)	14(12.5%)	50(44.6%)	38(33.9%)
Became more diligent and thoughtful at work	14(12.5%)	27(24.1%)	39(34.8%)	32(28.6%)
Minimized errors at work	9(8.4%)	22(19.6%)	44(39.3%)	37(33.0%)
Perform tasks accurately within limited time	12(10.7%)	22(19.6%)	36(32.1%)	42(37.5%)
No impact it's a technical requirement	37(33.0)	42(37.5%)	18(16.0%)	15(13.4%)

From Table 11, 50 (44.6%) of the respondents disagreed that Performance appraisal improved their skills at work; 38 (33.9%) strongly

disagreed, 14 (12.5%) agreed with just 10 (8.9%) strongly agreeing that Performance appraisal has helped improve their skills at work. This might be because results of Performance appraisal are not used to help workers develop professionally. A total of 41 (36.6%) of the respondents agreed that performance appraisal helped them to put more diligence and thought into their work, with as many as 71(63.4%) disagreeing that performance appraisal helped them put more diligence and thought in their work. only 31 (26.8%) of the respondents said performance appraisal helped them to work with minimal errors with as many as 81 (72.3%) indicated it didn't. An implication the process was not developmental in nature.

A total of 34 (30.3%) of the respondents were of the view that the process improved their performance by helping them perform task accurately within limited time. While 78 (69.6%) did not see the process helped them to perform their duties faster than before. A significant number of the respondents (70.5%) actually considered it a technical requirement and so did not perceive any impact on their job performance. The general perception with regards to this question is that, performance appraisal plays a very little role in improving performance. This could be attributed to the fact that the developmental role of performance appraisal has been ignored.

If the performance appraisal process of the university is aimed at improving performance, it must focus not only on evaluating staff but also putting mechanisms in place to identify employees' weaknesses and helping them to overcome them. Workers need an improvement in their skills to be more effective. Otherwise workers can be diligent but if their skills are not constantly upgraded it may not lead to an improvement in their performance.

The findings affirm that of Simmons (2002) in his study to gain academic staff perspectives and expectations of performance appraisal. He found out appraisees did not think appraisal contributed in improving their performance which they attributed to incompetence on the part of appraisers. The implication is that what the appraiser does or fail to do has an effect on the way staff perceive the effectiveness of performance appraisal. For instance, when appraisal is conducted just for the sake of it, without providing consistent feedback, training and development needs of employees, and opportunities for workers to discuss appraisal reports with their managers, it is very likely that the process will not lead to an improvement in staff performance.

Similarly, Davies and Landa (1999) conducted a study into the internal systems within organizations acknowledged to be intrinsic to its success. In their findings only, 39% of the respondents reported that appraisal, was helpful in improving their on the job–performance. Their study concluded that appraisal was a whip in the hands of management. This was because the respondents perceived the process was mainly used to ensure compliance to organisational rules.

These findings also affirm Khoury and Analou (2004) in their study of 22 universities on how performance appraisals are experienced by faculty members in universities. The study concluded that poorly conducted appraisals partly attributable to secrecy and lack of feedback resulted in low morale, demotivation and dissatisfaction.

This finding however, contrast Pettijohn, Pettijohn and Taylor (1999) in their survey of retail sales persons and retail managers on whether properly

conducted appraisals could improve sales force productivity and turnover. The study concluded that when an organization has more appraisals which have clear criteria to measure performance it could lead to an improvement in performance.

Summary of Discussion

A summary of answers to the various research questions is presented below. The answers to research question one was derived from the questionnaire items given out. Majority of the staff respondents representing 78.3% of senior staff were of the view that performance appraisal should be used in a developmental way. The only evaluative aspect of the appraisal which had quite a number of respondents supporting it was that results should be used to promote and increase salaries. This is an indication that quite a few wanted to be rewarded for good performance.

The general perception of staff about the university's appraisal system is that it is evaluative in nature since much emphasis is laid on making people comply with laid down regulations. Close to 80% think Performance appraisal does not promote the career development of the staff. This could be attributable to the fact that staff do not get consistent feedback from their appraisal. Also, training programmes are seldom organized for them to help improve their skills and a significant number of respondents do not even get the opportunity to discuss results with their heads of department. The lack of adequate development activities in the appraisal system could therefore be a reason why staff do not think it helps in their career development.

Very few of them, thought it helped in improving their performance. Also, since feedback is seldom given, staff do not perceive the process helps

them to identify their weaknesses and improve upon their strengths. Consequently, they do not think the process helps in improving their performance. In fact, majority consider it a technical requirement with no impact on their performance.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study was conducted to find the perception of senior staff of University of Education Winneba on the use of performance appraisal and some of the ways in which appraisal has improved on their job performance. Performance Appraisals should serve both evaluative and developmental purposes. However, in most public institutions, the process is more evaluative than developmental. As a result, staff do not perceive any improvement in their work as a result of appraisal.

Summary

For this study, 120 senior staff from the University of Education, Winneba campus served as subjects of the research. The quota sampling technique was used in selecting them. A questionnaire was designed and used in collecting information for the study. For maximum response rate and effective collection of questionnaire, they were hand-delivered to the 120 respondents out of which 112 were collected. The researcher used three weeks to collect the completed questionnaires.

Frequencies and percentages were used in analysing the data and the results displayed in tables. The frequency of responses given to a set of items on the questionnaire that dealt with issues on appraisal use was pooled. These results were then used as the basis for determining the perception of staff

relating to appraisal usage and their perception. The following findings were identified.

- 1 Staff of University of Education perceive appraisal as a process supposed to help management find out how workers are performing their jobs with the aim of helping them overcome obstacles on their way to high performance. To them the process should help in providing consistent feedback that will help in staff development, by creating opportunities to discuss appraisal report with their heads as well as providing training opportunities that will help them to continue to grow and develop in their careers. It is important to note that the workers are not against evaluative appraisal per say, but they think even if the system evaluates, there should be developmental elements to make the process more effective and worthwhile.
- 2 The perception of the staff on the university's appraisal system is that it is predominantly evaluative. In other words the whole process is aimed at finding out how well staff are complying with laid down regulations so far as performance of their duties are concerned. To them results are used to reward loyal workers in the form of pay increases, promotion etc and to punish workers who do not seem to be working so hard by either demoting them, denying them promotion or laying them off.

The senior staff feel little or no effort is made at helping workers progress in their career. Feedback which is very necessary in developmentally oriented appraisals is seldom given as a result the

system does not help staff to discover their strengths and weaknesses for them to work at improving them. Few or no opportunities are provided for workers to discuss results with their heads and yet still very few of them get opportunities to go for on the job training after their appraisal.

- 3 Staff perceive the appraisal process does little to contribute to their career development. This is largely attributable to the fact they are not given constant feedback, a lot of them do not get the opportunity to discuss the appraisal report with their heads; training programs are seldom organized after an appraisal to help workers improve upon their weaknesses.

An appraisal system that is developmentally oriented should consider feedback, identifying and providing training and development needs as well as creating opportunities for workers to discuss the appraisal report with their heads. All such activities help workers to grow in their careers and could make workers more competent in their jobs. Training programmes are organized mostly when there is something new to be learnt, the emphasis is not on helping workers who have problems to find solutions.

- 4 Majority of the staff did not think appraisal made them more competent in their work places since they did not have any feedback that would enable them build on their strengths and improve upon their weaknesses. Neither did they think that the process made them diligent or thoughtful or helped to perform task accurately which all boils down

to the lack of feedback. In fact, more than 70% see it as a technical requirement with little or no impact on their performance which can be attributed to lack of staff development programmes after an appraisal.

Conclusions

A critical look at the results make it worthwhile to conclude that senior staff of University of Education Winneba think that appraisal should be used in a developmental way; this to them will help them grow in their career which will eventually lead to an improvement in their performance. However, their perception of the university's appraisal system is one which is more evaluative than developmental. As such the staff feel that the appraisal process has had little or no improvement on their job performance.

From the responses gathered, the researcher is of the opinion that the appraisal process of the university is more evaluative than developmental since feedback is not consistent, training opportunities are seldom organized for staff after an appraisal and rare opportunities are offered for staff to discuss the report with their heads of department.

The researcher also thinks the process does very little in improving workers performance; since workers do not think that it makes them more competent in their work and the developmental aspects of the appraisal are not given prominence. The researcher shares the sentiments of Rudman et al (2000) which have already been expressed in the work that; even though many organisations claim they conduct appraisal for staff development purposes, but in reality however, it takes second place. For appraisal to be more effective it should not only tend to evaluate but also provide opportunities for staff

development. This will help in improving performance and make the system worthwhile.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made for improving the appraisal process in the University of Education, Winneba.

- 1 The staff perception of an appraisal is one which performs both evaluative and developmental roles. Therefore for appraisal to achieve maximum results and have the support of staff it should not only seek to evaluate but also create opportunities for staff development.
- 2 The university's entire appraisal system should be revised to make it more development oriented so that the appraisal process will be beneficial to both the institution and the individual since that will help in making workers more effective and consequently help in improving productivity. This is necessary because the respondents think the appraisal is there only to serve the needs of the university by making workers comply with laid down regulations.
- 3 Mechanisms should be put in place to ensure that Heads of Departments in the university provide consistent feedback to appraisees. In fact they should be educated on the need to provide consistent feedback on appraisal. The university can also set up a body to monitor the consistency of appraisal feedback. A motivational package could also be given to Heads who consistently give feedback whilst sanctions are meted out to those who fail to do so. These

measures are necessary because the role of feedback in an effective appraisal cannot be overemphasized.

- 4 Training programmes should be drawn or recommended for workers who have problems with certain aspects of their jobs after an appraisal to make appraisal more development oriented. For example, the university can provide funds to the various departments to undertake refresher courses for staff after an appraisal. Those workers who also need training outside the university should also be given the opportunity to undertake such courses after an appraisal.
- 5 Opportunities should also be created for appraisees to discuss appraisal reports with immediate supervisors. Specific times can be set aside either by the university or the department head to undertake such an activity. Development oriented performance appraisal should create opportunities for dialogue between a manager and his / her staff after an appraisal. Discussing the appraisal report with ones manager helps the employee to discover his/her strengths and weakness and also helps them to get clarification on aspects of the appraisal which they do not understand. This will help improve upon their skills at work. It also affords heads the opportunity to congratulate their staff on satisfactory performance which goes a long way to boost their morale.
- 6 There is also the need for a constant evaluation of the university's appraisal system by ascertaining the views of staff on the appraisal process at any given time to enable management design an appraisal system which can take care of both the needs of staff and the organization.

Suggestions for Further Research

Workers perceive that when performance appraisal is used mainly as an evaluative tool, it contributes very little in improving job performance as a result the researcher recommends further studies in the following areas.

- 1 Perception of heads of department on effective performance appraisal.
- 2 The relationship between appraisal use and employee attitudes.
- 3 Challenges of effective performance appraisal in universities in Ghana.
- 4 The relationship between appraisal use and employee commitment.

REFERENCES

- Amedahe, F. K. (2002). *Fundamentals of Educational Research Methods*. Cape Coast, UCC: Mimeograph.
- American Association of University Professors (1998). Post-tenure review: An AAUP response: *Academe*, 84(5), 61-72.
- American Association of University Professors (2001). Post-tenure Review: An AAUP response: *Academe*, 45(2), 7- 12.
- Anderson, J. R. (1993). *Managing performance appraisal systems*, Blackwell: Oxford.
- Anderson, J. R. (2002). *Measuring Human Capital: Performance Appraisal Effectiveness*. Paper presented at the Human Resource Track. Midwest Academy of management conference.
- Armstrong, M., & Applebaum, M. (2003). *Stress free performance appraisals: Turn your most painful management duty into a powerful motivational tool*. Franklin Lakes, NJ: Career Press.
- Armstrong, M. & Baron, A. (2000). *Performance Management-The new realities*. London: CIPD.
- Armstrong, M. (1992). *Human resource management: Strategy and action*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Armstrong, M. (1996). *Employee Reward*. London: Institute of Personnel Development.
- Arnold, E., & Pulich, M. (2003). Personality conflicts and objectivity in Appraising Performance. *The Health care, Manager*, 22(3), 227.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C. & Razavieh, A. (1990). *Introduction to Research in Education*, (4th ed.). Chicago: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston Inc.
- Austin, J. T., Villanova, P., Kane, J. S. & Bernardin, H. J. (1991). Construct validation of performance measures: issues, development and evaluation of indicators, *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 9, JAI Press, Greenwich.
- Australian Universities Quality Agency (2004). About AUQA. Retrieved May 12, 2009, from www.auqa.edu.au/aboutauqa/auqaainfo/index.shtml.
- Autry, J. A. (2001) *The servant leader*. Roseville, CA: Prima Publishing.
- Bacal, R. (1999). *Performance Management USA*: McGraw-Hill.

- Baker, J., Jr. (1988). *Causes of failure in performance appraisal and supervision*. USA : Greenwood press Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Barry, J., Chandler, J., & Clark, H. (2001). Between the ivory tower and the academic assembly line. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38 (1), 87-101.
- Bell, L. (1992). *Managing teams in secondary schools*. London: Routledge.
- Bell, L., & Day, C. (Eds.) (1991). *Managing the professional development of teachers*. Philadelphia: Open University.
- Bennet, N., Glatter, R., & Leva`cic`, R. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving educational management through research and consultancy*. London : Chapman.
- Bennett, H., Lister, M., & McManus, M. (1992). *Teacher appraisal: survival and beyond*. London: Longman.
- Bennett, J. B., & Chater, S. S. (1984) Evaluating the performance of tenured faculty members. *Educational Record*, 65, 38-41.
- Bernardin, H. J. (2003). *Human Resource Management: An experiential approach*, (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Pence, E. G. (1980). The effects of rater training: Creating new response sets and decreasing accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66, 6-60.
- Best, J. W. & Kahn, J. V. (1989). *Research in Education*. USA: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Bollington, R., Hopkins, D., & West, M. (1990). *An introduction to teacher appraisal*. London: Cassell.
- Bone, A. & Bowner, T. (1998). Developing university managers: *Higher Education Quarterly*, 52(3), 283-99.
- Boswell, W. R., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). Employee Satisfaction with performance Appraisals Appraisers: The Role of Perceived Appraisal Use. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 11(3), 283-299.
- Bowles, M. L., & Coates, G. (1993). Image and substance: The Management of Performance as Rhetoric or reality? *Personnel Review*, 22(2), 3-21.

- Boyne, G. A. (2003). What is public service improvement? *Public Administration*, 81(2), 28-45.
- Bozionelos, N. (2001). Organizational Downsizing and career development. *Career Development International*, 6(2), 87.
- Bracken, D. W. (1994). Straight talk about multi-rater feedback. *Training and Development*, 48 (9) 44-51.
- Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (1999). *Human resource management* (2nd ed.). London: Macmillan Business.
- Brown, W., Deakin, S., Hudson, H., Pratten, C., & Ryan, P. (1998). *The individualisation of employment contracts in Britain*. London: Department of Trade and Industry.
- Bruce, W. (1997). Deciding what's important in pay for performance. *HR Monthly*, March, 6-7.
- Bryson, J., Burns, J., Hanson, M., Lambie, H., & Ryan, R. (1999). Performance pay systems and equity. *Human Resource Management*, 36, 22-30.
- Burgess, R.G. (1993). *Implementing in-service education training*. London: Campus Review.
- Chow, I. H. S. (1994). An opinion survey of performance appraisal practices in Hong Kong and the People's Republic of China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 32, 3- 72.
- Cole, K. (2001). *Supervision The Theory and Practice of Firstline management* (2nd Ed.). Frenchs Forests NSW: Pearson Education Australia.
- Commerce Clearing House. (2000). *Employee assessment, appraisal and counselling*. Melbourne: CCH Australia Ltd.
- Compton, R. (2005). Performance management: Panacea or corporate outcast? *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 13, (1), 46-54.
- Conger, J., & Toegel, G. (2003). Action learning and multi-rater feedback as leadership development interventions: Popular but poorly deployed. *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4), 332-348.
- Cozby, P. C. (1993). *Methods in Behavioural Research*. California: Matfield Publishing Company.
- Craft, A. (1996). *Continuing professional development: A practical guide for teachers and schools*. London : Routledge.

- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317-372.
- Darboe, K. (2000). An empirical study of the social correlates of job satisfaction among plant science graduates of a Midwestern university: A test of Victor H. Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences*, 61 (5-A), 2054.
- Davies, B., Ellison, L., Osborne, A., & West-Burnham, J. (1990). *Educational management for the 1990s*. London : Pitman.
- Davies, T., & Landa, M. (1999). A contrary look at employee performance appraisal. *The Canadian Magazine*, 24(3), 18-21.
- Davis, J. R. (1997). Assessing what professors do: An introduction to academic performance appraisal in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education* 68 (1), 112-5.
- Dean, E., Kathawala, Y., & Wayland, R. (1992). Traditional Performance Appraisal Systems: The Deming challenge. *Management Decision*, 30 (8), 42-49.
- Deming, W. E. (1989). *Out of the Crisis*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Dickensen, C. (1997). *Managing for performance: Why, what and how to proceed: AVCC Staff Development and Training Program Division*. Queensland, Q.U.T. Acacia Computing Services Pty. Ltd.
- Dunphy, D. (1987). The historical development of human resource management in Australia. *Human Resource Management Australia*, 34, 7-40.
- Dunphy, D. C., & Hackman, B. K. (1988). Performance appraisal as a strategic intervention. *Human Resource Management Australia*, 40, 23-34.
- Edmonstone, J. (1996). Appraising the state of performance appraisal. *Health Manpower Management*, 22(6), 13-19.
- Edwards, M. R., & Ewen, J. A. (1996). *360-degree feedback: the powerful new model for employee assessment and performance improvement*. New York: AMACOM.
- Encel, S. (1990). *Higher Education in Australia after the White Paper*, (Eds.), C. Bridges, Sir Robert Menzies, Centre for Australian Studies, University of London: London.

- Fidler, B., & Cooper, R. (Eds.). (1992). *Staff appraisal and staff management in school and colleges: A guide to implementation*. Essex: Longman.
- Fisher, C. D., Schoenfeldt, L. F., & Shaw, J. B. (1999). *Human Resource Management*, (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fletcher, C., & Bailey, C. (2003). Assessing self-awareness: Some issues and methods. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(5), 395-404.
- Fletcher, C. (1993). Appraisal : An idea whose time has gone? *Personnel Management*, 25(9), 34-37.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 74(4), 473-487.
- Fletcher, C. (1999). The implication of research on gender differences in self assessment and 360-degree assessment. *Human Resource Management journal*, 39-46.
- Folger, R., and Cropanzano, R., (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Garavan, T. N., Marley, M., & Flynn M. (1997). 360 degree feedback: Its role in employee development. *Journal of Management Development*, 16(2), 134-147.
- Gay, L. R. (1992). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application* (4th Ed.). New York: Merrill/Macmillan.
- Giano, S. V., & Kleiner, B. H. (2001). New developments concerning wrongful termination in academic institutions. *Managerial Law*, 43 (1/2) 8-32.
- Gibbons, M. (1998). *Higher education relevance in the 21st century*. Paper presented at the World Conference on Higher Education, Paris.
- Gilchrist, C. (2003). The performance relationship. *New Zealand Management*, 21-22.
- Goddard, I., & Emerson, C. (1993). *Appraisal and your school*. London : Atheneum.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 561-568.
- Grint, K. (1993). What's wrong with performance appraisals? A critique and a suggestion. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 3, 61-77.

- Groeschl, S. (2003). Cultural implications for the appraisal process. *Cross Cultural Management*, 10 (1), 67-79.
- Harrison, K., & Goulding, A. (1997). Performance appraisal in public libraries. *New Library World*, 98(7), 275-280.
- Henderson, R. (1980). *Performance appraisal: Theory top Practice*. Virginia: Reston Publishing Company, Inc.
- Henson, S. (1994). *No escape from judgement appraisal and PRP in higher education*, Portsmouth: University of Portsmouth.
- Hewton, E. (1990). *The Appraisal interview: An approach to training for teachers and school management*. Philadelphia: Open University.
- Higgins, E.T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52(12), 1280-1300.
- Holley, D., & Oliver, M. (2000). Pedagogy and the new power relationships. *International Journal of Management Education*, 1 (1), 11-21.
- Hort, L. (1997). *Performance appraisal and management of academic staff: What is wrong with making us more accountable?* NTEU Professional Development Paper, Retrieved May 20, 2009 from www.nteu.org.au/policy/current/profdvlpmnt/1304.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1991). *Educational Administration- Theory, Research and Practice* (4th ed). New York: McGraw –Hill.
- Issac, R.G., Zerbe, W.J., & Pitt, D.C. (2001). Leadership and motivation: The effective application of expectancy theory. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13(2), 212.
- Jackson, M. P. (1999). The role of the head of department in managing performance in UK universities. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 13(3), 142-9.
- Johnson, D. (1994). *Research methods in educational management*. Essex: Longman.
- Johnson, E. (1995). *Total quality management and performance appraisal: To be or not to be?* Auckland: Longman Paul Limited.
- Johnson, S. M. (1990). *Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools*. New York: Basic Books.
- Khoury, G. C., & Analoui, F. (2004). *Innovative management model for performance appraisal*. London: Kingsley Publishers.

- Kaplan, R., & Norton, D. (1992). The balanced scorecard—Measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 24, 85-90.
- Kaplan, R., & Norton, D. (1996). Using the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system. *Harvard Business Review*, 40, 183-211.
- Khoury, G. C., & Analoui, F. (2004). Innovative management model for performance appraisal: The case of the Palestinian public universities. *Management Research News*, 27 (1/2), 57-73.
- Kikoski, J. K., (1999). Effective communication in the performance appraisal interview: Face-to-Face communication for Public Managers in the culturally Diverse Workplace. *Public personnel Management*, 28 (2), 301-322.
- Kydd, L., Crawford, M., & Riches, C. (Eds.). (1997). *Professional development for educational management*. Buckingham: Open University.
- Lam, S. S. K., & Schaubroeck, (1999). Total quality management and performance appraisal: an experimental study of process versus results and group versus individual approaches. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 445-457.
- Lansbury, R. (1988). Performance management: A process Approach. *Human Resource Management Australia*, 34, 46-55.
- Lawson, M. (1996). Soft bosses ignoring problem workers, survey finds: *Australian Financial Review*, 56, 4-6.
- Leatherman, C. (2000). Despite their gripes, professors are generally pleased with careers, poll finds. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46, 26-19.
- Lewis, P. (1993). Performance-related pay in higher education: Nine lessons ... but no songs of praise. *Education & Training, London*, 35 (2), 11-5.
- Longenecker, C. O., & Gioia, D. A. (1988). Neglected at the top: Executives talk about executive appraisal. *Sloan Management Review*, 29, 8-41.
- Longenecker, C. O., Sims, H., P., Jr., & Gioia, D. A. (1987). Behind the Mask. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 1 (3), 183-193.
- Lonsdale. (1996). *Performance management: The fourth generation*. Melbourne: Campus Review.
- Lonsdale, A. & Varley, P. (1995). *The operation of academic staff appraisal schemes in Australian universities during the trial period*. Carlton, Victoria: Australian Higher Education Industrial Association.

- Macky, K., & Johnson, G. (2000). *The Strategic Management of Human Resources in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.
- Management Advisory Committee. (2001). Performance management in the Australian public service: A strategic framework. *Human Resource Management* 3 (6), 10-12.
- Mani, B. G. (2002). Performance appraisal systems, productivity, and motivation. *A study of Public Personnel Management*, 31 (2), 141-159.
- Marginson, S. (1993). *Education and public policy in Australia*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Martey, A. K. (2002). Appraising the performance of library staff in a Ghanaian academic library. *Library Management*, 23 (8/9) 16-23.
- Mathis, R. L. (2004). Pay for performance: Keeping up with changing times. *Rural Telecommunications*, 23 (6), 34-9.
- McAdam, R., Hazlett, S., & Casey, C. (2005). Performance management in the UK public sector: Addressing multiple stakeholder complexity. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 18 (3), 73-256.
- McCarthy, A., & Garavan, T. (2001). 360 degree feedback process, improvement and career Development. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 25, 1-5.
- McGregor, D. (1972). An uneasy look at performance appraisal. *Harvard Business Review*, 50(5), 133-138.
- McKirchy, K. (1998). *Powerful performance appraisals: How to set expectations and work together to improve performance*. Franklin Lakes, N.J., Career Press.
- Meek, V. L. (1991). The transformation of Australian higher education: From binary to unitary system. *Higher Education*, 21 (4), 11-43.
- Meek, V. L., & Wood, F. Q. (1997). *Higher education governance and management: An Australian study*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Miller, H. (1996). Academics and their Labour process in White-collar work. Smith, C., Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (Eds.), *The non-manual Labor process*. London: Macmillan.
- Miller, M. A. (1999). State-level post-tenure review policies. *Innovative Higher Education*, 24 (1), 17-24.

- Mondy, R. W., Noe, R. M. & Premeaux, S. R. (1999). *Human Resource Management*, 7th edn New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Montgamery, D., & Hadfield, N. (1989). *Practical teacher appraisal*. London: Kogan.
- Morris, L. (2005). *Performance appraisal in Australian universities—imposing a managerialistic framework into a collegial culture*. Paper presented to AIRAANZ, Deakin University.
- Moses, I. (1999). Tensions and tendencies in the management of quality and autonomy in Australian higher education. *Australian Universities Review*, 1, 11-5.
- Moses, I. (1988). *Academic staff evaluation and development: A university case study*, St Lucia, University of Queensland Press.
- Mouton, J. (1996). *Understanding social research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1991). *Performance Appraisal An organizational perspective*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Murphy, K. R., Cleveland, J. N., Skattebo, A, L., Kinney, T. B., (2004). Raters who pursue different goals give different ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 158-164.
- Nankervis, A. & Leece, P. (1997). Performance appraisal: Two steps forward, one step back? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 35 (2), 80-92.
- Paget, N., Baldwin, G., Hore, T., & Kermond, B. (1992). *Staff appraisal procedures in Australian higher education institutions*. Canberra: AGPS.
- Pfeffer, J. (1998). *The human equation*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Painter, C. N. (2003). Ten steps for improved appraisals. *Supervision* 64 (10), 12.
- Peterson, D., Kromrey, J., & Smith, D.C. (1990). Research-based teacher evaluation: A response to Scriven. Schwab, L. (Eds.), *Research based teacher evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer.
- Peterson, K. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: a comprehensive guide to new directions and Practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

- Pettijohn, L. S., Pettijohn, C. E., & Taylor, A. J. (1999). An empirical investigation of the relationship between retail sales force performance appraisal, performance and turnover. *Journal of marketing theory & practice*, 7 (1), 39-52.
- Pfeffer, J., Veiga, J. F., Hatano, T., & Santalainen, T. (1995). Producing sustainable competitive advantage through the effective management of people. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 9 (1), 55-62.
- Picket, L. (2000). People make the difference. *HR Monthly*, 26, 9-28.
- Poster, C., & Poster, D. (1991). *Teacher appraisal: A guide to training*. London: Routledge.
- Redman, T., Snape, E., Thompson, D., & Yan, F. K. C. (2000). Performance Appraisal in an NHS Hospital. *Human Resource management Journal*, 10(1), 48-62.
- Regal, R. W., & Hollman, R. W. (1987). Gauging performance objectively. *Personnel Administrator*, 32(6), 78-80.
- Robbins, S. P. (2000). *Organizational behaviour* (9th Ed). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Roberts, G. E. (2002). Employee performance appraisal systems participation: A technique that works. *Public Personnel Management*, 31, 33-42.
- Roberts, G. E. (2003). Employee Performance Appraisal system Participation: A Technique That Works. *Public personnel Management*, 32(1), 89-98.
- Rudman, R. (2003). *Human Resource Management*. New Zealand: Pearson Education, New Zealand Limited.
- Sarantakos, S. (1998). *Social research* (2nd ed). South Melbourne: MacMillan Education Australia.
- Scholtes, P. R. (1998). *The leaders Handbook. A Guide to Inspiring Your People And Managing The Daily Workflow*. USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Scott, D. (2001). The performance appraisal: what employers should know? *New Hampshire Business Review* 23(18), 24-29.
- Sergovianni, T.J., & Starrat, R.J. (1988). *Human perspective* (4th ed.). New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Shelly, S. (1999). Diversity of Appraisal and Performance- related Pay Practices in Higher Education. *Personnel review*, 28 (5/7), 436-439.

- Sheppard, J.A. (1993). Productivity loss in performance groups: A motivation analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(1), 67-81.
- Simmons, J. (2002). An expert witness perspective on performance appraisal in universities and colleges. *Employee Relations*, 24 (1/2), 86-100.
- Simons, H., & Elliot, J. (Eds.) (1990). Rethinking appraisal and assessment. *Managing performance*, 26(3), 12-30.
- Skarlicki, D.P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434-443.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and Human Behaviour*. New York: Free Press.
- Smith, R. (1995). *Successful school management*. London: Cassell.
- Solomon, G.B. (2001). Performance and personality impressions cues as predictors of athletic performance: An extension of expectancy theory. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 32(1), 88-100.
- Spinks, N., Wells, B., & Meche, M. (1999). Appraising the Appraisals: computerized performance Appraisal systems. *Career Development international*, 4(2), 94-100.
- Squelch, J., & Lemmer, E. (1994). *Eight keys to effective school management in South Africa*. Durban: Southern publishers.
- Stone R. J. (2002). *Human resource management*. (4th Ed.). Milton: Australia.
- Storey, A. (2000). A leap of faith? Performance pay for teachers: *Journal of Education Policy*, 15(5), 23-509.
- Storey, J., & Sisson, K. (1993). *Managing human resources and industrial relations*. Buckingham: The Open University Press.
- Taylor, P., & O'Driscoll, M. (1993). Functions and implementation of performance appraisal in New Zealand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 31(1), 20-32.
- Taylor, T., Gough, J., Bundrock, V., & Winter, R. (1998). A bleak outlook: Academic staff *Telecommunications*, 23 (6), 34-9.
- Thomas, S. L. & Bretz, R. D. J. (1994). Research and practice in performance appraisal: Evaluating employee performance in America's largest companies. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 59(2), 28-34.
- Thomas, S. L. (1997). Performance appraisals: Any use for training? *Business Forum*, 57(5), 31-45.

- Townley, B. (1990). The politics of appraisal: lessons of the introduction of appraisal into UK universities. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 1 (1), 27-44.
- Townley, B. (1992). Selection and appraisal: reconstituting social relations. Storey, J. (Ed.), *New Perspectives on Human Resource Management*, (chapter 6). London: Routledge.
- Tully, S. (1994). Why go for stretch targets? *Fortune*, 130 (10), 95-100.
- Turner, G., & Clift, P. (1988). *Studies in teacher appraisal*. London : Falmer.
- Tyler, K. (1997). Careful criticism brings better performance. *HR Magazine*, 42 (4), 57.
- Tyler, T.R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(5), 830-838.
- Tziner, A., & Latham, G. P. (1989). The effects of appraisal instrument, feedback and goal-setting on worker satisfaction and commitment. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 10(2), 145-153.
- Tziner, A., & Murphy, K. R. (1999). Additional evidence of attitudinal influences in performance appraisal. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13(3).NS
- Tziner, A., Joanis, C., & Murphy, K. (2000). A comparison of three methods of performance appraisal with regard to goal properties, goal perceptions, and ratee satisfaction. *Group and Organization Management*, 25, 175-190.
- Tznier, A., Kopelman, & R.E. Livneh, N. (1993). Effects of performance appraisal format on perceived goal characteristics, appraisal process satisfaction, and changes in rated job performance: a field experiment. *The Journal of Psychology*, 127(3), 281-291.
- University of Tasmania. (2001). A review of the performance management system of the University of Tasmania. Retrieved May 12, 2009, from http://www.admin.utas.edu.au/hr/staff/perf_mgmt/pm_ext_review_200
- Van Earde, W., & Thierry, H. (1996). Vroom's expectancy models and work-related criteria: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81 (5), 575-586.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Whitehall, A. H. (1992). *Japanese management*, London: Routledge.

- Wiese, D. S., & Buckley, M. R. (1998). The Evolution of the Performance Appraisal Process. *Journal of Management History*, 4(3), 233-249.
- Williams, B. (1990). The crucial question of how we should run our universities. *The Australian*, 20 July, p. 14.
- Wilson, F. (2002). Dilemmas of Appraisal. *European Management Journal*, 20(6), 620-629.
- Wilson, F., & Nutley, S. (2003). A Critical Look at Staff Appraisal: The case of Women in Scottish Universities. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(3), 301-319.
- Wilson, J. P., & Western, S. (2001). Performance appraisal: An obstacle to training and development? *Career Development International*, 6(2), 93-99.
- Woods, R. H., Sciarini, M., & Breiter, D. (1998). Performance Appraisals in Hotels. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 39(2), 25-29.
- Wragg, E., Wikeley, F., Wragg, C., & Haynes, G. (1996). *Teacher appraisal observed*. London: Routledge.
- Wright J. N. & Race, P. (2004). *The management of service organisation* (2nd Ed). U. K., Thompson.
- Wright, J. N. (2001). *The managrment of service operations*. London: Continuum.
- Valence, S., & Fellow, H. (1999). Performance Appraisal in Singapore, Thailand and the Phillipines; A cultural perspective. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*. 15(5), 23-509.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Atwater, L. E. (1997). Implications of self-other rating agreement for human resources management. *Organisational Dynamics*, 25 (4), 35-44.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire for senior staff

This study is about performance appraisal in universities. Your responses to the following questions will be of immense help. Please don't sign your name; all responses are to remain anonymous.

Instructions

Please, fill in the spaces provided with the required information or please tick [] or write in the spaces provided below.

Section I

Biographic Data

1. Name of Department/Section/Faculty
2. Age: a 22-30 [] b. 31-36 [] c. 37-42 [] d. 43-58
[]
3. Sex: a. Male [] b. Female []
4. What is your highest academic and professional qualification?
 - i. Diploma [] ii. bachelors degree []
 - ii. Post Graduate Diploma [] iv. Masters degree []
 - v. PHD [] iv. Other [] specify.....

Section II

5. Job Title.....
6. Number of years in the University
7. How long have you been on your present job.....
8. Performance appraisal is a systematic evaluation of the individual with respect to his performance on the job and his potential for development.
- a. strongly Agree [] b. agree [] c. disagree []
- d. strongly disagree []
9. Have you ever gone through a performance appraisal?
- a. Yes [] b. no []
10. When did you last have an appraisal?
- a. Within the last 12 months [] b. Within the last six months []
- c. Other [] (approximately when).....
11. Who initiated the process
- a I [] b. My manager [] c. Others [] Please specify
12. How often is appraisal conducted in your department/Section?
- a. 6 monthly[] b. 12monthly[] c. other [] specify.....

13. Perception on the uses of performance appraisal

	SA	A	D	SD
Provide feedback to help me discover my strengths and weakness				
Helps to identify employees' lay-off/discipline.				
Provides information for determining training and development needs of employees.				
To motivate employees by providing feedback on their performance levels.				

SA = Strongly agree

A= Agree

D = Disagree

S = strongly disagree

14. Perception of appraisal use in the University's

	SA	A	D	SD
Determination of increments				
Setting work objectives				
Providing self development information				
Identification of training needs				
For lay off decisions/discipline				
Reviewing, updating job description				
Transfer decisions				

SD = strongly disagree

D = Disagree

A = Agree

SA = strongly agree

Staff development

15. The appraisal process is beneficial to your career development.

a. strongly disagree [] b. agree [] c. disagree []

d. strongly disagree []

How often do you receive feedback after an appraisal?

a. Most of the time [] b. some of the time []

c. Seldom [] d. never []

16. There was an opportunity to discuss the appraisal report with my manager?

a. strongly agree b. agree c. disagree d. strongly disagree

17. Was the feedback you received used for your career development?

Yes [] no []

18. If yes which of the following were included?

a Training and development courses offered by UEW to promote career development []

- b. External courses []
- c. Development within your faculty/directorate []
- d. Others, please specify.....

19. In which of the following ways has performance appraisal influenced your job performance.

Options	SA	A	D	SD
Improved my skills at work				
Became more diligent and thoughtful at work				
Minimized errors at work				
Perform task more perfectly within limited time				
Perform task well with minimum supervision				
No impact it's a technical requirement				

Please indicate other ways appraisal has contributed in improving your performance which have not been indicated in the table above

.....

.....

.....

20. Please comment on any issues you think are related to the appraisal process that have not been included in this questionnaire?.....

.....