UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

THE USE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN THE UNIVERSITY OF

CAPE COAST: PERCEPTION OF SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

FRANCIS KWAME ADU

2016

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

THE USE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN THE UNIVERSITY OF

CAPE COAST: PERCEPTION OF SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

BY

FRANCIS KWAME ADU

Thesis submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning andAdministration
of the College of Education Studies, University of Cape Coast, in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Master of Philosophy degree in
Administration in Higher Education

MARCH 2016

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: …………………………………………………….................

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: ………………………………………………………………….

Co-supervisor's Signature………………….….. Date……….………..

Name: …………………………………………………………….……..

ii

ABSTRACT

Performance appraisal is a mechanism for determining the performance levels of employees in any organization and based on it reward and training programmes are implemented. This study was undertaken to find out the perception of senior administrative staff oftheUniversity of Cape Coast on the use of performance appraisal in the University. It also sought to find out the various ways in which performance appraisal promotes career development and improves staff performance. A descriptive survey design was adopted for this study. Stratifiedsampling method and the lottery method of simple random sampling were used to select 210 samplesize out ofa population of 458 senior administrative staffof the University of Cape Coast. Questionnaire was the main instrument used. The questionnaire had both open ended and close-ended questions. 207 questionnaires were retrieved from respondents, representing98.6% return rate. Data collected were analysed using frequencies, mean, standard deviations and percentages. The findings revealed that 81.8% of senior administrativestaff perceives the University's appraisal system mainly being evaluative in nature. The findings also revealed that 82% and 72.2% ofsenior administrative staff perceives the University's performance appraisal system has little effect onpromoting career development and improving staff performance respectively since it is mainly evaluative than developmental. It wasrecommended that the University needs to adopt a performance appraisal system which appraisal reports of employees are discussed with immediate supervisors and based on for staff training programmes.

iii

KEY WORDS

Career development

Performance appraisal

Performance

Performance appraisal system

Perception

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

To my wife, Alberta Kpeleku and my children, Daniel and Kevin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

x

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BAS   Behaviourally Anchored Scales

BOS   Behavioural Observation Scales

GRS   Graphic Rating Scales

IPR   Individual Performance Review

NLC   National Liberation Council

PA   Performance Appraisal

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Organisations hire the services of employees for the purpose of increasing and improving productivity. Even though efforts are made during the recruitment process to ensure that people with the right knowledge and skills are employed, those who get appointment will most often possess some skills which may not be readily useful for the organisation and also some skills which fall short of what is required to perform. Also, changes in the organisation, which may be as a result of factors such as changes in technology, increase in output, change in consumer taste or expansion usually result in employee performances which differ from what is expected from management. The need to appraise the performance of staff while on the job therefore becomes necessary.

Performance appraisal goes by many terminologies. These include performance evaluation, performance review, employee evaluation, and merit evaluation (Sangweni, 2003) and progress rating, merit rating, and performance evaluation (Dawra, 2001). Noe (2005) defined performance appraisal as the measurement of specified areas of an employee's performance. This implies that the various criteria which serve as indicators of performance by an employee should be considered and assessed during appraisal. Performance appraisal is a purposeful activity. This means that it is carried out with an objective in mind. Again, the purpose of each appraisal activity could vary from another. Bratton and Gold (1999) for instance saw performance appraisal as the collection and analysis of data on the overall

1

capabilities and potentials of individual workers in an attempt to make decision in tune with a purpose while Dawra (2001) also wrote "In simple words, performance appraisal is the systematic evaluation of the individual, with respect to his performance on the job and his potential for development". Dawra explained further that appraisal also considers the personality of the employee and observed that it is usually performed by his supervisor. The definitions of Bratton and Gold (1999) and Dawra (2001) imply appraisal is for the purpose of staff development.

Thus, during performance appraisal, management should not only concern itself with measuring staff performances but also look out for potentials in staff which should be developed for the benefit of the organisation. It considers not only what the employee does on the job but also the innate qualities which are necessary for the performance of his tasks. In supporting the view that appraisal is also for developmental purposes, Beach (1980) explained performance appraisal as a systematic evaluation of the individual with respect to his performance on the job and his potential for development.

It is important to note that appraisals are carried out for the benefit of the organisation and not for its own sake. This is the view of Agyenim-Boateng (2006) that appraisal is about measuring, monitoring and enhancing the performance of employees as a contributor to the overall organisational performance. Again, Wilson and Western (2001) supported this in the statement that it is not a standalone process but an approach to creating a shared vision of the purposes and aims of the organisation, helping each

2

individual employee to understand and share the workload to achieve those aims.

Another issue worth mentioning is that appraisal in organisations is a process and not a "one shot activity" (Griffin, 1999). Thus, performance appraisal should be a continuous activity in the work place so that any conclusion that is arrived at about the individual will be a fair description and representation of that employee. This notion is supported by Gobbler (as cited in Agyenim-Boateng, 2006) who explained performance appraisal as an ongoing process of evaluation and management of both the behaviours and outcomes of employees in the work place. Appraisals are aids to creating and maintaining a satisfactory level of performance by employees on their present jobs. When the actual evaluation process is followed up with each employee, it may contribute towards more effective or improved performance on the part of many individuals.

Performance appraisal is very important to the training and development process because it is a means to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the employee. Cowling and Lundy (1996) wrote "The assessment of employee performance interface with training and development and with the organisation's employee reward system". Thus, the weaknesses and strengths of the employee identified by an appraisal process become the basis for future training and development. They explained further that the results of appraisal are used for taking important decisions like training, transfer and promotion. Performance appraisal could therefore be described as the bedrock for developing an appropriate training and development programme. It is therefore important that before any training and development

3

programme is carried out, management should first appraise staff to determine their level of performance and what knowledge, skills and attitudes fall short and should be imparted.

According to (Logogye, 2009; Donkor, 2010; Zogbator, 2011), in some universities , appraisal forms are developed by the Directorate of Human Resource Department of the Universities and passed unto immediate heads of the various departments, sections/units to appraise the performance of those under them. These heads of departments, who may also be loaded with both administrative and academic duties, fill the forms for employees to append their signatures without any form of discussions and put them in the employees' folders. The forms are usually called for when information regarding the employees are needed especially when critical decisions such as promotion, transfers or discipline are being taken.

Regular discussions of appraisal reports provide information for employees to identify their strengths and weaknesses so that they can draw up plans for personal development (Byars & Rue, 2004). When a regular discussion of appraisal reports is missing, staff may not be able to identify their weaknesses and hence draw up personal plans to overcome them. It also makes appraisal more of an evaluative tool than a developmental one. According to Edmonstone (1996), feedback from discussions of appraisal reports whether positive or negative plays a significant role in employee development and sadly this is seldom given.

Unfortunately, the views of employees on 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 study deems it important to find out the perception of senior administrative on staff how performance appraisal system is used, how performance appraisal system promotes career development and the extent to which the appraisal system improves staff performance.

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.

Some researchers (Logogye, 2009; Donkor, 2010; Zogbator, 2011) found in their research that in some universities and polytechnics appraisal forms are filled yearly by the immediate heads of departments for employees to append their signatures without any form of discussions and put them in the employees' folders only to be made use of when there is an interview for promotion or when vital decisions concerning employees are being taken. The appraisers hardly discuss with their appraisees the feedback received when appending signatures on their appraisal forms.

This led the researcher investigate into how senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast perceive the type of performance appraisal system used in the University of Cape Coast.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to find out how senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast perceive the performance appraisal system of the university in terms of how it is used and specific ways in which performance appraisal system improves career development and staff performance. The specific objectives were to:

1. find out the perceptions of senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast on how performance appraisal system is used;

2. find out the perceptions of senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast on how performance appraisal system promotes career development;

3. find out the extent to which appraisal system improves performance as perceived by senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast.

Research Questions

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

1. What are the perceptions of senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast on the uses of performance appraisal system?

Digitized by UCC, Library

2. What are the perceptions of senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast on how performance appraisal system promotes career development?

3. To what extent does appraisal system improves performance as perceived by senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast?

Significance of the Study

Information gathered from the study if published and 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. The study will help the University of Cape Coast to identify lapses in its performance appraisal system, augment the existing data and devise measures for correcting them. It will 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 help future researchers who would like to conduct a study on performance appraisal system in higher educational institutions.

The results of the study could be relied upon to improve upon the quality of support services provided to teaching and learning in higher educational institutions. This is because an effective appraisal system 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 only senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast comprising Chief Administrative Assistant, Principal Administrative Assistants, Senior Administrative Assistants and Administrative Assistants relating to their perceptions on the uses of performance appraisal system. The senior administrative staff was chosen because they have a sizeable number of experienced senior staff in terms of performance appraisal, who are in charge of mainly administrative work in all the divisions/departments/units in the university.

Limitations

In this research, a number of problems were encountered that could affect the results of the study. The main limitation observed is that even though respondents were expected to respond to all items in the questionnaire, some failed to provide answers to one or two items. 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. Again, as with all surveys, the researcher had no control over extraneous factors which could affect the results.

Definition of Terms

Senior Administrative Staff: These are middle level staff of the University of Cape Coast who work in the various departments/sections/units to support top level management, academic and technical staff (Senior Members) in their various fields of operation. They comprise Chief Administrative Assistant,

8

Principal Administrative Assistants, Senior Administrative Assistants and Administrative Assistants.

Perception: The process of noticing and making sense of information.

Performance: The employee's accomplishment of assigned tasks.

Performance appraisal: The systematic description of an employee's job; relevant strengths and weaknesses.

Performance appraisal system: Processes used to identify, encourage, measure, evaluate, improve and review employee performance.

Career development: The professional growth of an employee.

Organisation 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, delimitation , limitation of the study and definition of terms. 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

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter contains existing literature studies on performance appraisal. Specifically, the chapter attempts to review facts and opinions other researchers and writers have documented or expressed on performance appraisal. The literature review was undertaken under the following sub-headings: concepts of performance appraisal, purpose of performance appraisal, types of performance appraisal, methods of appraisal, frequency of performance appraisal, human factors in performance, appraisal system, responsibility for appraisals, use of performance appraisal, studies on perception of performance appraisals, performance appraisals in higher education institution and summary of literature review.

Concepts of Performance Appraisal

There has always been the tendency to evaluate work being done, either by others or by oneself. Formal performance appraisal systems are the offshoots of the human inclination to make judgments about work being done (Robbins and Coulter, 1999). In the absence of a method of determining whether work that is done is in accordance with an expected criterion, it will be difficult to ensure quality of products and services and whether those performing tasks need some further skills to perform their tasks efficiently. According to Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert (2006), performance appraisal is the process of measuring each employee's work against the performance standards or objectives established for the job. Creamer and Winston (1999) define performance appraisal as "an organisational system comprising deliberate processes for determining staff accomplishments to improve staff

10

effectiveness." The purpose of performance appraisal, in this context is to develop staff to make it more effective in fulfilling organisational goals.

One way to ensure that staff has the knowledge and skills needed to perform the core tasks of the universities is to regularly appraise the performance of the staff and remedy any existing gaps between expected competences and available ones through a staff development programme. Warner (1997) avers that "the performance of employees must be appraised. If they are not doing well, it is necessary to diagnose the reasons. It may show that employee training is necessary or some type of motivation should be provided." Performance appraisal involves two issues: performance, which is working at an assigned task on the job; and appraisal which measures how well or to what degree what is done is in agreement with employers and others expectations.

Heery and Noon (2001) describe appraisal as the process of evaluating the performance and assessing the development or training needs of an employee. There are two issues involved in this definition. One is measuring what is being done against a certain predetermined standard; the other is determining developmental needs and finding ways to bridge the gap between skills and competences needed to perform the assigned task and what the employee currently possess.

Noe (2005) defines performance appraisal simply as "the process of measuring employees' performance" over time. According to Mondy, Noe and Premeaux (1999), performance appraisal is an official method of regular review and evaluation of an individual's or team job performance. Performance appraisal, also called performance review, is the key aspect of

performance management. Byars and Rue (2004) describe performance appraisal as "a process that involves determining and communicating to employers how they are performing their jobs and establishing a plan for improvement." Daft and Marcic (1998) also define performance appraisal as comprising the steps of monitoring and evaluating employee performance, recording the assessment and giving feedback to the employee. In these instances, performance appraisal is seen as a process, rather than a one time annual ritual, and one that provides the employee an opportunity to improve performance.

According to Byars and Rue (2004), for performance appraisal to be effective there is the need to go through the process of:

1. Establishing clearly and precisely defined statements of objectives for work an employee is to do.

2. Developing an action plan indicating how these objectives are to be achieved.

3. Allowing the employees to implement this action plan.

4. Appraising performance based on objective achievement.

5. Taking corrective action when necessary.

6. Establishing new objectives for the future.

These views are in consonance with Harrington and Harrington's (1995) assertion that an appraisal system can only be effective and acceptable, especially to the subordinate when:

1. The right things are measured;

2. Both employees and the appraiser agree on the performance standards: and

3. There is an ongoing measurement and feedback system that provides information to the employees and managers.

Griffin (1999) explains performance appraisal as a formal assessment of how well employees are performing their jobs. This assessment could be for several reasons, apart from staff development. It could be for assessing the impact of training programmes, to help make decisions about pay increases, promotions, and training. It may also be for the purpose of providing the employees feedback to help them improve their performance and plan future careers.

Performance appraisal is the evaluation of a person or a group's performance by a well defined criterion. Nelson and Quick (2003) assert that the major purposes of performance appraisal are to provide employees feedback on performance, to identify the employees developmental needs, to make promotion and reward decisions, to make demotion and terminating decisions; and to develop information about the organisation's selection and placement decisions. Performance appraisal is not only for developmental purposes but for others as well. Jawahar and Williams (1997) indicate that in reality, performance appraisal for a purely developmental purpose has not been given much prominence in organisations. What prevails is to use performance appraisal mainly for determining wages and rewards.

Jawahar and Williams (1997) state that a major function of a good performance appraisal system is to develop people and improve careers. Developmentally, performance appraisal should emphasise individual growth needs and future performance. A good performance appraisal should thus be geared mainly towards employee development. The appraisal system should

give the employee the opportunity to take responsibility for future development and growth. This responsibility could mean challenging the superiors' ideas about future development as well as experiencing future individual preferences and goals. A properly thought out performance appraisal system will be able to evaluate the tasks an employee is performing now, how well the task is being performed in relation to organisational and individual standards and what is needed to make the employee develop to meet personal and organisational goals.

Khoury and Analoui (2004) have also described performance appraisal as the process of reviewing and evaluating how well employees are performing their tasks relative to the required performance standards. 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.

Performance appraisal is 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 summarized 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).

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 relation, with the real intent of monitoring and controlling today's more sophisticated employee by emphasising trait rating rather than job-based criteria. A study based on 100 interviews with Hong Kong Chinese line managers examined attitudes to performance appraisal in their organization (Wright, 2001). Alarmingly, line managers felt that performance appraisals did not add value or help to achieve business objectives. Additionally they thought that the forms, guideline and standards used to evaluate performance were inadequate. In particular, appraisal training was seen as having no impact.

Purpose of Performance Appraisals

Stone (2002) grouped the major purpose of performance appraisal as 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 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 (2002) 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; Development: Fulfilling the manager's role to help each employee to continue to grow and develop by removing blocks to performance, building on employee strengths

16

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); Training: Pfeffer, Veiga, Hatano and Santalainen (1995) argue 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 based on performance appraisal reports 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 study of training for appraisers made by Commerce Clearing House (2000), 77% of responding organisations in Australian indicated that they provide formal training for all their appraisers, using skill development and workshops. Although it was common for training to occur, the implementation system was little or no follow up.

Interactive method focused on conducting the interview and providing formal and ongoing informal feedback, using the appraisal forms, setting performance standards, and avoiding rating errors which may increase (Thomas, 1997; Commerce Clearing House, 2000; Mathis, 2004). Didactic training 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).

Preparation of staff generally receives less attention in terms of the time allowed to provide training although the numbers of organisations' training employees have increased (Commerce Clearing House, 2000). Given the inherent power imbalance between managers and staff that exists in any hierarchical workplace, 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 PA 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).

These groupings reflect one of the most intractable divisions that are debated in the literature, between appraisal for formative or staff development purposes (feedback, training and development) 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 performance appraisal system heavily based upon judgemental appraisal centred in an instrumental or 'hard' human resource management (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.

Types of Performance Appraisals

Formative performance appraisal: Refers to a system which enables the development of individual employees and provides them with 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 manage their own performance (Lonsdale, 1996). Employees are encouraged to learn through setting objectives, taking on new areas of work or acquiring new capabilities that enable them demonstrate additional skill or knowledge for the organisation's advantage.

Research indicates that the use of 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 performance appraisal 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 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 in formative appraisal. A well integrated and aligned formative performance appraisal system can still face major credibility problems if the process of feedback is not handled well by the immediate manager (Management Advisory Committee, 2001).

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 (Lonsdale, 1996). It seems evident that developmental feedback would be better facilitated where a relationship of mutual trust, negotiation and a problem solving orientation exists.

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 performance appraisal (PA) 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 PA 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 individual performance objectives aligned to organisational objectives or macro performance parameters 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 and are more typical of 'hard' HRM cultures (Longenecker & Gioia, 1988). Summative PA systems thus serve as a major vehicle for employee acculturation and control assessing who has performed well and distributing valued organisational rewards (especially money) for employees who comply with desired behaviours (Townley, 1992).

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 and appraisers and top management in the organization will devote little time and effort to performance appraisal reducing it to a meaningless ritualistic exercise.

Lewis (1993) points out that under these circumstances, the relationship between appraisees and appraisers is fraught with many problems. 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 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 (Lansbury, 1988).

Methods of Appraisal

Methods of performance appraisal can be grouped into two main categories. These are the informal and formal performance appraisal (Cole, 2004). Informal appraisal is adhoc in nature and involves the day-to-day assessment of an employee by his superior in the ordinary course of work. Formal appraisal is a planned event which is usually discussed between the superior and subordinate with definite terms of reference or work context and content. The two types should be used for the purpose of identifying training needs.

In addition to the informal and formal performance appraisals, performance appraisal can take a variety of methods depending on what is being measured, who is doing the measurement, how the measurement is being done and the purpose of the measurement. Some of the methods with their advantages and disadvantages are as follows:

22

1. Work Standards Approach: This is mostly used for production employees.

   According to Byars and Rue (2004), Work Standards Approach involves setting a standard or an expected level of output and then comparing each employee's performance to the standard. Marks may be awarded, depending on level of performance and efforts are made to remedy poor performances. The advantage of Work Standards Approach is that performance review is based on highly objective factors. However, this method has its weakness as lack of comparability of standards for different jobs.

2. Goal Setting or Management by Objectives (MBO): This method as ideal with professional and high calibre employees. It involves the participation of all employees in determining what should be done and how it should be done. Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart and Wright (2004) defined MBO as a system in which people at each level of the organisation set goals in a process that flows from top to bottom. So with MBO method, employees at all levels are contributing to the organisations' overall goals; these goals become the standards for evaluating each employee's performance. It is worth mentioning that for MBO to be successful, the objectives set should be clear, concise and unambiguous. Also, they should be measurable, attainable and challenging. Finally, both the employee and manager should regularly discuss and review the objectives and action plan as and when the need arises.

23

3. Essay Appraisal Method: In this method, the manager provides a written narration of the performance of the employee. Byars and Rue (2004) explained that it is a method in which the rater prepares a written statement describing an individual's strengths, weaknesses and past performance. In most cases, instructions are provided on which specific areas to cover such as quantity and quality of work, job knowledge, ability to get along with others etc. This has the advantage of touching on most important issues in an objective manner since there is minimum restriction. However, it is subject to the raters' writing abilities and skills.

4. Rating Attributes: Certain traits or attributes are necessary for the performance of certain jobs. Management could therefore identify these traits and use them as the basis for appraisal. Thus, employees who exhibit higher levels of such attributes could be adjudged as performing well on the job. Rating attributes has become a very popular method of performance appraisal because it is easy to develop and can be applied to a wide variety of jobs and organizations. Its main disadvantage is that ratings of attributes such as judgment and creativity are at the manager's discretion. Reliability is therefore questionable (Noe et al., 2004).

5. Total Quality Management (T. Q. M): This method of appraisal assesses both individual employee performance and the system within which he works (Noe et al., 2004). It enables the employer, employee and customers to work together to set standards and measure performance, all in an effort to achieve the overall goals of the

24

organization through customer satisfaction. Total quality management combines both measurement of results and measurement of attributes. Thus, the employee is assessed on subjective feedback from managers and peers on issues like initiative and intelligence as well as objective issues like work process.

Similarly, according to Macky and Johnson (2000), the objective feedback instrument involves the direct quantitative measurement of performance within a specified time period. Examples of Objective instruments include key performance indicators (KPIs), pay–for– performance incentive remuneration. Subjective instruments (most commonly used) involve the appraiser exercising qualitative judgment focusing on the results on the outcomes of the employee and focusing on the process on how the outcomes were achieved. This means that the appraisers need to be knowledgeable and have observed the performance they are judging (Macky & Johnson, 2000). The subjective instruments 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 & Johnson, 2000). The 360-degree feedback or multi-source feedback and the rating-scale method of the subjective instruments will be reviewed in details as follows.

Three Hundred and Sixty (360) 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 & Bailey, 2003; Garavan, Marley, & 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). Rudman (2003) emphasised that if feedback focusing on developing, its subjects are usually in management positions. It has been chiefly oriented to target manager's development and has taken place in the context of management development or leadership courses (Conger & Toegel, 2003; Fletcher & Bailey, 2003). At the core of this feedback is the cognitive process of self-reflection, which increases self-awareness (Conger & Toegel, 2003). Also, Groeschl (2003) commented that when an organization

26

encourages 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 appraise 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).

The 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

27

appraiser may be unable to interpret the behaviour to be rated; appraisee may feel threatened and upset by the assessments; organizations may feel saturated with forms; appraisals are 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 fells 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 & Bailey, 2003).

In the 360- degree feedback, Fletcher (2001) 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. Fletcher (2001) 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 and 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). Conger and Toegel (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 practitioners 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

29

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 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). 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. Bacal (1999) 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. The disadvantages are that the manager can forget why it was carried out and that it may not help in planning performance, preventing problems, protecting the organisation, or developing employees because it so vague. Bacal also suggested that managers supplement this method of feedback with regular discussions with each employee.

The main rating scales (Macky &Johnson, 2000; Tziner, Joannis & Murphy, 2000) are:

1. Graphic rating scales (GRS) (non-behaviour), where appraisers record their judgment 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

31

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).

Frequency of Performance Appraisal

The occurrence of performance appraisal in any organisation may be twofold: informal and systematic (Mathis & Jackson, 2004). Informal performance appraisal is the day-to-day working relationship between a

32

supervisor and an employee which offers an opportunity for the employee's performance to be evaluated. The supervisor communicates this evaluation through conversation on the job or by on-the-spot examination of a particular piece of work. Informal appraisal is appropriate when time is an issue, because delays in giving feedback weaken its motivational effect. Robbins and Coulter (1999) cited a number of organisations where managers and subordinates meet to negotiate a performance plan that is tied to the organisation's strategic priorities. Managers constantly hold formal performance review with their subordinates twice a year and informal 'coaching' sessions every quarter.

A systematic appraisal is applicable when the contact between the supervisor and employee is formal, and a system is in place to report managerial impression and observations on employee performance. Systematic appraisal features a regular time interval, which is distinguished from informal appraisal. Both employee and supervisor know that performance will be reviewed on a regular basis, and can be purposively planned for. In some organisations, the conduct of appraisals can be once or twice a year, half year, monthly or weekly.

Human Factors in Performance Appraisal System

Some factors have been identified as potential conflicts that arise during the appraisal process. The first to be identified is the negative attitude towards PA process. According to Ellis and Hartley (1991), some superiors believe that the process is too time consuming and requires judgment of which they are not competent in terms of knowledge skills. It is this view that Dawra (2001) stressed that the systematic evaluation of the personality and performance of the employee must be done by a person trained in the

33

techniques of merit rating. Considering these views, the appraising process will not be time consuming when a qualified person handles it. This is because the one knows exactly what he is looking for.

The next factor identified by Lang (as cited by Filder & Copper, 1992) is the inherent conflicts. Lang explained this as the lack of support for both the appraisee and the appraiser to enable them to know what target is to be achieved and what is to be appraised. In this situation, the appraisee needs to be given a job description and specification with targets set to be achieved. However, many organisations neither set targets nor specify the job contents which finally results in conflicts between the superior and the subordinate. For the success of PA, therefore, the system must attempt to meet the needs of both the individual and the organisation.

Another factor identified by McGregor (1987) is the resistance of super- ordinates to appraise subordinates. McGregor argues that superiors are uncomfortable when put in a position to playing God. They therefore find it difficult to judge the performance of their employees. Building on McGregor's argument, Stroul (1987) pointed out that managers just adopt the role of counselors to set a helpful tone for employees to see performance feedback as meaningful.

The last factor is accountability and development. Beer (as cited in Pearce & Robinson 1989) opines that potential conflicts between individuals and organisations occur when accountability and development are combined in the PA system. The individual, therefore, views the PA system as a victimization tool to tarnish his/her image in a long earned reputation. Employees, therefore, need to be exposed to the criteria for the PA system and

its benefits to them and the organisation. When this is done, employees will see the appraisal process as a link to rewards, their career and self-image. If this is not done, they will feel reluctant to engage in open dialogue that is required for valid evaluation and personal development.

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). 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).

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 requiring ratings to be reviewed by a third party, such as the manager's manager (Robbins, 2000).

Armstrong (1996) 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 judgments, reactions, emotions, flashbacks to experiences that reinforce or dispel, and all the expectations and anxieties that frame the appraisal session itself.

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). 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, 1996) 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. 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.

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 McKirchy (1998). 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.

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). There is however a marked increase in the usage of self-assessment as a component of performance appraisal (Compton, 2005; Thomas 1997).

Use of Performance Appraisal

It is obvious 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 uses of the process which included relationships building, benchmarking of performance, and identifying development and training needs. In New Zealand (NZ), Taylor & 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. According to Bowles and Coates (1993), performance appraisal is gaining

40

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 (1980) 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:

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

1. Halo effect (the opposite of hom effect where one positive characteristics of an employee or their positive performance is used to generalized into an overall high rating);

2. Similar-to-me-effect (whereby an appraiser rates someone perceived accurately or inaccurately to have the same characteristics as them);

3. Tendency towards the mean or extremes (appraising employees as "average" or may be too strict or too lenient in their assessments);

42

4. Status effect (where managers are rated more highly than lower graded employee); and

5. 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.

Longenecker, Sims and Gioia (1987) carried out in-depth, semi-structured interviews with 60 executives form 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." 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. Tziner and Murphy (1999) added that to achieve specific goals such as self enhancement or enhancing relationships with subordinates. cautioned that if the organizational culture supports the political behaviour, this will tend to cascade down. However, it is impossible to eliminate politics

form performance appraisal but what an astute manager needs to do is to effectively manage it.

However, to limit errors and conflicts in the usage of performance appraisal Byars and Rue (2004) suggested that managers should;

1. Make refinement in the designs to make them more applicable and relevant.

2. Improve the skills of raters through training in performance appraisal methods.

Naming (2005) studied performance appraisal of administrative staff in tertiary institutions. The aim of the study was to determine the purpose of performance appraisal systems used at the Auckland University of Technology and also to investigate the perception and understanding of administrative staff of the appraisal system. The sample size consisted 543 staff members with a 20 percent return rate of the staff survey. Data was gathered via audio taped interviews and questionnaire in an attempt to gauge what people were thinking. The interview was semi-structured and a set of 10 respondents who volunteered were interviewed. The rest responded to two sets of questionnaires, one to obtain information on administrative decisions (pay and promotion) and the other to obtain developmental information (training and development). The results revealed that appraisal was beneficial in helping with career development. The main purposes for performance appraisal were stated as to assist in administrative (pay increase and promotion), and developmental (training) decisions.

Agyenim-Boateng (2000) also conducted a study on performance appraisal in University of Cape Coast. The main purpose was to evaluate the system of appraisal for senior and junior staff of the University and to recommend any improvements if necessary or to develop a new system for consideration by the University authorities. Agyenim-Boateng (2000) review of related literature revealed that there are two main purposes of appraisal which appear to be at extreme ends to each other. While one school of thought opined that appraisal should be used mainly for staff development purposes, (e.g. Gilley & Eggland, 1993), another school (e.g. Bannister & Balkin, 1990) believed that it should rather be used for reward outcomes. The study revealed that performance appraisal system used in University of Cape Coast is purposely to determine who should earn a salary increment or be promoted. Agyenim-Boateng (2000) wrote "It does not aim at assessing the past performance, identifying training needs of employees, identifying career development opportunities, establishing a more effective communication system or performance goals for employees." (Agyenim-Boateng, 2000) therefore proposed Peter Drucker's Management by Objective (MBO) system of appraisal for adoption by the management of the University. Agyenim-Boateng (2000) findings revealed that the need for staff appraisal for the purpose of training and development is crucial if the University wants to make its training and development programmes more effective.

From the Agyenim-Boateng (2000) findings of performance appraisal can be explained as the processes adopted by an organisation to identify the strengths and weaknesses of its employees and also to measure their performances. In addition to remuneration or promotion purposes, appraisal

45

plays a crucial role in the training and development process. However, the appraisal system in some organisations including University of Cape Coast is not used for developmental purposes. Appraisal is a continuous process and different methods are available for use to appraise staff performance. The nature of the job, capabilities of appraisers as well as the objective of the appraisal system influence the method to choose. Also, appraisal is prone to some problems and care should be taken to avoid them since they could make appraisal results unreliable. For organisations to be able to provide training and development programmes which are relevant to the job schedules of the staff and cost effective to the organisation, it is prudent to first appraise staff performance. This will enable the organisation to determine the shortfalls in performance and the causes of such shortfall. Unfortunately, some managers are not themselves knowledgeable in the appraisal process. They are therefore unable to do proper appraisal, thus making appraisal results not very reliable for training and development purposes.

Also, Spinks, Wells and Meche (1999) commented that performance appraisal system 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

46

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 (McGregor, 1972; Wilson &Western, 2001; Anderson, 2002) has shown that performance appraisal has many uses and 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 that performance appraisal was used to serve the four categories identified by Wilson and Western (2001). 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 & Boudreau, 2000).

To minimize these conflicts, Rudman (2003) suggested that an organisaiton's performance appraisal should attempt to only be used 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 primary 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

The review of literature has attempted to look at the use 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 appraisals 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%) 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%) of the Canadian workers 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%)

49

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.

Redman, Snape, Thompson and Yan (2000) 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 form the study included patchy application, uneven managerial commitment, lack of continuity between appraisal, the links with performance related pay and

50

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 positiveness. 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 of Redman, Snape, Thompson and Yan (2000) also 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. Redman et al. (2000) 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 empty statements.

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 out from the East Carolina University in USA on 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, Mani (2002) 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 (2002) 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 nod satisfaction employees felt towards their supervisors also determined if they were satisfied with the system. Mani (2002) 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 (2002) 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 weakness 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. Rudman (2003) 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. Henderson (1980) 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 in 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 (2001) 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 highfliers.

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 (2000), it can directly influence employees' attitudes. These attitudes may in turn influence turnover, absenteeism and the performance of the organisations.

Boswell and Boudreau (2000) 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

56

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 Wilson's 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. Form that study Wilson 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 appraisals.

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.

58

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 (2002) 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. Simmons suggests that understanding the characteristics and features of performance appraisal that will engage professionals in knowledge-based organisations is a significant issue, but one that is under-researched. Khoury and Analoui (2004) in a study of 22 universities in UK found out staff of universities are often not comfortable with performance appraisal 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.

According to Khoury and Analoui (2004), one of the few empirical studies of how performance appraisal processes are experienced by faculty

59

members in universities, concluded that poorly conducted appraisal processes result in low morale, de-motivation and dissatisfaction.

Lonsdale (1996) 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. This increasing emphasis on evaluative appraisal in modern performance appraisal systems confronts a key element of the academic role, long held as inviolate: the concept of academic freedom.

Proponents of PA 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

60

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 performance appraisal systems into universities as an effort to transpose corporate managerialist approaches to performance 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 higher education and further education sectors and the remuneration of those who work in them (Barry, Chandler & Clark, 2001; Henson, 1994; Holley and Oliver, 2000; Townley, 1992).

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

Findings from the literature indicate that the response of staff to the implementation of comprehensive performance appraisal 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 performance appraisal systems in higher education assert that academic staff accept appraisal as a necessary and constructive process (Morris, 2005; Moses, 1995; Paget et al. 1992;

Digitized by UCC, Library

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 PA practice illustrate this, for example 'management is a full-time occupation (Dickensen, 1997), 'university managers are ill-equipped or trained to be effective managers' (Dickensen, 1997), 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).

Summary of Literature Review

Performance appraisal has been around since the third century (Johnson, 1999; Vallence & 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 (Anderson, 2002; Dean et al., 1992). As a developmental tool, it is used to identify training and staff development needs (Wilson & Western, 2001; Anderson, 2002; Dean et al., 1992). It has also been claimed that performance

Digitized by UCC, Library

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

RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter presents the methods adopted by the researcher for the study. It discusses the research design, population, sample size and the sampling techniques used. In addition, the research instruments used, how the instruments were developed and pilot tested, procedures used in gathering data and how data were analysed are discussed.

Research Design

According to Trochim (2000), "a research design provides the glue that holds the research together". Trochim explains that the design is used to structure the research, thereby showing how all the major parts of the research work together to address the central research question. Nwadinigwe (2005) also emphasised the importance of design to research in the following statement, "basically, research design is an important aspect of research, must be the most appropriate to appropriately measure what is being measured and obtain the data that will validly lead to a conclusion that is also valid". The descriptive survey design was used for the study. This was considered appropriate because according to Anderson (1995), it gives an opportunity for the researcher to get the opinion of the population concerning some issues of interest and relevance to the study. The study mainly dealt with seeking for the perceptions of senior administrative staff in the University of Cape Coast in relation to the most recent use of performance appraisal system in terms of how it affects their career development and staff performance.

65

This was also based on the assertion by Gay (1992) that descriptive survey specifies the nature of a given phenomenon by determining and reporting the way things are which involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or answer research questions concerning the current status of the study. It was the belief of the researcher that since the study is a descriptive survey, this would give a clear picture of the perceptions of senior administrative staff in the University about the use of performance appraisal system because it specifies a given phenomenon.

This survey gave the researcher the chance to provide background information and explanations about the issue in question as according to Sarantakos (2005), descriptive design has the advantage of affording the researcher the opportunity to describe social systems, relations or social events, provide background information about the issue in question as well as stimulating explanations.

Some disadvantages of descriptive survey design according to Gay (1992) are the dangers of praying 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. However, efforts were made to minimize this limitation by explaining the purpose of the research to respondents and reporting only what was obtained.

Study Area

University of Cape Coast (UCC) was chosen for the study. It was established in December 1962 as a University College and in 1967, it was incorporated by the University College of Cape Coast NLC Decree 1967,

66

effective October 1966. It became a full university under the University of Cape Coast Act 1971 (Act 390), thus obtaining the power to confer its own degrees (Antwi, 1992). According to Antwi (1992), "the primary purpose for the establishment of the university was "to produce graduate teachers in arts and science subjects for the secondary schools, teacher training colleges, polytechnics and technical institutions in Ghana". Antwi (1992) again explained that the aims of the university include the provision of higher education, research, knowledge dissemination and to foster relations with other bodies.

The University of Cape Coast is located in Cape Coast, the capital town of Central Region of Ghana. It has two campuses, the southern campus or Old Site and the northern campus or New Site popularly referred to as "Science". The Old Site is located within "Apewosika" and "Kokoado" towns in the Cape Coast metropolis close to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. The New Site or "Science" is located within "Kwaprow" and "Amamoma" towns in the Cape Coast metropolis about 1km away from the Old Site.

The staff in the Universities in Ghana are categorised into three main groups. These are junior staff, senior staff and senior members Collard (as cited in Effah, 1998). Senior staff employees of University of Cape Coast are put into different categories depending on the nature of task they perform. They occupy ranks which can conveniently be described as middle level management positions. These include Administrative Assistants to Chief Administrative Assistants; Research Assistants to Chief Research Assistants; Library Assistants to Chief Library Assistants, Technician Assistants to Chief Technicians as well as teachers and some ranks among health workers. They

67

are concerned with the implementation of decisions taken by top management and supervision of junior staff. They also engage in planning and decision making at a micro level as well as training of junior staff.

The senior administrative staff of the University of Cape Coast are middle level staff of the university who work in the various departments/sections/units to support top level management, academic and technical staff (Senior Members) in their various fields of operation. They comprise Chief Administrative Assistant, Principal Administrative Assistants, Senior Administrative Assistants and Administrative Assistants.

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 main interest of the study was to find out the perception of personnel in the universities on the use of performance appraisal system, and its impact on the individual employee. To ensure that the objective of this research reflected on the true perception of the personnel, a target population of senior administrative staff was selected in the University of Cape Coast (UCC). UCC was chosen because it has a sizeable number of senior administrative staff, who are in charge of mainly administrative work in all its divisions/departments (University of Cape Coast [UCC], 2015, Data on Senior Administrative Staff). Also UCC was chosen due to proximity. The target population for this study was all 458 Senior Administrative staff of University of Cape Coast; comprising 24 Chief Administrative Assistants, 94 Principal Administrative Assistants, 240 Senior Administrative Assistants and 100 Administrative Assistants.

Sample and Sampling Procedure

A sample size of 210 senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast was selected from the population of 458. The sample size was chosen using the table for determining sample size from a given population provided by Sarantakos (2005) which shows that for a population of 458, a sample size of 207 is adequate. The sample for each stratum was made up of 11 Chief Administrative Assistants, 43 Principal Administrative Assistants, 110 Senior Administrative Assistants and 46 Administrative Assistants.

Stratified sampling method was used to select the subgroups making up the sample. Stratified sampling involves dividing the entire population into a number of strata and a sample is drawn from each stratum (Sarantakos, 2005). Nsowah-Nuamah (2005) explained that stratified sampling is used when individual members within a stratum are similar in characteristics and the different strata exhibit different characteristics among themselves. This thus becomes appropriate because senior administrative staff in University of Cape Coast fall into different categories of ranks. The sample for each stratum was therefore chosen according to the total number of workers in the various ranks in the population of the Senior Administrative staff of University of Cape Coast (UCC).

According to Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh (2002), the major advantages of using stratified sampling are that it guarantees representation of defined groups in the population and again enables the researcher to study the differences that might exist between various subgroups in the population. Also, (Nsowah-Nuamah, 2005) explained that stratified sampling ensures a proportional representation of the various categories of the strata. Thus, to

ensure proportional representation of the various strata and lessens the possibility of one-sidedness. The sample for each stratum was therefore chosen according to their proportion in the population.

To get the sample for the Chief Administrative Assistants that numbered 24, the researcher divided the total number of the Chief Administrative Assistants in the population by the total population of senior administrative staff of UCC which was 458 and multiplied it by the sample size which was 210 and this resulted 11 (that is 24/458*210 = 11). The same procedure was used in selecting the 43 Principal Administrative Assistants, 110 Senior Administrative Assistants and 46 Administrative Assistants. For Principal Administrative Assistants, it was 94/458*210 =43, Senior Administrative Assistants 240/458*210 =110 and that of Administrative Assistants was 100/458*210 =46 altogether making up the sample of 210.

After, the researcher identified the senior administrative staff in their various departments/sections/units for the exercise using the lottery method of simple random sampling to select them according to the number sample in each stratum for the study. Nsowah-Nuamah (2005) explained that the lottery method of simple random sampling is any technique designed to draw sample elements from a population in such a way that each element in the population has an equal chance of being selected. According Nsowah-Nuamah (2005), the major advantages of using the lottery method are that it eliminates selection bias, it is very reliable method of selecting random sample and it is the best sampling technique for homogeneous population. The lottery method was used by identifying the number of each chief administrative assistants, principal administrative assistants, senior administrative assistants and administrative

70

assistants of senior administrative staff in their various departments/sections/units in the university on separate slips of paper of identical size and shape. The researcher identically folded the slips and mixing them up in a container and the slips were drawn from the container one by one until the desire sample size was obtained.

Research Instrument

The instrument used for the collection of data for the study was the questionnaire. The instrument was used because all the participants can read and write. The items in the questionnaire were developed by the researcher under the guidance of his supervisors. Items in the questionnaire were mostly "close ended" with a few "open-ended" ones. According to Twumasi (2001), "close-ended" items are very easy to code, thus making analysis easy. However, they are quite difficult to construct and also, there is the likelihood that individual respondents may have other responses other than the options provided. "Open-ended" items on the other hand are easier to construct. Also, respondents have the opportunity to provide their original responses. The problem with them is that it is difficult to code and analyse responses. The researcher considered the merits and demerits of both items and used them appropriately to ensure that adequate data are collected.

The questionnaire for the senior administrative staff contained 36 items and was divided into four parts. The first part (Part I) solicited information on the personal data of respondents. Information required included: gender, age of respondents; working experience, rank and educational qualification. There were five items, all of which were close ended.

71

The second part (Part II) dealt with issues regarding the perception of staff on performance appraisal which contained 17 items, 16 close ended. Out of these five were close ended and 11 close ended four point Likert's scale format ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with scores of "four" to "one" respectively and one open ended item. Third part (Part III) had six close ended items on how performance appraisals promotes career development while the fourth part (Part IV) was on how performance appraisal system promotes staff performance, which contained eight items, six close ended four point Likert's scale format ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with scores of "four" to "one" respectively and two open ended items.

Pilot Testing of Instrument

For the purpose of ascertaining the validity and reliability of the instrument, the questionnaire was pilot tested at the University of Education, Winneba from 3rd to 20th of February, 2015. This University was chosen because it is one of the public universities in Ghana which offers educational courses and administratively its management practices, including staff training and development, are therefore similar to the University of Cape Coast. Also University of Education, Winneba was chosen due to proximity. According to Bell (1999), all data gathering instruments should be piloted to test the duration it takes respondents to complete them and to ensure that all questions and instructions are clear so as to enable the researcher delete any items which do not yield useable data. Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh (2002) and Johnson (1994) also opined that "field-test" of the instrument will help to identify

72

ambiguities, misunderstandings and all other inadequacies so that they can be corrected before the actual study is done.

The researcher administered 30 questionnaires randomly using the lottery method of simple random sampling to selected senior administrative staff in the various departments/sections/units for the study. Guidelines for filling the questionnaires were clear and respondents were assured that the information they will provide will be used for only academic purpose and will be treated confidential. They were also given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification of doubts. While seven senior administrative staff representing 23.3% were able to complete and return theirs immediately, the 23 senior administrative staff representing 76.7% who could not complete were requested to leave completed questionnaires in their general office for collection at a later date. 28 questionnaires out of the 30 were retrieved from the respondents representing 93.3% recovery rate.

After retrieving the questionnaire from the senior administrative staff of University of Education, Winneba, the items were subjected to total item analysis. Opoku (2002) opines that even when using an existing questionnaire, there is the need for pilot test to ensure that all the items are ethically and culturally relevant. It was revealed that only 10% of the respondents indicated their department/section/unit of work. This depicted that the respondents were not comfortable with the item which required them to indicate their department/section/unit of work. The final instrument was therefore revised to take care of these weaknesses.

Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was computed after the pilot study. The results for the various sections are: Perception on the uses of performance appraisal system; the coefficient was .879, Appraisal process influence on career development; the coefficient was .866 and Appraisal process influence on staff performance; the coefficient was .880. Meaning the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient for the sections of the questionnaire averagely was .875 which indicated good results. This interpretation is in agreement with the view of Sproull (1988) that a reliability of .7 is ideal for an instrument to be used as well as with the rule of thumb for determining the Cronbach's Alpha results provided by George and Mallery (2003) as follows: ">/= .9 - Excellent; >/= .8 - Good; >/= .7 - Acceptable; >/= .6 - questionable; >/= .5 - Poor and </= .5 - Unacceptable".

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher obtained a letter of introduction from the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (IEPA) of the University of Cape Coast. This helped the researcher to obtain the needed cooperation from the departments/ sections/units where data were collected. Data collection for the main study was conducted at the University of Cape Coast from the 2nd of March 2015 to 31st of March 2015. The researcher selected the senior administrative staff in their various departments/sections/units for the exercise using the stratified sampling and the lottery method of simple random sampling. The researcher then established the necessary rapport with the respondents and after explaining the purpose of the exercise, the 210 questionnaires were randomly distributed to respondents in the various department/section/unit according to the number sample in each stratum.

74

Guidelines for filling the questionnaires were explained to respondents and respondents were assured that the information they will provide will be used for only academic purpose and will be treated confidential. They were also given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification. While 17 senior administrative staff representing 8.1% were able to complete and return theirs the first day, the 193 senior administrative staff representing 91.9% who could not complete were requested to leave completed questionnaires in their general office for collection at a later date. 207 questionnaires out of the 210 were retrieved from the respondents representing 98.6% recovery rate. Hence 207 senior administrative staff took part in the study.

Data Analysis

After collecting the questionnaires, the responses on each questionnaire was computed using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 16.0 as the main statistical tool which provides a full range of contemporary statistical methods. The items in the questionnaire were coded to assist in analyses. 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 = 1, agree = 2, disagree = 3, strongly disagree = 4. 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. Frequencies, mean, standard deviations and percentages presented in the form of tables 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 administrative staff on the uses of performance appraisal. Frequencies, mean, standard deviations 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 solicited views from senior administrative staff on how performance appraisal promotes career development. The responses were also converted into frequencies and percentages and presented in tables. Interpretation and discussion was based on majority views.

Research question three sought to find the perception of senior administrative staff on ways in which appraisal promotes or reduces their staff performance. Frequencies mean, standard deviations 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, mean, standard deviations and percentages because these descriptive analyses are convenient and acceptable in most research work. Also, they are easy and understandable by many people to draw credible conclusions.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

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

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	100	48.3
Female	107	51.7
No response	0	0.0
Total	207	100

Source: (Field Data, 2015)

From Table 1, the respondents in the study were predominantly female forming 51.7 % of the total number of respondents. All of them indicated their gender.

77

Table 2 - *Age of Respondents*

Age	Frequency	Percent (%)
22-30	56	27.1
31-36	57	27.5
37- 42	66	31.9
43-60	28	13.5
Total	207	100

Source: (Field Data, 2015)

Table 2 indicates that the University of Cape Coast has an adult administrative force. Out of the 207 respondents 72.9 % had obtained age of 31 years or more. While 27.1 % of the respondents were within the age range of 22-30. It is therefore evident that the bulk of senior administrative staff were above 30 years.

Table 3 - *Qualification of Respondents*

Qualification	Frequency	Percent (%)
Diploma	40	19.3
First degree	91	43.9
Post graduate diploma	32	15.5
Masters	44	21.3
Total	207	100

Source: (Field Data, 2015)

From the information in Table 3, 36.8 % of the respondents had more than one qualification. Post Graduate Diploma holders were 15.5% while 21.3 % had Masters. The findings also show that majority of the respondents

78

comprising 43.9% of the total number of respondents had a First degree. Those with Diplomas were 19.3%.

Table 4 - *Length of Service of Respondents*

Years	Frequency	Percent (%)
2 - 5	97	48.9
6 – 15	50	24.2
16 – 25	34	16.4
26 – 35	26	12.6
Total	207	100

Source: (Field Data, 2015)

Table 4 indicates that Majority of the respondents as many as 48.9% have worked in the university from 2-5 years, 24.2% of the respondents have worked from 6-15, 16.4% has worked from 16-25 years and just 12.6% of the total respondents have worked from 26 – 35 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 Question One: Perceptions of Senior Administrative Staff on the Use of Performance Appraisal System

The study sought to find out the perceptions of senior administrative staff on the use of performance appraisal system in UCC. Performance appraisal has two broad uses; development or evaluative (Stone, 2002; Rudman, 2003). 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. The question therefore sought to ascertain the perception of senior administrative staff on the use performance

79

appraisal, that is whether for development or evaluative and if it is developmental, then emphasis is 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 is placed on reward and punishment, lay-off, discipline, etc. and how well employees are conforming to organisational standards. The results on perception of senior administrative staff on the use of performance appraisal are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 - *Perception of Senior Administrative Staff on the Use of Performance Appraisal*

Perception on appraisal use	SA Freq(%)	A Freq(%)	D Freq(%)	SD Freq(%)	M	STD
Provides feedback to help me discover my strength and weakness	9(4.3)	30(14.5)	100(48.3)	68(32.9)	3.10	0.96
For layoff decisions/discipline	100(48.3)	58(28.0)	42(20.3)	7(3.4)	1.79	0.78
Setting work objectives	17(8.2)	30(14.5)	90(43.5)	70(33.8)	3.03	0.29
Providing self-development information	30(14.5)	35(16.9)	100(48.3)	42(20.3)	2.74	0.74
Identification of training needs	10(4.8)	40(19.3)	101(48.8)	56(27.1)	2.98	0.98
Reviewing and updating job description	30(14.5)	35(16.9)	80(38.7)	62(29.9)	2.84	0.84
Transfer decisions	40(19.3)	34(16.4)	78(37.7)	55(26.6)	2.71	0.75
Determining of salary increment	-	3(1.5)	6(2.8)	198(95.7)	3.94	0.15
Motivating employees by providing feedback on their performance levels	12(5.8)	20(9.7)	80(38.6)	95(45.9)	3.25	0.34
Maintain promotion	57(27.6)	100(48.3)	40(19.3)	10(4.8)	2.01	0.24
Creating good relation among employees	13(6.3)	29(14.0)	90(43.5)	75(36.2)	3.10	0.96

Key: *SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD= Strongly disagree, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, Freq=Frequency, %= Percentage*

Source: (Field Data, 2015)

Table 5 represents responses from all senior administrative staff involved in the study on their perceptions on the use of performance appraisal system in the university. On performance appraisals in the university providing feedback which will enable the staff discover their strengths and improve upon their weaknesses, 32.9% indicated strongly disagreed while 48.3% indicated disagreed. Thus a total of 81.2% with the mean score and standard deviation (M = 3.10, STD = 0.96) disagreed that performance appraisals in the university provide feedback which will enable them discover their strengths and improve upon their weaknesses. Also in Table 5, responses on appraisal use for layoff decisions/ discipline, 48.3% strongly agreed while 28.0% agreed to the statement. Thus a total of 76.3% (M = 1.79, STD = 0.78) of respondents agreed that the university's appraisal is used for layoff decisions/discipline.

On performance appraisal helping in setting work objectives, 43.5% disagreed that they help in setting objectives while 33.8% strongly disagreed to the statement. This gives a total of 77.3% (M = 3.03, STD = 0.29). 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. In Table 5, responses on performance appraisal providing self-development information, 48.3% disagreed while 20.3% strongly disagreed. Thus a total of 68.6% (M = 2.74, STD = 0.74) disagreed that appraisal results provide self-development information to determine training needs in the university. As to the identification of training needs after appraisal, in Table 5, 48.8% respondents indicated disagreed 27.1% indicated strongly disagreed. Thus a

82

total of 75.9% (M = 2.98, STD = 0.98) disagreed that appraisal is used for identification of training needs. This statistics indicates that the perception of the staff on the use of performance appraisal in the university is not developmentally oriented which is in contrast to the study of Rudman, Snape, Thompson and Yan (2000) on the effectiveness of performance appraisal in a public sector context found out that training and development is strongly emphasized in the performance appraisal process.

From Table 5, it can be seen that 38.7% of staff disagreed that appraisal is used for reviewing and updating job descriptions while 29.9% also strongly disagreed to this statement. Thus, a total of 68.6% (M = 2.84, STD = 0.84) disagreed that appraisal is used for reviewing and updating job descriptions. Table 5, also reveals that 37.7% of respondents disagreed that appraisals are used for transfer decisions while 26.6% strongly disagreed to the statement. Thus, a total of 64.3% (M = 2.71, STD = 0.75) disagreed that appraisals are conducted to enable the institution transfer people from one department to the other. 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.

Table 5, also shows that 95.7% of respondents strongly disagreed that appraisal is used in determining salary increment while 2.8% also disagreed. This means that a total of 98.5% (M = 3.94, STD = 0.15) disagreed that appraisal determines salary increment. This confirms a disadvantage of using appraisal for pay as identified by Harrison and Goulding (1997) that it will be associated with judgment and retribution rather than with personnel

83

development which may also result in an ineffective performance appraisal process.

Again, it is seen from Table 5, that 45.9% of respondents strongly disagreed that performance appraisal motivating employees by providing feedback on their performance levels while 38.6% disagreed to the statement. This gives a total of 84.5% (M = 3.25, STD = 0.34) disagreed that performance appraisal motivates employees by providing feedback on their performance levels. From Table 5, 48.3% of the respondents agreed that appraisal system is used to maintain promotion and 27.6% strongly agreed to this statement. Thus a total of 75.9% (M = 2.01, STD = 0.24) agreed the University's appraisal system is used to maintain promotion. This perception supports the assertion of Stone (2002) that performance appraisal is for discrimination; which is enabling management to objectively differentiate between hardworking employees 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. On performance appraisal creating good relation among employees, in Table 5, 43.5% respondents disagreed while 36.2% strongly disagreed. Thus a total of 79.7% (M = 3.10, STD = 0.96) disagreed that performance appraisal in the University creates good relation among employees.

Generally, the results from Table 5 affirm the assertion of Armstrong and Baron (2000) that performance appraisal should measure and reward behaviours which support the organization's strategic objectives. The implication here is that the goals of an organization are paramount to career

84

needs of employees and hence performance appraisal should be used as a tool to ensure satisfaction of organizational objectives. The underlining perception of appraisal of the university leans towards the evaluative pattern which is identifying people for promotion and rewards and also for layoff decisions and discipline.

Majority of the respondents representing 81.8% from Table 5 were of the view that performance appraisal is not used in a developmental way. The only evaluative aspects of appraisal in the questionnaire which had quite a number of respondents supporting it was that results are used to promote and for layoff decision/discipline. This is an indication that many of the respondents wanted performance appraisal system in the university to be used in a developmental way. 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 Boudreau (2000) pointed out that when employees perceive that the appraisal process does not help in their development, for example by not offering them opportunities for training, it does not promote positive attitudes towards the system.

Research Question Two: Perceptions of Senior Administrative Staff on how Performance Appraisal System Promotes Career Development

The study sought 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 among others. Tables 6, 7, 8 and 9 present data on perceptions of senior administrative staff on how performance appraisal system promotes their career development.

Table 6 - *Extent to which Respondents' Agree or Disagree that Appraisal Promotes Career Development*.

Responses	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	8	3.9
Agree	18	8.7
Disagree	118	57.0
Strongly disagree	63	30.4
Total	207	100

Source: (Field Data, 2015)

From Table 6, 57% of the respondents disagreed that appraisal promotes their career development. This contradicts Roberts (2003) that it helps in enhancing an employee's 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

86

manager/head of department or no opportunities are offered for staff to undertake further training to enhance their competence after an appraisal.

The study therefore sought 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 7.

Table 7- *Respondents' Perception on the Frequency of Appraisal Feedback.*

Responses	Frequency	Percent (%)
Most often	8	3.9
Often	13	6.3
Seldom	20	9.6
Never	166	80.2
Total	207	100

Source: (Field Data, 2015)

From Table 7, 80.2 % never received any form of feedback on their appraisal. The findings support an earlier study by Rudman et al. (2000) to examine the effectiveness of performance appraisal in a service trust hospital (UK). They 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 the assertion of Tyler (1997) that communicating clear specific expectations and giving both positive and negative feedback enables employees to know how they are doing. A lack of

87

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 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. In all, 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. Combinations of the evaluative and developmental aspects produce a better productive workforce.

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 appraisers. The results are presented in Table 8.

88

Table 8 - *Extent to which Staff Agree or Disagree with the Assertion that Opportunities are provided for them to discuss Appraisal results with their Appraisers*.

Responses	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly agree	3	7.3
Agree	6	14.6
Disagree	7	17.1
Strongly disagree	25	61
Total	41	100

Source: (Field Data, 2015)

From Table 8, a total of 21.9% of the respondents said there was an opportunity to discuss the appraisal report with their appraisers while as many as 78.1% of the respondents said there was no opportunity to discuss the report with their appraisers. The implication is that even majority of the few who had feedback (78.1%) did not get the opportunity to discuss the report with their appraisers.

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 8, staff perceive very little emphasis on career development because activities that are supposed to help in staff development are not given prominence.

89

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.

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 if its reveals that they lack skills in certain areas. The results obtained are presented in Table 9.

Table 9 - *Courses Workers Attended after Appraisal.*

Responses	Frequency	Percent (%)
Training programmes offered by UCC	33	15.9
External courses	24	11.6
Others	13	6.3
None	137	66.2
Total	207	100

Source: (Field Data, 2015)

The responses in Table 9 indicate that 15.9% of the respondents attended training and development courses offered by the University after their appraisal. Those who attended external courses were 11.6%, 6.3% attended other courses and 66.2% did not attend any course after their appraisal. The implication is that training programmes are rarely organized for staff after an appraisal results and from the comments in the open ended questions on the questionnaires; some respondents stated that even if it is done it does not base on appraisal results.

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.

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. 82% 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.

Research Question Three: The extent to which Appraisal System improves Performance as perceived by Senior Administrative Staff of University of Cape Coast

Every human resource activity is usually aimed towards improvement of an organisation. Appraisals should not therefore be conducted for their sake but have an impact on workers performance to make it worthwhile. The views of senior administrative staff on the various ways in which appraisal contributes to staff performance are presented in Table 10.

Table 10 - *Staff Views on Ways Performance Appraisal has Improved their Performance*

Perception on appraisal use	SA	A	D	SD	M	STD
	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	Freq(%)	Freq(%)		
Improved my skills at work	18(8.7)	26(12.6)	92(44.4)	71(34.3)	2.79	0.79
Become more diligent and thoughtful at work	26(12.6)	50(24.2)	72(34.7)	59(28.5)	2.97	0.96
Minimized errors at work	17(8.2)	41(19.8)	81(39.1)	68(32.9)	2.97	0.44
Perform tasks accurately within limited time	22(10.6)	41(19.8)	66(31.9)	78(37.7)	3.03	0.53
Performs tasks with minimum supervision	20(10.6)	25(12.1)	90(37.7)	72(34.7)	2.00	0.48
No impact, it is a technical requirement	70(33.8)	85(41.1)	33(15.9)	19(9.2)	3.04	0.43

Key: *SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly disagree, M=Mean, STD=Standard deviation, Freq=Frequency, %= Percentage*

Source: (Field Data, 2015)

93

Table 10 represents responses from all senior administrative staff involved in the study about their perceptions on ways performance appraisal system has improved staff performance. On performance appraisal improved my skills at work, 44.4% indicated disagreed while 34.3% indicated strongly disagreed. Thus a total of 78.7% with the mean score and standard deviation (M = 2.79, STD = 0.79) disagreed that performance appraisal help improves their skills at work. This might be because from the comments of the respondents in the open ended questions on the questionnaires, results of performance appraisal are rarely based on for training needs to help workers develop more professionally. Also in Table 10, responses on performance appraisal helping staff to become more diligent and thoughtful at work, 34.7% disagreed while 28.5% strongly disagreed to the statement. Thus a total of 63.2% (M = 2.97, STD = 0.96) disagreed that performance appraisal helped them to become more diligent and thoughtful at work. On performance appraisal minimizing errors at work, 39.1% disagreed while 32.9% strongly disagreed to the statement. Thus a total 72.0% (M = 2.97, STD = 0.44) disagreed performance appraisal helps them to work with minimal errors.

Again in Table 10, it can be seen that 37.7% of the respondents strongly disagreed that the appraisal process enable them perform task accurately within limited time while 31.9% also disagreed to this statement. Thus, a total of 69.6% (M = 3.03, STD = 0.53) disagreed that the process enable them perform task accurately within limited time. On performance tasks with minimum supervision, Table 10, indicates that 37.7% disagreed and 34.7% strongly disagreed. Meaning a total of 72.4% (M = 2.00, STD = 0.48) disagreed that performance appraisal helps them to perform tasks with

94

minimum supervision. Again from Table 10, 41.1% agreed and 33.8% strongly agreed. Thus a total of 74.9% (M = 3.04, STD = 0.43) agreed performance appraisal has no impact on their staff performance and only a technical requirement.

The general perception of respondents with regards to ways performance appraisal system improves staff performance 72.2% of the respondents thought performance appraisal plays a very little role in improving staff 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. In fact, majority consider it a technical requirement with no impact on their performance.

The findings affirm that of Simmons (2002) in his study to gain staff perspectives and expectations of performance appraisal. Simmons found out that 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 Analoui (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. However, if performance appraisal is properly conducted, according to 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 staff performance.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides summary, conclusions from the findings, recommendations based on the conclusions and suggestions for further research of the study conducted to find the perception of senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast on the use of performance appraisal and ways in which performance appraisal system has improved on their performance and career development.

Summary of the Study

Many authors acknowledge the importance of performance appraisal system to the success of all organizations (Griffin, 1999; Nelson & Quick,2003; Mondy, Noe & Premeaux, 1999). Some have described performance appraisal system as a system which leads to the training and development process because it is a means to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the employee (Roberts, 2002; Byars & Rue, 2004). However, if performance appraisal system is not practice or work in an organization, the organisation may experience atrophy since performance appraisal system leads to the future employee appropriate training. This makes the employee not to become a liability to the organisation.

The need for effective staff performance appraisal system is therefore crucial if an organisation is to derive the expected benefits from its employees. For performance appraisal system to become beneficial to an organisation, management must approach it methodically, bearing in mind some principles and theories which affect its success. This study aimed at finding the perception of senior administrative staff of the University of Cape Coast on

the use of performance appraisal system and ways in which performance appraisal system has improved on their performance and career development.

The descriptive survey design was used for the study. This is because the study specifies the nature of a given phenomenon and gives an opportunity for the researcher to get the opinion of the population concerning some issues of interest and relevance to the study. The target population for the study was all 458 senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast; comprising 24 Chief Administrative Assistants, 94 Principal Administrative Assistants, 240 Senior Administrative Assistants and 100 Administrative Assistants (University of Cape Coast [UCC], 2015, Data on Senior Administrative Staff). To ensure that all categories of senior administrative staff are fairly represented, the stratified sampling method and the lottery method of simple random sampling were used to select a sample size of 210.

Instrument used in collecting data was questionnaire. This instrument was developed by the researcher with the guide of his supervisors. Some items in the questionnaire were however adopted from previous studies elsewhere and adapted to suit this study. For maximum response rate and effective collection of questionnaires, they were hand-delivered to the 210 respondents out of which 207 were retrieved. The researcher used four weeks to collect the completed questionnaires. Frequencies, mean, standard deviation and percentages were used in analysing the data and the results displayed in tables. These results were then used as the basis for determining the perception of senior administrative staff relating to appraisal usage.

Key Findings

From the analysis of the bio data 65.2% of the senior administrative staff have either first or second degree. 51.1% of them have worked in the university for 6-35 years and the remaining 48.9% who have worked in the university for 2-5 years are all either first or second degree holders. This means that they have adequate experience for the study.

1. The first question sought to find out the perceptions of senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast on how performance appraisal system is used. The study found out that 81.8% of the senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast perceive that the university's appraisal system is mainly being evaluative in nature than developmental. This attributed to the fact that the developmental role of performance appraisal has been ignored. 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 demoting them, denying them promotion or laying them off. The senior administrative staff feels little or no effort is made at helping workers to identify their strengths and build upon them. If the performance appraisal process of the university is aimed at improving performance, it must focus not only on evaluative 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

99

if their skills are not constantly upgraded it may not lead to an improvement in their performance and will affect institutional objectives.

2. The second question sought to find out the perceptions of senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast on how performance appraisal system promotes career development. The study found out that 82% of the senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast perceive that the university's appraisal system has little effect on promoting career development. This is largely attributable to the fact that there is little or no constant discussion of feedback of appraisal reports after they have been appraised by their heads. Training programmes based on workers' appraisal reports are seldom organized after an appraisal to help workers improve upon their weaknesses or build upon their strengths. 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 will 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.

3. The third question sought to find out the extent to which appraisal system improves performance as perceived by senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast. The study found out that 72.2% of the senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast perceive

that the university's appraisal system has little effect on their performance. This is attributed to the fact that there is little or no constant discussion of feedback of appraisal reports after they have been appraised by their heads. Training programmes based on workers' appraisal reports are seldom organized after an appraisal to help workers improve upon their weaknesses or build upon their strengths. Neither did they think that the process made them diligent or thoughtful or helped to perform task accurately which all come down to the inadequate discussion of feedback of appraisal reports after workers have been appraised by their heads. In fact, they see it as a technical requirement with little or no impact on their performance which can be attributed to little or no staff development programmes after an appraisal.

Conclusions

A critical look at the results make it worthwhile to conclude that senior administrative staff of University of Cape Coast prefer appraisal should be used in a developmental way. To them will help develop 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 feels that the appraisal process has had little or no improvement on their staff performance.

The appraisal process of the university is more evaluative than developmental since 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 demoting them, denying them promotion or laying them off. Feedback is not consistent, training opportunities are seldom organized basing on feedback from appraisal reports after an appraisal and rare opportunities are offered for staff to discuss the appraisal reports with their heads of department. 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.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made for improving the performance appraisal system in the University of Cape Coast:

1. The appraisal reports of employees in the university should be based on   for staff training and developments programmes to make the appraisal system to be both developmental and evaluative to benefit both the individual and the institution.

2. Opportunities should be created for employees to discuss the feedback of their appraisal reports with their immediate supervisors to help the employees to discover their strengths to build upon and weaknesses to improve upon in training and developments programmes to promote career development.

3. Opportunities should also be created for appraisees to discuss consistently feedback of appraisal reports with immediate supervisors to helps appraisees to get clarification on aspects of the appraisal

process which they may not understand and to congratulate them on satisfactory performance which goes a long way to boost their morale to improve staff performance.

Suggestions for Further Research

The researcher suggests the following areas for future researchers who are interested in researching performance appraisal system in tertiary education institutions:

1. Perception of heads of department on effective performance appraisal.

2. The relationship between appraisal use and employee attitudes.

3. The relationship between appraisal use and employee commitment.

4. Challenges of effective performance appraisal in universities in Ghana.

REFERENCES

Agyenim-Boateng, E. O. (2000). Towards the development of performance appraisal system for UCC senior and junior staff. *Journal of Educational Management, 3,* 128 – 141.

Agyenim-Boateng, E. O. (2006). Problems associated with the management of performance appraisal in universities: The case study of Ghanaian public sector universities. *Journal of Educational Management, 5,* 134-152.

American Association of University Professors (2001). Post-tenure Review: An AAUP response: *Academe, 45*(2), 7- 12.

Anderson, G. (1995). *Fundamentals of educational research*. Basingstoke:

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. Midest Academy of management conference.

Antwi, M. K. (1992). *Education, society and development in Ghana*. Accra: Unimax Publishers Limited.

Armstrong, M. & Baron, A. (2000). *Performance management: The new realities*. London: CIPD.

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. (2002). *Introduction to research in education*, (6th ed.). Belmont, CA. : Thomason Learning Co.

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 August 14, 2014, from www.auqa.edu.au/aboutaqua/auqainfo/index.shtml.

Bacal, R. (1999). *Performance management.* New Yoke: McGraw-Hill.

Barry, J., Chandler, J., & Clark, H. (2001). Between the ivory tower and the academic assembly line. *Journal of Management Studies, 38* (1), 87-101.

Beach, S. D. (1980). *Personnel: The management of people at work* (4th ed.). New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Bell, J. (1999). *Doing your research project: A guide for first time researchers in education and social sciences* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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.

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, 18* (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.

Bruce, W. (1999). 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 Science Press.

Byars, L. L., & Rue, L. W. (2004). *Human resource management* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill/Irwin.

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, G. A. (2004). *Management theory and practice* (6th ed.). London: T J
International.

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.

Cowling, A., & Lundy, O. (1996). *Strategic human resources management.*
Australia: Thomson.

Creamer, D. G. & Winston R. B. (1999). The performance appraisal paradox:
An essential but neglected student affairs staffing function, *NASPA
Journal, 36,* 248 -263.

Daft. R. L. & Marcic, D. (1998). *Understanding management*. Fort Worth:
The Dryden Press.

Davies, T., & Landa, M. (1999). A contrary look at employee performance
appraisal. *The Canadian Magazine, 24*(3), 18-21.

Dawra, S. (2001). *Human resource development and personnel management.*
New Delhi: Radha Publications.

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.

Donkor, J. E. O. (2010). *Evaluation of the performance appraisal system of personnel of the headquarters of the Ghana Education Service (GES) Accra.* Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.

Dunphy, D. (1987). The historical development of human resource management in Australia. *Human Resource Management Australia, 34*, 7-40.

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.

Effah, P. (1998). The training and development of academic librarians in Ghana (Electronic version). *Library Management. 19,* 37-41.

Ellis, J. R., & Hartley, C. L. (1991). *Managing and co-ordinationg nursing care.* Philadelphia: Lippicot Company.

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.

Fiddler, B. & Cooper, R. (1992). *Appraisal and staff management in schools and colleges,* London: Longman Group, U.K.

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 genda. *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.

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: Merill/Macmillan.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Giano, S. V., & Kleiner, B. H. (2001). New developments concerning wrongful termination in academic institutions. *Managerial Law, 43* (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.

Graham, H. T. & Bennette, R. (1992). *Human resources management*. London: MacDonald and Evans.

Griffin. W. R. (1999). *Management*. New York: Houghton Mufflin.

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.

Harrington. H. J. & Harrington. J. S (1995) *Total improvement management: The next generation in performance*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Harrison, K., & Goulding, A. (1997). Performance appraisal in public libraries. *New Library World, 98*(7), 275-280.

Heery, E. & Noon, M. (2001). D*ictionary of human resource management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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.

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 August 14, 2014 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.

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.

Jawahar, I. M. & Williams. C. R. (1997). Where all the children are above average: Meta-analysis of the performance appraisal purpose effect. *Personnel Psychology,* Winter 1997, 50 905-928.

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.

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* (2), 57-73.

Kikoski, J. K., (1999). Effective communication in the performance appraisal interview: Face-to-Face communication for public managers in the in the culturally diverse workplace. *Public personnel Management, 28* (2), 301-322.

Lansbury, R. (1988). Performance management: A process approach. *Human Resource Management Australia, 34,* 46-55.

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.

Logogye, D. (2009). *Perception of senior staff of University of Education, Winneba, on the usage of performance appraisal.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.

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, 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.

Lonsdale, A. (1996). *Performance management: The fourth generation.* Melbourne: Campus Review.

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) 16-23.

Mathis, R. L. (2004). Pay for performance: Keeping up with changing times. *Rural Telecommunications, 23* (6), 34-9.

Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2002). *Human resource management.* (2nd ed.).Canada: Thomson Learning Co.

McCarthy, A., & Garavan, T. (2001). 360 degree feedback process, improvement and career development. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 25,* 1- 5.

McGregor, D. (1987). *The human side of enterprise.* International Students Edition, Tokyo: McGraw-Hill, Kogakusha Book Company Inc.

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, 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 ed.) New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Morris, L. (2005). *Performance appraisal in Australian universities–imposing a managerialistic framework into a collegial culture.* Paper presented to AIRAANZ, Deakin University.

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., Skattebo, A, L., Kinney, T. B., (2004). Raters who pursue different goals give different ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(1), 158-164.

Naming, A. (2005). *Performance appraisal of administrative staff: Usage and perceptions.* Unpublished master's thesis, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland.

Nankervis, A. & Leece, P. (1997). Performance appraisal: Two steps forward, one step back? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 35* (2), 80-92.

Nelson. D. L. & Quick. J. C. (2003). *Organisational behavior, foundations, realities and challenges.* Mason-Ohio: South-Western.

Noe, R. A, Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P.M. (2004) *Human resource management.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Noe, R. A. (2005) *Employee training and development* (3rd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Nwadinigwe, I. P. (2005). *Fundamentals of research methods and statistics*. Lagos: Sibon Books Limited.

Opoku, J. Y. (2002). *A short guide to research writing in the social sciences and education* (2nd ed.). Accra: Ghana Universities Press.

Paget, N., Baldwin, G., Hore, T., & Kermond, B. (1992). *Staff appraisal procedures in Australian higher education institutions.* Canberra: AGPS.

Pearce, J. A., & Robinson, R. B. Jnr. (1989). *Management.* New York: Random House.

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.

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.

Robbin, P. S., & Coulter, M. (1999). *Management.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

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.

Rudman, R. (2003). *Human resource management*. New Zealand: Pearson Education, New Zealand Limited.

Sangweni, S. S. (2003). Performance management as a leadership and management tool. *SDR,* 2, 4.

Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social research* (4th ed.). New York: Pelgrave Macmillan.

Scott, D. (2001).The performance appraisal: What employers should know? *New Hampshire Business Review 23*(18), 24-29.

Simmons, J. (2002). An expert witness perspective on performance appraisal in universities and colleges. *Employee Relations, 24* (1)*,* 86-100.

Spinks, N., Wells, B., & Meche, M. (1999). Appraising the appraisals: Computerized performance appraisal systems. *Career Development international, 4(2),* 94-100.

Sproull, N. L. (1988). *A handbook of research methods: A guide for practitioners   and students in social sciences*. Metuchen: Scarcrow.

Stone R. J. (2002). *Human resource management* (4th ed.). Milton: Australia.

Stoner, J. A. F., Freeman, A. E., Gilbert, D. A. (2006). *Management,* New Delhi: Prentice Hall.

Storey, J., & Sisson, K. (1993). *Managing human resources and industrial relations.* Buckingham: The Open University Press.

Stroul, N. A. (1987). Wither performance appraisal training and development. *Office Automation, Journal* 3 (2) 70-71.

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 in UK Universities. *New perspectives on human resource management, 4* (6), 14-25.

Trochim, W. (2000). *The research methods knowledge base* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, O. H.: Atomic Dog Publishing.

Tully, S. (1994). Why go for stretch targets? *Fortune, 130* (10), 95-100.

Twumasi, P. A. (2001). *Social research on rural communities*. Accra: Ghana Universities Press.

Tyler, K. (1997). Careful criticism brings better performance. *HR Magazine, 42* (4), 57.

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*(4), 175-190.

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), 16-20.

UCC (2015). *Data on senior administrative staff*. Division of Human Resource. (Unpublished)

University of Tasmania. (2001). *A review of the performance management system of the University of Tasmania*. Retrieved August 14, 2014, from http://www.admin.utas.edu.au/hr/staff/perf_mgmt/pm_ext_review_200

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.

Warner, M. (Ed.). (1997). *The concise international encyclopaedia of business management.* London: International Thomson Business Press.

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.

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). London: Thompson.

Wright, J. N. (2001). *The management of service operations.* London: Continuum.

Yammarino, F. J., & Atwater, L. E. (1997). Implications of self-other rating agreement for human resources management. *Organisational Dynamics, 25* (4), 35-44.

Zogbator, B. K. E. (2011). *Role of performance appraisal in staff development in private universities in Ghana: A case of Regent University College of Science and Technology.* Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF ON

THE USE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

I kindly request your response to this questionnaire on the above mentioned study. The information you provide will be used for only academic purpose and therefore its confidentiality is assured.

Thank you.

<u>PART I</u>

Biographic Data

Please tick [√] or write as appropriate in the spaces provided.

1. Gender: Female   [ ]

                  Male   [ ]

2. Age: (a) 22 – 30 years [ ]

        (b) 31 – 36 years [ ]

        (c) 37 – 42 years [ ]

        (d) 43– 60   [ ]

3. What is your highest academic qualification?

    (a) Diploma   [ ]

    (b) Post Graduate Diploma [ ]

    (c) First degree   [ ]

    (d) Second degree (Masters) [ ]

    (e) PhD.   [ ]

    (f) Others   [   ] (Please specify) ……………………………

4. How long have you worked with this University?

    (a) 2 – 5 years   [   ]

    (b) 6 – 15 years   [   ]

    (c) 16 – 25 years   [   ]

    (d) 26 – 35 years   [   ]

5. What is your present rank?

    (a) Chief Admin. Asst.   [   ]

    (b) Prin. Admin. Asst.   [   ]

    (c) Snr. Admin. Asst.   [   ]

    (d) Administrative Asst.   [   ]

PART II

Perception on the uses of performance appraisal system in the University

1. Have you ever been appraised?

    Yes   [   ]

    No   [   ]

2. Who was the appraiser?

    (a) Head of Dept.   [   ]

    (b) Chief Admin. Asst.   [   ]

    (c) Prin. Admin. Asst.   [   ]

    (d) Snr. Admin. Asst.   [   ]

    (e) Others [   ] (Please specify)………………………………………

3. How often are you appraised?

    (a) Annually   [   ]

    (b) Every six month   [   ]

    (c) Others [   ] Please specify…………………………………………

4. When were you last appraised?

    (a) Within the last 12 months   [   ]

    (b) Within the last six months   [   ]

    (c) Other [   ] (approximately when)……………………………

5. How do you consider the criteria for appraising your performance?

    (a) Poor   [   ]

    (b) Fair   [   ]

    (c) Good   [   ]

    (d) Very Good   [   ]

Please, indicate in the Table below the extent to which you agree or disagree to each of the following statements on the uses of performance appraisal system in this University by ticking [√] in the appropriate column.

SA = Strongly agree   A= Agree   D = Disagree   SD = Strongly disagree

No.	Statement	SA	A	D	SD
6	Provides feedback to help me discover my strengths and weakness				
7	For lay off decisions/discipline				
8	Setting work objectives				
9	Providing self development information				
10	Identification of training needs				

122

No.	Statement	SA	A	D	SD
11	Reviewing and updating job description				
12	Transfer decisions				
13	Determining salary increment				
14	Motivating employees by providing feedback on their performance levels.				
15	Maintain promotion				
16	Creating good relation among employees				

17. Please indicate other uses of performance appraisal which have not been

indicated in the table above……………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………..…………………

PART III

The performance appraisal system and career development

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

      (a) strongly agree   [   ]

      (b) agree   [   ]

      (c) disagree   [   ]

      (d) strongly disagree [   ]

2. Do you receive any feedback from your Head of Department after you

   have been assessed?

      Yes   [ ]

      No   [ ]

3. How often do you receive feedback after an appraisal?

      (a) most often   [   ]

      (b) often   [   ]

      (c) seldom   [   ]

      (d) never   [   ]

4. There was an opportunity to discuss the appraisal report with my appraiser?

      (a) strongly agree   [   ]

      (b) agree   [   ]

      (c) disagree   [   ]

      (d) strongly disagree   [   ]

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

      Yes   [   ]

      No   [   ]

6. If yes which of the following were included?

      (a) Training and development courses offered by this University to promote career development   [   ]

      (b) External courses   [   ]

      (c) Development within your faculty/section [   ]

      (d) Others [ ] Specify………………………………………….

PART IV

The performance appraisal system and staff performance

Please, indicate in the Table below the extent to which you agree or disagree to each of the following ways performance appraisal system has improved your performance by ticking [√] in the appropriate column.

124

SA = Strongly agree   A= Agree   D = Disagree   SD = Strongly disagree

No.	Ways it Influences	SA	A	D	SD
1	Improves my skills at work				
2	Makes me to become more diligent and thoughtful at work				
3	Helps minimize errors at work				
4	Makes me perform task more perfectly within limited time				
5	Makes me perform task well with minimum supervision				
6	No impact. It is a technical requirement				

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

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

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

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………