

## How the Performance Appraisal instruments are Being Valued by Staff in Organisations

Nelson Chibvonga Madziyire\*

Senior Lecturer, Faculty Of Education, Zimbabwe Open University, P. O. Box MP 1119 Mount Pleasant, Harare, Harare, Zimbabwe

**\*Corresponding author**

*Nelson Chibvonga  
Madziyire*

**Article History**

*Received: 10.06.2018*

*Accepted: 22.06.2018*

*Published: 30.06.2018*

**DOI:**

10.21276/sjbms.2018.3.6.12



**Abstract:** Employees are the major drivers of any form of business and good employee performance is the most important need for the current competitive business environment to run successfully. Many organisations have started to attach a great emphasis towards the attitudes of workers towards the various instruments they use for performance appraisals. Performance Management and Performance Appraisal are very important tools; it helps to motivate employees to work hard and improves overall company's productivity. The need to design instruments that motivate the employees through the entire of performance management process cannot be overemphasized.

**Keywords:** Organisations, performance, value, appraisal, instruments, staff.

**INTRODUCTION**

Available literature tends to show that the quest for accurate and effective performance appraisal in universities points to the fact that the process of performance appraisal often fails to achieve expected results [1]. The problem is that there is scanty research on the organisational context and efforts of managers as determinants of appraisal outcomes. Further, the extent to which performance appraisals are viewed by senior managers as essential remains unclear. Given such a scenario, it is necessary to examine how judgements and rating behaviours are arrived at. Indeed, improvements in the design of appraisal systems and the conduct of appraisals emanating from research include job-relevant criteria and more effective formats [2, 3].

There has also been a call for training interventions to improve rating accuracy [4, 5].

Other weaknesses as viewed by staff emanate from lack of research-based recommendations for improving performance. Indeed, research agendas that have shaped a lot of empirical work do not address many of the problems of great concern to the senior managers. In fact, the traditional view of performance appraisal as a measurement problem remains prominent in appraisal research. Moreover, very little emphasis was made on rating accuracy in favour of other motivational and dynamics of the appraisal process. Further, Murphy and Cleverland [5] indicated a new focus on how managers form impressions and make appraisal judgements guided by Social Cognition [6] and information processing [7].

In fact, a number of positives seem to emerge pertaining to effectiveness of performance appraisal and implications on reward management. Studies by Wright [8] confirm that there is a relationship between fairness of the compensation and the workers' level of stress and burnout on the job. This implies that compensation viewed as fair will motivate staff to be committed to

their job. Another critical observation was made by Mujtaba and Shuaibi [9] who stated that if an organisation rewards ethical behaviour and employee efforts fairly, workers will tend to reciprocate by putting extra effort to improve organisational performance. This further confirms empirical evidence by Heneman [10] who concluded that merit pay plans generally lead to higher levels of employee and organisational performance. The above findings are pertinent to my study since the researcher intended to examine how appraisal systems could impact on rewards vice versa.

Research on employees' reactions to performance appraisals seems unclear. stressed the need for organisations to develop highly skilled employees who can survive in a competitive environment. Indeed, researchers bemoan the absence of research on employee reactions to performance appraisals. Earlier on, Murphy and Cleveland [5] had stated that strong psychometric properties alone had little impact when the appraisal system was not accepted. Current literature however calls for the need to examine current practices and to assess their effectiveness. The issue of appraiser/appraisee perceptions was further explored by Bevan and Thompson [2] who noted that there were

limited reactions in everyday practices. However, this was a contradiction of what Labig and Chyte [4] had observed when he said that appraisal satisfaction was positively related to organisational commitment. What seems clear is that research has not yet fully explored the role of worker values [11]. This study will explore further the extent to which such worker values are viewed as critical in performance appraisal and reward management.

### Measurement Instruments

In line with the second objective of this study, few researchers have ventured to find ways of promoting good performance appraisal practices; Guest [11] identified factors that contributed to the adoption of the performance appraisal system. He focused on specific elements that contributed to effectiveness. These included:

- Thorough rater training
- Significant user participation in the system's development
- A clear ratification of the system's rationale, goals and objectives as well as
- A rating format which is compatible with the organisations' culture and consistent with the objectives of the appraisal system.

It would appear the above provide a fertile ground for the participation of staff who also are involved in managing the performance appraisal system. Indeed, Yue-Chang goes further to suggest ways of solving reliability and validity issues in performance appraisal. He suggests rethinking peer feedback and annual reviews in order to obtain reliable performance. Apart from suggesting the need to integrate appraisal factors in the institutions, he suggests designing complementary criteria in order to upgrade and maintain a synergy. According to Guest [11], efforts at solving problems that surround performance appraisal include the construction of the appraisal documents, the style in which the appraisal is approached and the culture of the organisation. In fact, they noted that a culture that favours control and measurement will tend to impose a system that discourages openness and participation. In such a climate, there is likely to be a joint problem solving rather than situations when the supervisor calls the tune. There is also a tendency to use forms which seek generalised criteria rather than performance of the appraisee on the job. At times there is heavy reliance on subjectivity as opposed to concrete evidence. Heneman [10] suggested that there is need for performance standards which specify conditions which exist when results are satisfactorily achieved in terms of quantity, quality, time or cost. The above are further confirmed by Guest [11] who in his study emphasised the importance of the existing context and criticises management's tendency to emulate management systems comparable to international standards or

external expertise demands leaving realities within their own system. This study therefore is pertinent in that it focuses on specific cases in a bid to unravel what actually obtains in the selected universities with regards to performance appraisal and prevailing reward systems.

Literature further suggests that problems arise from translating behaviours and performance into simple numerical or grading measures. Gillham [6] raised a number of pertinent issues regarding use of such appraisal strategies. For instance, he says:

- What point values should accrue to different types of scholarships given that faculty members are less likely to agree?
- For example, if someone publishes enough to have the highest scholarship ratings and accrues excess points, what should be done with excess points?
- How can faculty members be encouraged to build on creative ventures beyond minimum requirements?
- Should single authoring be rated the same as co-authoring?

### Performance Appraisal Systems and their Effects on Reward Management in Universities

Marume [7] focused on management systems with a focus on emerging trends and issues. He indicated the following key considerations in developing reward systems:

- The need for skill based pay
- The need for broad banding

In the broad banding structure, an employee can easily be rewarded for lateral movement or skills development as opposed to the traditional multiple grade salary. There is redesigning to allow pay ranges to reflect what obtains in the market. This allows common sense salary structures which provide for plenty of room to compete for talent. The system continues to reward stars without exceeding the pay grade ceiling. This involves consolidating traditional pay structures consisting of many narrow pay ranges into few wide ranges. Variable pay as a method of paying employees above and beyond the pay base depending on successful attainment of specific objectives is also favoured. A variable pay design can put into consideration achievement based on individual performance, group performance or company performance. It is significant to note that team rewards have been known to be effective in improving not only team performance but also individual performance within the team [12].

Indeed, the philosophy of reward management includes the need to achieve fairness, equity, consistency and transparency in operating a reward system [13]. They state that for any system to obtain good returns. It is necessary to reward differently and

to ensure elements of rewards are clearly stipulated. This implies that policies provide clear guidelines on approaches to guide the rewards. Practices adopted should indicate rewards including contingent pay. They also state that it is important to ensure that there are clear processes which focus on assessing individual performance and also evaluate the relative size of jobs. Further, they state that procedures which serve to maintain the system and allow for predictability should be well articulated and finally that there should be a clear structure which provides a framework for pay.

The above confirms the need for performance pay as a way of improving quality. Linking pay with performance includes well laid out requirements that progress through all levels of pay. It is further emphasised that staff should fulfil set levels of performance. Performance pay has yet another advantage in that it increases staff motivation since the staff will be recognised for achieving or exceeding desired objectives.

Given the view that staff will be fully appraised, there are chances that there could be cost savings from non-payment of under-performing staff and since such a system calls for observance of discipline, this will save costs in that there will be fewer staff who have to be charged for indiscipline.

Heneman [10] examined current performance appraisal practices on reward, financial or non-financial rewards using lessons from literature and results of a qualitative analysis as revealed from interviews of some executive members. It is significant to note that they indicated that there was scarcity of empirical case study work on organisations pertaining to workings of performance appraisal and factors which result in positive effect. While the literature reviewed recognised the importance of effective systems regarding performance measurement and reward, it was not clear how to measure team performance and how to structure rewards to achieve maximum effectiveness [10].

Of importance is the view that reward systems should comply with the overall management style of an organisation. It is also significant to note that there has always been a debate on the merits of financial versus non-financial and extrinsic rewards.

- Non-financial rewards are evidenced by recognition.
- Provision of opportunities to succeed related to role design and development activities.
- Skills development and career planning which encompass coaching, learning and review discussions.
- Promoting job enlargement which emphasises intrinsic motivation factors like job satisfaction and job outcomes.

- Commitment by integrating individual and organisational objectives.

According to Guest [11], most formal performance appraisal systems use financial extrinsic rewards such as individual merit-based pay, skill-based pay as well as knowledge-based pay based on learning and knowledge other than skills.

For team merit-based pay, gain-sharing and / or profit sharing based on organisational level performance, special rewards and bonuses are also used. It is further stated that it is essential to measure performance or competence to determine what to pay for performance with regard the above. Armstrong [13] hinted that assessment should be based on good information and informed opinion. He further indicated that the person being assessed should be encouraged to contribute to the process of obtaining evidence to support the assessment. The appraisee should be able to appreciate why the assessment was made and should be given an opportunity to appeal against the assessment.

While efforts have been made to define performance and behaviour expected, it was found difficult to motivate individuals and teams to meet desired expectations indicates conceptualisation model is not widely accepted. In fact, research is not agreed. Some studies indicate that pay is the most important factor while others rate it lower. There is therefore lack of consistency pertaining to the role of pay as a motivator. Indeed in a survey conducted on the third quarter of 2005, the following themes emerged:

- Irrespective of the size of the organisation, cash is always the mostly provided reward and is usually in the form of bonus or other award.
- Long term incentive plans are utilised throughout organisations.
- Companies tend to offer low cost creative rewards coupled with learning activities which in turn upgrade skills and improve morale.

While the above findings relate to the application of rewards in the private sector, their importance in relation to rewards management in the universities under study remains to be seen. Further, a clearer assessment of performance appraisal systems in selected universities can best be understood through the exploration of a number of critical concepts. This study will therefore focus on the following:

- The role of merit pay
- Management by objectives
- Results based management
- Balanced scorecard
- Organisational commitment
- The four Cs; and
- Benchmarking

### The role of merit pay

The issue of merit pay plans has remained controversial among researchers. Their study focused on current performance appraisal practices on rewards financial and non-financial using lessons from literature and results from qualitative analysis as revealed from interviews conducted on some executive members. Research results indicated regular use of appraisal system by leaders in order to better organisational results. Such results included reward elements like basic pay, contingent pay, employee benefits or intrinsic rewards from the work place.

In another study on merit pay plans in Higher Education Institutions, Gillham [6] focused on the need to provide empirical data on effects of merit pay plans in Higher Education institutions. They used a sample size of 500 faculty members from four-year colleges and universities in the United States. In their findings, they concluded that merit pay plans in general has somehow a positive effect on Faculty performance levels in areas of teaching research and service.

Of note is the view that formal appraisal systems would use individual merit pay, skill based pay, knowledge based pay, team merit based pay as well as gain sharing or a profit sharing system. They concluded that pay was the commonly provided reward. It was found to have significant impact on performance. Tied to the above Chief Executive Officers preferred compensation related to job description so as to have measurable results. While merit pay plans have been seen to have a somewhat positive effect on performance appraisal in the public sector financial incentives were seen to have a greater impact on quantity than quality. It is significant to note that research to date has not empirically investigated the impact of merit pay plans upon performance levels of faculty in university setting hence the need for this study.

Indeed as further evidence of contradictions on the relevance of merit pay plans in Higher Education Institutions, Schutz and Tanguay [14] state that merit pay has been the hallmark of pay for organisational programmes for years. They even go further to say that merit pay systems are based on well communicated predetermined standards which provide greater rewards to those performing at higher levels. Further confirmation comes from Flynn [12] who stated that pay for performance can motivate staff and that there is a connection between results of performance appraisal and compensation of individuals.

From what has been advanced so far, neither monetary incentives nor non-monetary incentives could be said to exclusively impact on employee performance. The researcher would like to find out the situation which obtains in the selected universities.

### CONCLUSION

Performance appraisal nowadays is applied almost from every organization in order to measure and evaluate the job performance of the employees. Behind the use of such systems two main objectives exist for every company. First, is to use the outcomes as an evaluation to help determine rewards and second, to use it as a feedback for detecting training needs and career enhancement opportunities. The goal of performance appraisal is to measure effectively performance, to increase motivation, to enhance productivity and finally to make strategic planning easier. For another approach, the purpose of performance appraisal can be characterized by the fact that when it is done positively it can be beneficial for everyone in the organization, both supervisor and subordinate, and the driving force in any situation must be that: "quality feedback improves performance"). Essentially, the aim of such systems is to compare the actual performance of an employee with that desired from the organization. The significance of instruments for measuring performance, therefore plays a critical role.

### REFERENCES

1. Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2009). *Designing qualitative research*. Sage publications.
2. Bevan, G., & Thompson, M. (2014). *Performance appraisal in the UK: An Analysis of the Issues*: London: Institute of Personnel Management.
3. Carl, A. P., & Kapp, C. (2004). Performance appraisal in Higher Education. *Bridging the Gap in Journal of Education Research*. 21(2).
4. Labig Jr, C. E., & Chye, T. Y. (1996). Problems with performance appraisal? Remedies for HR executives. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 4(1), 107-113.
5. Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (2003). *Performance appraisal An Organisational Perspective* Allyn and Bacon Boston. MA. *Resource Management on Employee Relations*.
6. Gillham, W. (2006). *Improving Company Performance through Sustainability Assessment*.
7. Marume, S. B. M. (2015). *Public Administration: special contemporary problems and challenges*. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
8. Wright, A. (2004). *Reward Management in Context*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel Development.
9. Mujtaba, S. A. (2010). *U.S. Patent No. 7,742,390*. Washington, DC: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.
10. Heneman, R. L. (Ed.). (2002). *Strategic Reward Management: Design, Implementations, and Evaluation*. IAP.
11. Heneman, R. L. (Ed.). (2002). *Strategic Reward Management: Design, Implementations, and Evaluation*. IAP.
12. Guest, D. (2011). *Human resource management, corporate performance and employee: building the*

- worker into HRM. *Journal of Industrial Relations*. 4(3). 335-358.
13. Flynn, F. (2005). Identity orientations and forms of social exchange in organisations. *Academic Management Review* 30(4) 737-750.
  14. Armstrong, M., & Stephens, T. (2005). *A handbook of employee reward management and practice*. Kogan Page Publishers.
  15. Langlois, C., Jorquera, R., Finegold, M., Shroads, A. L., Stacpoole, P. W., & Tanguay, R. M. (2006). Evaluation of dichloroacetate treatment in a murine model of hereditary tyrosinemia type 1. *Biochemical pharmacology*, 71(11), 1648-1661.