

THE IMPACT OF PERSONNEL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL ON PRODUCTIVITY IN ORGANISATIONS

¹Chioma Joyce ALANEME and ²Stephen Olatunji ADEMULEGUN

¹Department of Business Administration and Management, Joseph Ayo Babalola University, Ikeji Arakeji, Osun State, Nigeria

²Directorate of Management Programmes, Waziri Umaru Federal Polytechnic, Birnin Kebbi

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56293/IJMSSSR.2022.4702>

IJMSSSR 2023

VOLUME 5

ISSUE 5 SEPTEMBER – OCTOBER

ISSN: 2582 - 0265

Abstract: This research assesses the impact of personnel performance appraisal on productivity in organisation. It is geared towards examining the relationship between self-evaluation apparatus, behavioural checklists, degree of feedback mechanisms, and management by objectives and employees' productivity of organisation. Data was collected from both primary and secondary sources. The structured research questionnaire was administered to a random sample of 331 employees and customers from various organisations. The organisations were chosen randomly within Birnin Kebbi metropolis. The research data analysis was done using descriptive and inferential statistics. The analysis result showed that there was a statistical difference on factors motivating different levels of management on employee loyalty and employee retention. When comparing Employee loyalty factors at low/middle level and at low/high level, the significant value is 0.001 while at middle /high level the significant level is 0.206. It further shows that comparing Employee retention factors at low/high level the significant value is 0.00, at middle/high level is 0.037 while low/middle is 0.066. These indicate that perception at different level varies and based on these findings it is recommended that management should take into consideration the motivating factors at different levels to enable them retain their employee and ensure their loyalty. At the end of this work the researcher was able to conclude that personnel performance appraisal has significant impact on employee's productivity through their self-evaluation, behavioural checklist mechanisms, degree of feedbacks and management by objectives mechanisms. It is also concluded that this can lead to improve employee's performance, motivate and fairly used for reward system in an organisation.

Keywords: Productivity, Performance Appraisal, Management by Objective, Behavioural Checklist.

Introduction

Organisations are established to perform certain tasks and use different cadre of staff to achieve their objectives. To maintain standards and anticipated productivity, organisations have to keep abreast with both new knowledge and technological advances. This fast growing challenge requires that organisations engage or update their staff so that they can cope with the rate of generation of new changes in these areas. Some of the coping mechanisms applied by organisations are: recruitment of trainable staff, reproofing of present staff, in service training in certain disciplines and on the job trainings.

A performance appraisal system is a good instrument that can be used to improve the quality of an organisation's work force productivity, which is considered as an important aspect in human resources management and as part of the control process in administration (Kavussi Shal, 1999). It is an important instrument in the manpower management. If it is performed correctly and logically, it can conduct the organisations to their goals and the employees will achieve their interests (Hamidi et al, 2011). In order for an organisation to achieve its objectives, planning of the appraisal process is an important subject which should be undertaken to enable it achieves the objectives like work force development, including improvements, promotions and assignments in managerial positions, persuasion and punishment, salary increase, personnel's performance feedback and determining their educational needs. Employee perceptions of the fairness of performance evaluations are critical to the success of any appraisal system (Rubin and Edwards, 2020).

Therefore, an appraisal can be considered as an important factor in identifying the people's talents and capacities and its results can make them aware of advancements, plans and goals. An organisation, itself, needs to detect the employees' efficiency to improve the manpower's status, for the purpose of increasing their productivity and making positive changes in its trend (Hamidi et al, 2011). Appraisal can also be used to improve productivity through minimizing of employee's complaints and perception of unfairness, if it is deployed objectively (Rubin and Edwards, 2020).

Performance appraisal is a veritable tool for employee productivity. The essence of performance appraisal is to checkmate the contribution made by every employee and to know how well they are going on with their tasks. Appraisal help to identify the skilled and performing employee of an organisation to increase their salary and other benefits that can make them satisfied on their job (Lawler et al, 2013).

There are lots of problems associated with effective performance appraisal which includes untrained supervisors/managers, lack of effective metrics, inconsistent rating of employees, unreliable reward systems. It is on this premises that the study seeks to know the influence of performance appraisal on employee productivity.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

THE CONCEPT OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Mwema and Gachunga (2014) averred that performance appraisal helps in evaluating employees' activities and should be geared towards the accomplishment of the organisational goals and objectives. Onyije (2015) viewed performance appraisal as efforts to match the employee's performance with the work situation and analysing the prospects in the future. Also, Ayomikun (2017) sees performance appraisal as a tool to identify the strength of employee to perform his/her task and the weakness inherent in the accomplishment of the task. It also involves the establishment of actions to achieve organisational goals.

It is this vein that Mwena and Gachunga (2014) averred that performance appraisal involved three processes which includes: the assigning to subordinate with responsibilities that will help him/her to gain experiences that will aid is performance, carrying out the assigned responsibilities effectively and efficiently and evaluation of the responsibility by the superior to ascertain suitability for reward or promotion. (Lawler et al, 2012). Hamidi et al (2011) opined that "performance appraisal should be a systematic way of determining the ability of employee in carrying out his/her assigned duty. It helps to know those who can perform and those who cannot". It is therefore imperative that performance appraisal should be both useful in judging and correcting performance in an organisation. Performance appraisal should bring out the potentials in employee, reveal his/her areas of competence, the training needs and adequate rewards or promotion desired (Mwena and Gachunga, 2014).

The usefulness of performance appraisal or its importance as been opined by Bhurtel and Adhikari (2016) is to help organisation allocate its resources, provide feedback mechanism to employees on their performances, maintain working relationship in their team and reward them accordingly within the fair and equal working rules and regulations. Performance appraisal systems should help to develop the employees for the overall organisational objectives. The objectives of performance appraisal therefore varies from different scholars perspectives; it is judgemental or punitive in some views while it is correctional in some others views.

Ayomikun (2017) enumerated the benefits of performance appraisal for both the employees and the organisations as follows: Employee benefits come from them understanding their strength and weakness and their potential for future development as indicated by the appraisal systems. He listed the benefits an employee's gain from appraisal to include:

- Gaining additional rewards
- Determining the means for salary increment and payment of bonuses
- Motivation for improve performance to gain promotion.
- Recognition of employee's abilities
- Enhancing of supervisory supports
- Provision of needed feedbacks from the organisation

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEMS

DeCenzo (2016) identified that performance appraisal can both be traditional and modern appraisal systems been used by most organisations.

Traditional Methods

Ranking Method
Paired Comparison
Grading
Forced distribution method
Forced choice method & Checklist method
Critical balanced method
Graphic scale method
Essay method
Field review method
Confidential report
Modern Methods

Management by Objectives (MBO)
Behavioural Anchored Rating Scale
Assessment censor
360 degree appraisal
Cost accounting method
360 Degrees Appraisal

According to Kuzulu and Iyem, (2016), the 360 degrees appraisal is a performance appraisal system that is similar to a compass which has multiple points. The appraisal system operates such that each employee can get feedback on his/her performance from the superior, peers, co-workers, staff members and customers. The appraisal system ensures that employee receive multiple feedbacks from all people they interact with in the organisation i.e all stakeholders that the employee's performance has impact upon. It is widely used for senior and middle level employees as their complexity roles in the organisation need sufficient data for a meaningful assessment. It is veritable tool for training and development within the organisation decision making such as promotion and placement. It comprises of four integral components:

Self appraisal: in this component, the employee has the opportunity to look at his/her strengths and weaknesses, then judge his/her performance base on his/her achievements.

Superior's appraisal: This is the component where the superior rate the performance of the employees based on their responsibilities and their actual performance.

Subordinate's appraisal: This is the component where the employees are allowed to judge the superiors based on certain performance indicators such as superior's communication and motivating skills, delegating abilities, leadership qualities etc. In this situation, the employees are referred to as internal customers.

Peer appraisal: This is the component where the peers and contemporaries give correct feedback to help employee's abilities to work in a team, co-operation and sensitivity towards others.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

According to DeCenzo et al (2016), the performance appraisal process has six steps which every employee must undertake before it can be effective. These steps are:

1: Establishing performance standards

Performance standards consist of departmental goals and objectives and the organisation's overall strategy and objectives that need to be achieved. These standards focused on the position in the organisation, it is not on individual capability. The standards adhere strictly to the same rules that apply to goal-setting; it is imperative that the rules should be "SMART:" specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound.

Also, performance standards include both observable behaviours—the how—and the expected results that comprise satisfactory job performance.

Step 2: Communicating the performance standards

Effectiveness of performance standards depend on clearly communicated expectations and understanding of the expectations by the employees. It is based on the assumption that individual employee is competent thus the only requirement from the organisation is to provide initial and corrective training that will aid the performance management process. The training should be specific so as to help the employee to perform to standard and there is need to communicate such performance standards to the employees.

Step 3: Measuring the performance

This involves expressing the performance in terms that can be measured. The numeric value should be attached to the performance such as quantity, quality, time frame, costs etc. that will be easy to measure. In another vein, expression in the area of soft skills such as customer service, leadership, communication, supervision skills, etc. are difficult to measure and evaluate. Therefore, the measuring of performance should be in the numeric values that are simple and easy to measure.

Step 4: Comparing actual performance with performance standards

The actual performance of the employees will be compared with the standard performance set by the organisation. There is need for the organisation to document actions and results which the following characteristics must be identified:

Formal i.e., in writing

Factual

Accurate

Specific

Consistency that covers the entire review period.

Balanced performance including both satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance

Step 5: Discussing the appraisal with the employee

This stage is very difficult most times because the managers and the subordinates may find it challenging to manage the emotions and expectations while discussing the appraisal. The ability of the managers to handle emotionally laden performance discussion will help the managers to relate either by regularly providing feedback and coach the employees from time to time basis. It is important that the managers should note employees with consistent poor performance, and provide corrective actions for such poor performance while motivating to sustain the positive performance. It is on this note that the managers should not always wait for annual review before providing corrective actions for poor performances. This will require the managers to adequately deal with the appraisal process in civilized and calmed manner that will engender motivations rather than punishments.

Step 6: Implementing the personnel action

The implementation of action or next steps of discussion is the final step in the appraisal process. This might be a reward such as salary increment, promotion, advancement or it can be a corrective or coaching action that will assist the employees to achieve their desire results or goals or expectations. At this stage also, performance gaps

are also identified, supervisors and managers therefore assess the reasons why the employees are not meeting the expectations. It is this process that will help to determine the training needs that will help to meet expectations of all stakeholders. Also at this stage, the performance evaluation may warrant termination of some actions in a timely manner.

Ibrahim and Daniel (2018) argued that organisations should evaluate their employees frequently, utilized targets and time management. Organisations should also use behavioural performance method to increase interpersonal relationships, team work and nurtured integration. Both the appraisers and the appraisees will benefit from effective performance appraisals as well as the organisations. The appraisees benefit in many ways which includes: helping them to discover expectations from them so as to set their goals, better understanding their strengths and weaknesses so as to adjust appropriately, it also provides a feedback platform for them to create constructive forum for behavioural adjustment, it provides avenue for them to give their input to the manager in the decision making and finally, it creates a plan to improve behaviour, and get a better grasp on the goals and priorities of the company.

The Triple-P Model

The Triple-P model has been developed based on the terminology surrounding the productivity to give a schematic view of how the different terms are suggested to be used (Tangen, 2005). The model includes five terms; productivity, profitability, performance, effectiveness and efficiency captured the differences and explains their relationships.

Productivity is at the center of Triple P-model and it gives a straightforward operational definition of productivity as a ratio of output to the input. The output is quantity i.e. number of correctly produced products that meet specification is divided by the input which is the quantity of all type of the resources that are consumed in the transformation process.

Profitability is also seen as the relation between output and input, but includes influences from price-factors (i.e. price recovery).

Performance is the umbrella term of manufacturing excellence and includes profitability as well as non-cost factors such as quality, speed, delivery and flexibility. Effectiveness is a term to be used when the output of the manufacturing transformation process is focused, while efficiency represents how well the input of the transformation process (i.e. resources) is utilized.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed descriptive survey design. This was used in order to facilitate answers to the research question and testing the hypothesis. This design was adopted to ease data collection and analysis and give desired and robust research output. The population of the study was 2,400 of selected employees/customers and the sample size was determined using the Krejcie and Morgan 1970 table in Sarantakos (2005) to arrive at a sample size of 331 employees and customers. The research questionnaire was administered to a random sample of 331 employees and customers who are from the organisations. The organisations were chosen randomly within Birnin Kebbi metropolis. The Heads of each organisation were contacted personally. To ensure a prompt response rate, the questionnaires were delivered by hand to the two organisations who then administered it to their employees/ customers. A total of 331 questionnaires were distributed at the rate of minimum of 1 per respondent and 298 respondents returned completed and valid questionnaires, representing a 90% response rate. According to Ikeagwu (1998), in an analytical survey of this nature, 40% of the population would be enough for adequate generalization. Hence the final sample size of 298 was used to test the hypotheses. In order to generate the appropriate data required to achieve the objectives of this research work, the researcher found it relevant to use primary data. Data generated were analysed twice. First, data were submitted to a descriptive analysis through the Frequencies procedure that provides statistics useful for describing many types of variables. Moreover, the Cross-tabs procedure forms (two-way and multi-way tables) were useful to find the shared relations between the variables and provide a variety of tests and measures of significant relationship for two-way tables. The descriptive statistics measured most of the contents in the questionnaire where it involved Self Evaluation (SE), Behavioural

Check List (BCL), 360 Degree feedback (DF), and Management by Objective (MBO). Thereafter, regression analysis and ANOVA were performed on the data. The dependent variable (level employees' productivity towards performance appraisal) was regressed on each of the independent variables. Thereafter, the t-test was used to test for significance of the regression parameters. The adoption of regression technique is due to the fact that it can be used for data in which the independent variables are correlated with one another and even to some extent with the dependent variable. Pallant (2007) argued that it is used when the predictive ability of a set of independent variables on one continuous dependent variable is to be explored. The profiles of each cluster are obtained from variables included in the analysis such as demographic and attitudinal variables. One-way ANOVA is performed to test for differences between the identified clusters. All analyses were conducted with the SPSS 20.0 statistical analysis program.

Presentation of Data

The tables below represent the conceptual demographic distribution of the respondents as it relates to performance appraisal and the level employees' productivity.

Table 1.1: Demographic and Personal Characteristics of Respondents

S/N	Categorization			
V1: Organisations	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid Waziri Umaru Fed. Poly	184	62.1	62.1	
Guaranty Trust Bank	113	37.9	37.9	62.1
Total	298	100	100	100
V2: Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid Male	159	53.4	53.4	53.4
Female	139	46.6	46.6	100.0
Total	298	100.0	100.0	
V3: Age	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid 20 - 29yrs	103	34.6	35.0	35.0
30 - 39yrs	132	44.3	44.9	79.9
40 - 49yrs	54	18.1	18.4	97.0
50 yrs and above	9	3.0	3.0	100.0
Total	298	100.0	100.0	
V4: Staff Category	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid Academic	172	57.7	69.1	69.1
Non Teaching	47	15.8	18.9	88.0
Operations Staff	23	7.7	9.2	97.2
Field Staff	7	2.3	2.8	100.0
Total	249	83.6	100	
Missing system	49	16.4		
Total	298	100.0		
V5 Educational Qualification	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid Phd/Master Degree	52	17.4	17.5	17.5
Bachelor's Degree/	68	22.8	22.9	40.4
HND	59	19.8	19.9	60.3
NCE/Diploma	67	22.5	22.6	82.8
HND/ First degree	48	16.1	16.2	100.0
School Certificate	4	1.3	1.3	
Others (please specify)	298	100	100	
Total				
V6: Discipline	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid Humanities/Educations	232	77.9	78.9	78.9
Management & S/Sciences	53	17.8	18.0	96.9

Engineering/Sciences	8	2.7	2.7	99.7
Others (please specify) ...	1	3	3	100,0
Missing system	294	98.7	100.0	
Total	4	1.3		
	298	100.0		
V7: Length of Service	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid 1 – 10 years	40	13.4	13.8	13.8
11 – 20 years	64	21.5	22.1	35.9
21 – 30 years	76	25.5	26.2	62.1
31years and Above	110	36.9	37.9	100.0
Total	290	97.3	100.0	
Missing system	8	2.7		
Total	298	100.0		

Source: Researchers Field Work 2021

Q1(Table 1.1) While 62.1% of the respondents are from Waziri Umaru Federal Polytechnic Birnin Kebbi and 37.9% are Guaranty Trust Bank, all the respondents were responsible for performance appraisers within their organisations. This is reflected in V1 (table 1.1)

Q2 (Table 1.1) shows the gender position of the respondents. 53.4% of the respondents are male and 46.6% are female, all respondents were fit for the performance appraiser analysis vis-a-vis productivity of their various organisation. This is reflected in V2 (table 1.1)

Q3 (table 1.1) represents the age distribution of the respondents interviewed. 34.6% are between the ages of 20-29 yrs, 44.3% are between the ages of 30 – 39 yrs, 18.1 are between the ages of 40-49 yrs, and 3.0% are between the ages of 50 and above.

Q4 (table 1.1) shows the respondents' staff category. 57.7% of the respondent's academic staff, 15.8% Non-Teaching Staff, 7.7% Operation Staff, while 2.3% Field Staff. This distribution shows that the respondent's cadre skewed towards Waziri Umaru Federal Polytechnic.

Q5 (table 1.1) represents the distribution of the respondent's highest educational qualification. 17.4% of the respondent have PhD/ Master Degree, 22.8% have Bachelor Degree/HND, 19.8%, have NCE/Diplomas, 22.5% have a School Certificates and 16.1% have other qualifications.

Q6 (table 1.1) shows the respondent's discipline. 77.9% are from Humanities/Education, 17.8% are from Management/ Social Sciences 2.7% are from Engineering/Sciences, while 3% indicated others. We have 1.3% representing the missing system (those who did not indicate their discipline on the questionnaire.

Q7 (table 1.1) shows the respondents' length of service distribution. 13.4% have worked with the organisation for a period of 1 – 10 years, 21.5% have worked for 11 – 20 years, 25.5% have worked for 21 -30 years, while 36.9% have worked for 30 –above years, others. 2.7% are the missing system (unspecified options).

Table 1.2 Personnel performance appraisals criteria such as change in the rating scale, attitude, interpersonal skills, customer service and management by objective significantly influenced employee's productivity in an organisation.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error
Independent variables	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic

Q21 Rating scale has helped the organisation productivity improved over the years.	298	1.0	5.0	2.916	1.7104	.030	.141
Q22 Attitude can serve as a tool for improved job performance	296	1.0	5.0	3.794	1.1938	-.835	.142
Q23 Interpersonal skills enhance productivity in the organisation.	298	1.0	5.0	3.383	1.3931	-.527	.141
Q24 Customer service sustains the achievement of the organisational objectives.	298	1.0	5.0	3.839	1.1952	-.865	.141
Q25. Management by objectives can significantly connect to increase in productivity	298	1.0	5.0	3.624	1.0761	-.545	.141
Valid N (listwise)	296						

Source: Researchers Field Work 2021

From historical development perspectives, organisation plan must identify value drivers which serve as key performance indicators (KPIs). It measurement must not be limited to internal KPIs. According to Sroufe (2017), strategic priorities and available resources, organisations may take different strategic responses to productivity and form a unique strategic performance appraisal model, Sroufe (2017). The sample size for all the independent variables is $N = 298$. The minimum and maximum are 1.0 and 5.0 respectively. People on the maximum parameter score high in performance appraisal and these categories of respondents occupy high management echelon. The mean score for

$LEP = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 RS + \alpha_2 A + \alpha_3 IPS + \alpha_4 CS + \alpha_5 MBO + \epsilon_i$, this translates into $\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 2.916 + \alpha_2 3.794 + \alpha_3 3.383 + \alpha_4 3.839 + \alpha_5 3.624 + 141i$. Mean = median = mode = 0

This shows that the mean value for rating scale is influence by employee's productivity and organisation sustainability because the score is strongly positively skewed compare to Attitude, interpersonal skills, customer service and management by objectives whose distribution is left skewed. However, it is less skewed or more symmetrical- than our rating scale which had skewness = .030. The standard deviation is above +1 which indicates that the spread is adequate. With this, there is evidence that ratings scale is a common method of appraisal. It uses a set of pre-determined criteria that a manager uses to evaluate an employee against each set of criteria that is weighted so that a measured score can be calculated at the end of the review. It also evidence that the single factor RS overshadow all other factors without any objective evaluation.

Table 1.3 Performance appraisals mechanism influence on the level of employee's productivity in an organisation.

Descriptive Statistics

		Mean	Std. Deviation	N
V 21	Level of employees' productivity	2.906	1.5997	298
V22	Self Evaluation	3.712	1.3081	298
V23	Behavioural checklist	3.385	1.4912	298

V24	Degree of Feedback	3.253	1.3467	298
V25	Management by Objectives	3.038	1.5102	298

Here we are interested in the overall distribution of performance of the variables to see their influence on employee productivity. The mean score for all variables is (2.53). The mean score for SE+BCL + DF +MBO = $f(x) = 3.712 + 3.385 + 3.253 + 3.038$, in the model, the mean becomes 2.53 α . The mean score for SE+BCL + DF + MBO is higher than total mean score (2.53), this show a mean distribution of the variables are influenced by the skewing. The standard deviation indicates a narrower distribution for all the variables i.e a homogenous score around the mean. This shows that performance appraisal influences the level of employee's productivity. This shall be subjected to further analysis using the regression analysis.

Model Summaryb2

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.851a	.741	.738	.8191	.741	202.911	4	283	.000

A. Predictors: (Constant), Self Evaluation, Behavioural Checklist, Degree Of Feedback, Management By Objectives

B. Dependent Variable: Level of Employees' Productivity

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	544.585	4	136.146	202.911	.000b
	Residual	189.884	283	.671		
	Total	734.469	287			

a. Dependent Variable: Level Of Employees' Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Self Evaluation, Behavioural Checklist, Degree Of Feedback, Management By Objectives

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.502	.151		-3.319	.001
	SELF EVALUATION	.011	.059	.009	.192	.848
	BEHAVIOURAL CHECKLIST	.262	.063	.244	4.163	.000
	DEGREE OF FEEDBACK	.488	.060	.411	8.158	.000
	MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES	.293	.055	.277	5.356	.000

a. Dependent Variable: LEVEL OF EMPLOYEES' PRODUCTIVITY

Discussion of Findings

Results of the Multiple Linear Regression Model indicate that: $\alpha_0 = -.502$, $\alpha_1 = .011$, $\alpha_2 = .262$, $\alpha_3 = .488$, $\alpha_4 = .293$. Thus, our model becomes

$$LP = -.502 + .011SE + .262BCL + .488DF + .293MBO$$

The calculated t statistics were -3.319, .192, 4.163, 8.158 and 5.368 for constant, X1, X2, X3, and X4 respectively. The associated significant probabilities are 0.001, .848, 0.000, 0.000 and 0.000 for constant X1, X2, X3, and X4 respectively, thus indicating that three of the independent variables (behavioural checklist, degree of feedback and management by objective as it relates to level of employees' productivity) are significant predictors of the level of employees' productivity at the ninety-fifth percent (95%) confidence level, hence t value of 8.158 at $P = 0.000$ is highly significant. It further indicates that all our variables are significant predictors of LP.

The ANOVA table indicated a calculated F statistic of 202.911 with a significant probability of 0.00, thus indicating that the overall significance of the regression model is good (model fit positive). The value of R square (coefficient of determination) is 0.741 while the adjusted R-square was 0.738, thus indicating that approximately seventy-four percent (74%) of the variation toward level employees' productivity is accounted for or explained by variations in self-evaluation, behavioural checklist, degree of feedback and management by objective, while the remaining 26% is explained by the error term.

The findings showed that all the relationships except that between level of employees' productivity and degree of feedback were statistically significant at the five percent (5%) level. Thus, at the ninety-five percent (95%) confidence level, the research findings are:

The results of the regression test indicate that there is a positive relationship between the dependent variable (Level of employees' productivity) and four of the independent variables – self-evaluation (X1) behavioural checklist (X2) degree of feedback (X3) as well as management by objective (X4) because they were significant. However, the regression between level of employees' productivity and all the independent variables (X1, X2, X3 and X4) was significant at the five percent (5%) level. The regression test further revealed that there is one negative relationship between level of employees' productivity and one independent variable, self-evaluation (X1). This confirmed that the process is subjective, and employees may struggle with either rating themselves too high or too low, as a results, it accounts for the partially relationship to performance output (Sroufe, 2017). The inference drawn here is that a single factor may overshadow all other factors without any objective evaluation.

It also reveals that there is no detailed analysis or detail on how the employee is actually doing, nor does it discuss goals, in the process of appraiser a YES or NO is recorded

Similar findings reveal that degree of feedback runs the risk of taking in broad generalizations from outside sources who many do not know how to provide constructive feedback. This aspect of performance appraisal provides a bigger picture of an employee's performance and that is why it accounts for the highest level of significance showing a relationship between level employees' productivity and performance appraisal in the two organisations.

Finally, It reveal that in the time past, employee and manager do not specify sets of attainable performance goals that the employee will strive to achieve over a given period of time and MBO is supposed to serve as catalyst for empowering in terms of personal career development.

This probably accounts for the significance of the t-test for significance of the coefficient of degree of feedback (α_3) at the five percent (5%) level, thus indicating that at the ninety-five percent (95%) confidence level, level employees' productivity is a significant predictor of performance appraisals. Indeed, the t-test for significance of the remaining regression coefficients self-evaluation (X1) behavioural checklist (X2) degree of feedback (X3) management by objective (X4) were all significant at the ninety-fifth percent (95%) confidence levels, thus indicating that all the independent variables are predictors of level of employees' productivity. This is in agreement with Ayomikun (2017) study which shows the presence of significant positive outcomes when the organisation uses performance appraisal as a motivation tool. Further, the study finds that the use of more than one appraisal techniques helps yield greater satisfaction and consequently higher motivational levels. It concludes that Where

performance appraisal is viewed as most successful in the private sector, it is firmly embedded in the context of management and personnel systems that provide incentives for managers to use performance appraisal ratings as the organisation intends in the public sector.

The R-Square is good because is above 50% percent. The model summary revealed an R coefficient of 0.861, yielding an R-square of 0.741 and an adjusted R-square coefficient of 0.738; thus indicating that 74% of the variation in the dependent variable (Level of employees' productivity) is accounted for (explained) by the independent variables (X1) behavioural checklist (X2) degree of feedback (X3) management by objective (X4) The high coefficient of determination, as it were, is suggestive of a high explanatory power of the independent variables (predictors), thus leaving a lower proportion of the variation in the dependent variable (level of employees' productivity) to factors not captured in the model-stochastic variables. Dina van jikh (2015) continuous surveillance on performance appraisal and evaluation; explained this where it considered the lower proportion of the variation in the dependent variable to accommodate changes in few exceptions where the analysis of managerial performance is cast at a high level of abstraction; far less attention has been given to the sort of detailed, task-centered definition typical of simpler, more concrete jobs and concluded that A job may be more or less routinized, structured, and constrained by the requirements of machinery or defined by training, but the evaluation of job performance will always depend in the final analysis on external judgments about what is most important (number of units produced or quality of the units produced; everyday performance or response to the infrequent emergency; single-minded pursuit of profits or avoidance of environmental damage).

Lastly, the ANOVA table revealed a calculated F statistic of 202.911 which was significant at the ninety-fifth percent (95%) confidence level. The implication is that the overall significance of the model is good. To this end, the study finds that the Linear Regression Model provides a better fit, and overall, the parameter estimates are improved.

Conclusion

The findings demonstrated that the personnel performance appraisal has significant impact on employee's productivity through their self-evaluation, behavioural checklist mechanisms, degree of feedback mechanisms and management by objectives mechanisms which will help to improve productivity in the organisations and their sustainability. It can therefore be concluded that employee participations in the personnel performance appraisal were high and led to improve employee performances. However, the perception of the objectivity of the process, motivation, reward and outcome in promotion has being judged fair. More so, it was found that personnel performance appraisal is an important tool used to assess employees' efficiency in workplace and it usually takes the form of annual review to evaluate work performance and significant training needs.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad R. and Bujang S. (2013); Issues and Challenges in the Practice of Performance Appraisal Activities in the 21st Century. International Journal of Education and Research, 1(4). www.ijern.com visited 2/2/2021
2. Ahsan N. A., Ali H. and Usman G. C. (2020); Performance Management and Employee Productivity: A study of the Banking Sector of Pakistan. Reviews of Management Sciences 1(1) pp 1-16, www.rmsjournal.com visited 11/12/2020
3. Ayomikun, I. (2017); Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal System and its Effect on Employee Motivation. Nile Journal of Business and Economics 3(5). www.researchgate.net visited 20/1/2021
4. Barth, A. L. and Beer, W. (2018); Performance Management Process: Diagnosis, In: Performance Management. Management for Professionals. Springer. Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64936-8_11
5. Bhurtel, A. and Adhikari, E. R. (2016); Performance Appraisal for Employee Development: Exploring Perceptions of Supervisors. International Journal of Social and Management 3(2) pp 93 – 101
6. Dale S. Beach, Personnel (1980); The Management of People at Work, 4th ed., Macmillan, p.368.
7. DeCenzo, D. A., Stephen P. Robbins, and Susan L Verhulst. 2016. Fundamentals of Human Resource Management. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
8. Dina van Jikh (2015). Performance Appraisal and Evaluation; International Encyclopedia of the Social &

- Behavioral Sciences, 716–721
9. Fletcher, C. (2004): Appraisal and feedback: making performance review work. 3rd ed. London:
 10. Fonseca, L.M., Domingues, J.P., Pereira, M.T., Martins, F.F., Zimon, D. (2018). Assessment of within Portuguese Organisations Sustainability. [CrossRef] Circular Economy
 11. Hamidi Y., Najafi L., Vatankhah S., Mahmoudy R., Behzadpur A. and Najafi A.(2011); The Effect of Performance Appraisal Results on the Personnels' Motivation and Job Production, Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences 4(9) pp 4178 – 4183 www.pdf.semanticscholar.org visited on 11/12/2020
 12. Hanaysha, J. (2016): Improving employee productivity through work engagement: Evidence from higher education sector. International Journal of Industrial Engineering Computations 6(1) pp 61 – 70. www.researchgate.net visited 23/2/2021
 13. Heyel C., and Appley L. A. (2011); Appraising Executive Performance, Literacy Licensing LLC, Whitefish, MT
 14. Ibrahim, U. M. and Daniel, C. O. (2019); Impact of Performance Appraisal on Employee Productivity in Nigeria Breweries Plc. The international Journal of Business and Management. 7(5) www.researchgate.net visited 3/2/2021
 15. Kane, J. S. and Lawler, E. E. (2009); Performance Appraisal Effectiveness: Its Assessment and Determinants. Research in Organisational Behaviour, Vol. 1 pp 475 – 478.
 16. Kavussi Shal. Nasud, 1999. Performance Evaluation System on Behzisti Organisation in Iran, thesis M.A.
 17. Kuzulu, E. and Iyem, C. (2016); Is 360 Degree Feedback Appraisal an Effective Way of Performance Evaluation? International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social sciences. 6(5) pp 172 – 178. www.researchgate.net visited 3/2/2021
 18. Koontz, H. and O'Donnell, C. (1968): Principles of Management: An Analysis of Managerial Functions, 4th Ed., McGraw-Hill, New York.
 19. Kuvaas, B. (2006). Performance Appraisal Satisfaction and Employee outcomes; Mediating and moderating roles of work motivation. London: Prentice Hall.
 20. Lawler, E. J., Benson, G., McDermott, M. (2012). How Can Performance Appraisals be more Effective? Compensation and Benefits Review 44(4) pp 191 – 200.
 21. Levinson, H. (1976): Performance Measurement: Appraisal of What Performance? Havard Business Review. www.hbr.org visited 04/03/2021
 22. Mackey, K. and Johnson, G. (2000): The Strategic Management of Human Resources in New Zealand, Irwin/McGraw Hill, Auckland.
 23. Mcgregor D. (1972); An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal, Havard Business Review. www.hbr.org visited 2/2/2021
 24. Miller, D. M. (1984); "Profitability = Productivity + Price Recovery". Harvard Business Review 62(2) pp 145 – 163
 25. Misterek, S. M. A., Dooley, K. J and Anderson, J. C. (1992); Productivity as a Performance Measure. International Journal of Operations and Production Management 12(1). www.emerald.com visited 1/2/2021
 26. Mwema N. W. and Gachunga H. G. (2014); The influence of performance appraisal on employee productivity in organisations, International Journal of Social Sciences and Entrepreneurship, 1 (11) pp 324-337. www.ijssse.org visited 10/12/2020
 27. Nasutio, B., Siregar, O. M. and Eriza, F. (2017); Analysis of Employees Performance, Promotion and Mutation in Organisational Performance at Bank Sumut Medan, North Sumatra Province. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 136(2) pp 673 – 680
 28. Onyije, O. C. (2015): Effect of Performance Appraisal on Employee Productivity in a Nigeria University, Journal of Economics & Business Research, 21(2) www.uav.ro/jour/jebr/article.com visited 17/1/2021
 29. Peter, F. Drucker (1964): The Practice of Management, Reissue Ed., Harper Business, New York.
 30. Quareshi, A. and Hassan, M. (2013); Impact of performance management on the organisational performance: Analytical investigation of the business model of McDonalds. International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences. 2(5) pp 54 – 76 www.hmars.com/journals visited 4/2/2021
 31. Randall S. Schuler, et. al., (1989); Effective Personnel Management, 3rd ed., West Publishing, NY, p.389.
 32. Roberts, G. E. (2002); Employee Performance Appraisal System Participation: A Technique That Works. Public Personnel Management 31(3) pp 333 -341 www.researchgate.net visited 3/2/2021.
 33. Rubin E. V and Edwards A. (2020); The Performance of Performance Appraisal System: Understanding

- the Linkage between appraisal structure and appraisal discrimination complaints. *The International Journal of Human Resources Management* 31(15) pp 1938 – 1957 www.tandfonline.com visited on 11/12/2020
34. Sroufe, R., Melnyk, S. (2017). *Developing Sustainable Supply Chains to Drive Value, Management Issues, Insights, Concepts, and Tools*. Foundations Business Expert Press: New York, NY, USA,
 35. Tegen, S. (2005); “Demystifying productivity and performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* 54(1) pp 34 – 36
 36. Thomas, S. L. and Bretz, R. D. (1994); *Research and practice in performance appraisal: evaluating employee performance in America's largest companies*. SAM Advanced Management Journal 59(2)
 37. Tovey, M. D. and Uren, M. L. (2010); *Managing Performance Improvement*. Pearson Publishing, Australia
 38. Yoder D (2000), *Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations*, Prentice Hall, New Delhi