

An Empirical Study of Employee Performance Appraisal in Selected Local Governments, Eastern-Uganda

Taibu Azah¹, Wilfred Tarabinah² and David Adeyemo³

^{1, 2, 3} Kampala International University, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

P. O. Box 20000, Kampala, Uganda

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.804008>

Received: 07 March 2024; Revised: 20 March 2024; Accepted: 23 March 2024; Published: 26 April 2024

ABSTRACT

This study sought to establish the level of performance appraisal in selected local governments, eastern Uganda. This was mainly focused on the level of regularly reviewing of employee's job performance and overall contribution to the local government. This was achieved through employment of largely quantitative methods using descriptive, cross-sectional and survey designs on a sample size of 336 civil servants who included CAOs, HRMs and personnel officers and Heads of Departments among others. Results revealed that Performance appraisal had remained at the routine level. It was still perceived negatively. Moreover, it was not autonomously driven by the local governments, it was more or less a requirement by the Central Government. This study recommends training of managers on how to evaluate workers based on their performance against established criteria; and Local Governments should be allowed to develop their performance appraisal system which suits their situation and provides an easy way of feedback instead of the current one.

Keywords: Employee Performance, Performance Appraisal, Local Governments in Uganda.

INTRODUCTION

Globally, the competitive pressures are forcing the Public Sector to re-engineer in order to become more relevant in the marketplace. To this end, Public Sectors in developed economies of Western Europe, North America and Japan have long been placing strong emphasis on managing human resources to improve performance (Idemobi et al 2011). This is on the premise that performance of any organization largely depends on the performance of its employees irrespective of the size and nature of an organization, the activity it undertakes, and the environment in which it operates, its success depends on its employees' decisions and their behavior (Zulfqar, Bilal, Affan, Muhammad 2011; Mello, 2005). Therefore, as the environment becomes more global, managing people also becomes more challenging, more unpredictable and uncertain and more subject to rapid changes and surprises (Randall 2000). One of the key issues facing public sector organizations, however, is the management of employees through the effective adoption of human resource management practices (Gould, Julian 2008).

World Bank report (2008) revealed very poor employees' performances in the local governments especially in Uganda which significantly affects service delivery and increases the opportunities for corruption to take hold and continue. Esua 2020 revealed that most local governments in Uganda are characterized by poor job performance of staff as they deliver services to the people.

The term “performance appraisal” refers to the regular review of an employee’s job performance and overall contribution to a company. Also known as an annual review, employee appraisal, performance review or evaluation, a performance appraisal evaluates an employee’s skills, achievements, and growth, or lack thereof. Aggarwal & Thakur (2013) illuminated several appraisal methods such as; ranking method, graphic rating, critical incident, narrative essays and management by objectives, human resource accounting and others.

According to Shah and Shah (2006) local government refers to specific entities and institutions created in four main ways. Firstly, in countries like Italy, India, Japan, Denmark, Brazil, and France, national constitutions create local governments, secondly, by state constitutions as in USA and Australia. Thirdly, as in other nations such as the New Zealand and United Kingdom a regular legislation of a higher level of central government is used. Lastly local government can be created through executive order as in the case of China. The main purpose of local government is to provide adversary of specialized amenities to a small geographically outlined and specified area.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According Garry (2005), performance appraisal means comparing your subordinate’s actual performance to the standards that have been set; thus, usually involves some type of rating form. George and Stephen (2007) are of the opinion that performance appraisal is the periodic evaluation of an employee’s job performance measured against the job’s stated or presumed requirements.

Performance appraisal is considered to be one of the predictors in the management practices, and performance feedback should be provided consistently. Ugwu and Okojie (2016) stated that favorable performance feedback can create a favorable psychological climate which will improve the level of employee engagement. Similarly, Rao and Rao (2017) posit that providing constant and honest feedback enables employees to improve their performance.

Said differently, it denotes evaluating individual job performance as a basis for establishing personnel decisions like improving performance, promotion, growth and development, confirmation, transfers, manpower planning, retention and discharge (Armstrong 2010; Kreitner 2006; Werther and Davis 1995). The implementation of the performance appraisal system is a complicated and difficult job because it requires an accurate and fair appraisal of an employee’s performance Francis and Kleiner (2003).

Armstrong (2010) noted that issues of accuracy and fairness in performance appraisal is one of the key research interests. In the field of HRM, performance appraisal may be used as a means of measuring performance. The purpose of measuring performance is not to indicate only where things are not going according to plan but also to identify why things are going well so that steps can be taken to build on success. The goal of performance appraisal is to access and summarize past performance, and develop future work, performance goals and expectations. It is a process of systematically evaluating performance and providing feedback on which performance adjustments can be made.

Akinyele, (2010) indicated that from the employee’s viewpoint, the purpose of performance appraisal is in four-fold: tell me what you want me to do, help me improve my performance, reward me for doing well. Performance appraisal therefore is an important HRM function, which provides management with a systematic basis for effectively recognizing and evaluating the present and potential capabilities for human resource. Performance appraisal should be a continuous function. The supervisors should continuously determine how effectively their subordinates are performing different tasks. Employees should be appraised at least once a year, as this will contribute to increased employee efficiency, productivity and morale.

Further, Douglas (2003) argued that performance appraisal is a method of evaluating the behavior of

employees in the work spot, normally including both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of job performance. Members of staff are measured by their breadth of knowledge, understanding of roles and contributions to the organizations strategic plan. The appraisal process therefore offers a valuable opportunity to focus on work activities and goals as well as identify and correct existing problems, and to encourage better future performance. Thus, the performance of the whole organization is enhanced (Akinyele and Obamiro 2005).

According to Armstrong (2010) performance was defined as the action or behavior and activities that are judged to be important for the accomplishment of organizational goals. However, performance can include productive and counterproductive employee behaviour that are contributively or detractor to organizational goals. For example, punctuality, level of absenteeism, accomplishment of task on time, quality of service, departure time, number of labour turnover, length of lunch-time break, working beyond scheduled time, remaining at work most of the time, attitude towards work, work morale, and level of loyalty.

Additionally, under performance appraisal, there is need to evaluate not only the performance of a worker but also his potential for development Subba (2003). Similarly, Ngu (1990) agrees with Subba (2003) that it is a system of measuring work output or productivity or efficiency either quantitatively or qualitatively. This is in agreement with Maicibi (2005) who conceptualized performance appraisal as a management technique used in assessing the performance and behavior of personnel in an organization. It is the name given to the regular (usually six months or annual) formulated and recorded view of the way in which an individual is performing his job normally carried out by the job holder's immediate boss. The approach to management is aimed at achieving more productivity and efficiency in an organization. It equally ensures accountability and corrections for improvement.

McGregor (1997) indicates that managers experienced the appraisal of others as a hostile and aggressive act against employees which resulted in feelings of guilt of employees. He asserted that the tension between appraisal as a judgment process and a supportive development process and a supportive development process has never been resolved and is likely to continue for some time to come Akinyele (2010). McGregor further says that making judgment about an employee's contribution, value, worth, capability, and potential has to be considered as a vital dimension of a manager's relationship with employees, as it will influence the employee's performance or output. Most companies have modified their appraisal systems to better acknowledge quality of performance in addition to teamwork and process improvement (Fowler, 1995).

Harper (1993) suggests dropping the word "appraisal" because it puts employees in the defensive. He further recommended a shift towards future oriented review and development which actively involve employees in continuously developing ways of improving efficiency in line with needs for attainment of original objectives.

Quchi (1997) indicated that many organizations conduct performance appraisals, regardless of their level of sophistication. But a number have not actualized the process. They are still learning the ropes, start by delinking the results of the appraisal from salary reviews. Put in place structures to manage the process. Get policies and procedures manuals and train the entire organization on target setting, monitoring and review.

Akinyele (2010) noted that the content of performance appraisal influences employee efficiency and satisfaction specifically, efficiency and employee satisfaction are interested when the evaluation is based on behavioral result-oriented criteria when career issues are discussed and when the employee has the opportunity to participate in evaluation.

Employee performance appraisal system was the only tangible metric way by which an organization can know the level of efficiency of its diverse employees. Although most employees are aware of the type of performance application system used in the public sector, such systems are not based on any serious formal

purpose for which they are designed. Managers in the public sector should consider all factors of an effective system so as to achieve the goals upon which they are designed. The major factor should include among others: frequency of the appraisal, accurate record system, employees' efficiency measurement, self-appraisal approach, employees' performance review, employees' strength and weaknesses, the system as an employee's motivator, the system should be able to provide feedback to employees, the system should be void of biasness and the process and procedures for the system should be ratable (Akinyele 2010).

METHODOLOGY

Study Approach and Design

The study was largely dominated by quantitative research approach, though qualitative approach was also used to support the quantitative results. Descriptive, survey and cross-sectional designs were adopted by this study. The descriptive design focuses on characterizing the traits of particular groups, estimating the frequencies or proportions of participants in a given population, examining the correlations between variables, or formulating specific predictions.

The study also used a cross section of respondents; this involved the use of a self-administered questionnaire to selected Local Government employees. The cross-sectional survey was the most appropriate because it allowed collection of all the data required on given variables at a given point in time (Amin, 2005a). This ensured that all the data required was collected within a short period of time, despite the relatively large sample of respondents.

Study Population and Sample Size

A total population of 1273 Civil Servants (CAOs, HRMs and personnel officers and Heads of Departments among others) in the five local governments in Eastern Uganda were considered. The sample size determination in this study was based on the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) Table. A sample of 336 was arrived at finally.

Data Collection Methods

Self-Administered Questionnaires (SAQ) and Interview Guide were frequently used in this study to collect primary data. A questionnaire is a carefully designed instrument consisting of a set of items to which respondents are expected to react usually in writing, used for gathering information about variables of interest in an investigation (Amin, 2005). Questionnaires were preferred basically because of: the study was concerned mainly with employee's opinions that could not be directly observed; The sample size (336) used in the study was quite large and given the time constraint, it was the most ideal tool for data collection within the shortest time possible; Besides, the target population for this study was largely literate and were unlikely to experience difficulties responding to questionnaire items.

Data Analysis

SPSS (statistical package for social scientists) was used. Quantitative data was analysed using Frequencies and Percentages, means and standard deviations, to establish the profile of respondents and measurement of Employee Performance Appraisal in selected Local Government, Eastern-Uganda.

In case of information obtained from interviews (qualitative data), Thematic analysis; a technique for finding, examining, and reporting patterns (themes) within data, were used. The interview transcripts were read numerous times to ensure a thorough comprehension of the information. The researcher then created themes and sub themes which appropriately reflected the data (Amin, 2005). The study was given more

credibility and transparency by the use of verbatim quotes and the corresponding questions, which also allowed readers to see the data for themselves and appreciate the findings.

RESULTS

Employee Performance Appraisal in selected Local Government, Eastern-Uganda.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations on Employee Performance Appraisals in Local Governments (n=336)

Attributes	Mean	Std. D	Interpretation
Evidence of performance is gathered throughout the year.	3.14	0.86	Satisfactory
District carries out frequent performance appraisals.	3.07	0.84	Satisfactory
District conducts annual appraisal meetings.	2.79	0.95	Satisfactory
Appraised on your personal and work characteristics.	3.07	0.80	Satisfactory
Staff Appraisals are based on fair judgments.	2.90	0.86	Satisfactory
Feedback about appraised performance	2.84	2.84	Satisfactory
Aware of the performance appraisal system in the district that concerns you.	2.86	0.94	Satisfactory
Opportunity to evaluate your own performance.	2.91	0.94	Satisfactory
Performance Appraisal results are a basis for employee compensation and bonuses.	2.24	0.92	Dissatisfactory
Performance Appraisal results are considered in employee recognition, promotion and awards.	2.54	1.01	Satisfactory
Performance Appraisal is accurate, acceptable and easy to use.	2.79	1.93	Satisfactory
Given counseling on how to improve your weak areas of performance.	2.46	0.99	Dissatisfactory
Opportunity to appraise the superior staff.	1.89	1.01	Dissatisfactory
Overall Mean	2.73		Satisfactory

Source: Primary Data

This section sought to understand performance appraisal in Local Governments. Respondents were asked whether evidence of their performance is gathered throughout the year which they answered in affirmative (mean=3.14 see table 1.). The findings from quantitative interviews indicated that though appraisals were carried out, they were not done progressively which marked them ineffective in determining performance. More seriously, respondents reported that available data on performance was not analyzed regularly. Employees' views were in line with what one of the HR managers said during the interviews when it was revealed that; *the appraisal forms are so many that we do not have time to analyze them*".

The lack of analysis of performance data could be related to the fact that performance reviews were a mere requirement but not necessarily used to assess or measure employees' output. This could indicate that the basis for rating performance was more about the personal traits of appraise than their performance against any objective criteria which encourages inefficiency. It is therefore safe to assume that there was no

systematic way of capturing the individual employee performance in Local Governments. Without proper and accurate knowledge of employees' performance it may not be easy to find a lasting solution to the problem of poor performance.

A question was posed as to whether performance appraisals were carried out frequently in Local governments. Data from survey respondents revealed a relatively positive response (mean=3.07 see table 1.). In a similar manner, qualitative respondents seem to corroborate these findings. Qualitative interview respondents stated that performance appraisal was a policy that all districts have to adhere to. But they further stated that although the performance appraisal was legislated for, its implementation had not been very successful.

Respondents noted that in some cases appraisals were not filled out. This could be the reason to explain the mean score of 3.14 which is not very satisfactory on a four-point scale. Qualitative interview respondents noted that supervisor and junior were supposed to sit together and come up with performance targets and indicators. They noted however, that sometimes employees create certainty by setting low targets which they could easily meet considering that some supervisor and junior have a 'psychological contract' to support each other on the job. They then subjectively ensured that the appraisal process where merit, innovation and results were less recognized.

Qualitative interview respondents also reported that personal liking or disliking is believed to steer performance appraisals. This situation causes tension between the subordinates and the supervisor with the subordinates likely to resist change in a passive manner, especially that appraisal is not linked with direct benefits. One respondent made the following revealing remark:

"While executing the performance appraisal form, it is the personal, kinship, and informal relations that guide most of the process, though it will not be admitted or documented".

Based on the views expressed above, it is safe to assume that whenever performance appraisals are performed, they are not carefully aligned to an objective criterion. These responses seem to suggest that supervisors tend to promote favoritism through giving positive appraisals to those they know. These types of evaluation undermined the performance appraisal which was founded on a merit-based system of evaluation thus rendering the appraisal system less effective.

Asked whether the results of the performance reviews were used to make positive adjustments in compensation and bonuses, quantitative respondents indicated a dissatisfactory response (mean=2.24 see table 1.). This view matches with the one expressed by qualitative interview respondents. They noted that appraisal was not directly related to rewards, pay rise and in most cases, it is even disregarded in making decisions for promotions. Qualitative interview respondents reported that merit assessment scores and comments are never considered so no reward can be attached to good performance. This shows that performance appraisals are not well interlinked with employees' performance which has negatively affected individual output.

Some qualitative interview respondents indicated that sometimes there is a lack of objectivity in the performance appraisals, so it would be unfair to link them to rewards anyway. The implication here is that the appraisal as an instrument is not objectively implemented in local governments. More so, finding of this study seem to suggest that performance appraisals are not linked to other Human resource management practices like promotion, training, remuneration, recognition, which linkage is key in creating a synergy that could have an effect on employees' performance.

As to whether they were aware of the performance appraisal system in the district, respondents indicated a

satisfactory response with a mean score 2.86 (see table 1.). Qualitative interview respondents noted that though they are aware of the appraisal system, there was no openness in the performance appraisals which had led to employees' developing a very negative attitude towards the process. It was however very difficult to have effective performance appraisals when supervisor-subordinate relationships are not supportive of appraisal processes. They reported that it was at the discretion of the supervisor to either rate the subordinate positively or even negatively which in a way escalates the biases towards the process. One respondent revealed that

“a supervisor can rate you negatively even if you have completed all duties but because he or she may have personal issues with you”.

When asked if there were given counseling on how to improve their weak areas of performance, respondents were dissatisfied (Mean=2.46 see table 1.). Qualitative interview respondents noted that since appraisals are not usually analyzed it is a little difficult to give feedback on weak areas.

A critical question arose while analyzing the performance appraisal: do junior employees' have the opportunity to appraise the superior staff. Findings from the quantitative data revealed a dissatisfactory response with a mean score of (Mean =1.89). This finding is corroborated by the revelation of the interviewees who explained that under no circumstance can junior staff appraise the supervisors. They noted that it is not provided for under current appraisal system. Respondents reported that this top bottom approach of appraisal was not appropriate since it foster large power distance and also creates an environment where employees were oriented towards showing the supervisor respect as opposed to interjecting their ideas and explain or defend their point of view. This kind of environment suffocates innovation and creativity and, in a way, makes employees more passive. Employees' response on their performance was presented in the following section

DISCUSSIONS

When respondents were asked whether evidence of their performance was gathered throughout the year, the response was satisfactory (mean=3.14 see table 1.). The findings were supported by responses from quantitative interviews which indicated that though appraisals were carried out, they were not done progressively which rendered them ineffective in determining performance.

In support of this finding, Okafor (2019) studied employee performance management and productivity in selected firms in Anambra State. The study revealed that a positive and significant relationship exists between employee recognition and employee productivity. The study also discovered a significant association between employee feedback mechanism and productivity. It was equally found in the study that a stable and peaceful industrial atmosphere promotes employee productivity in an organization. The study recommended among others that employee performance appraisal process should always be made to be as transparent as possible by management in order to increase the confidence of the employees in the organization for utmost commitment and productivity.

While, employee performance appraisals were still carried out in LGs, they were largely bureaucratic in terms of the set standards upon which employee performance was judged. This finding was consistent with Otobo, (2011) explaining that a systematic performance appraisal programmed should be objective, free of biases and custom-designed to fit the specific needs of the organization.

Kamoche et al., (2013) report further that performance appraisals in organizations in Liberia' have been complicated by cultural and social issues. This points to the fact that Local Government appraisal systems are rigid and thus may fail to be adopted across all organizations due to the uniqueness which may exist.

As to whether respondents were aware of the performance appraisal system in the district, they indicated a satisfactory response with a (mean score 2.86, see table 1.). Qualitative interview respondents noted that though they are aware of the appraisal system, there was no openness in the performance appraisals which had led to employees' developing a very negative attitude towards the process.

“a supervisor can rate you negatively even if you have completed all duties but because he or she may have personal issues with you” one respondent reported.

The study found out that elements including the caliber of the comments given, fairness of the process and the trustworthiness of the appraisers all had an impact on how effective the appraisal process was.

This study findings revealed that performance appraisals continued to experience problems related to form design and process such as vague criteria in the evaluation forms. Similarly, the evaluation criteria for different jobs, using the same relative weight in assessing employees with different functional tasks was also mentioned. This makes the appraisal less specific to individual performance. As a way to rectify this irregularity, Wachiuri (2017) investigated the effect of performance appraisal on organizational performance: a case study of KPMG Kenya. It was discovered that 360-degree feedback method of appraisal aligned to achievement of organizational goals. The study recommended areas of improvement as identified in the 360 degrees evaluation method that is used for self-assessment and not for rating purposes.

Furthermore, Byars (2014) in his study on performance appraisal noted that in order to meet the organization's goals, it is important to evaluate the performance of employees and for this evaluation to be effective performance appraisal system should be maintained.

Findings of the study further portrayed demoralization of employees with regard to performance appraisals, this was basically caused by favoritism, low ratings, comparison among peers which lead to dissatisfaction. Employees were ranked under forced level ranking, unquantifiable objectiveness, unclear criterion, irrelevant scales, and inflexibility in decision making. The current Performance appraisal also did not recognize career growth, promotion and monetary value.

Findings of this study also revealed that performance appraisals in Local Government were not done progressively which makes them ineffective in determining performance. The appraisal activity is an annual exercise. This study revealed that no regular monitoring and periodic review of the appraise/appraises performance on the job is carried out. This implied that if an employee was committing performance error or deviation from the requisite demand of the job in the beginning of the year, it will continue for the whole year. Thus, with the absence of monitoring on regular basis and periodic review of the appraise job performance, the chances of improvement of employee performance and output will remain a mere fantasy in LGs. These results were collaborated by Maher (2011) who found that performance appraisal in public sector were conducted once per year, as a result it did not achieve the purpose of providing continuous assessment for an employee's performance.

These results were also similar to those of Robert and Seward (2000), who argue that more recent behavior and performance was more readily remembered than what occurred sometime ago and in this recent performance dominates some appraisals. Wane (2003) found that irregular appraisals result in recency error which occur when a rater assigns his or her ratings on the basis of the employee's most recent performance. It was most likely to occur when appraisals were done only after long periods. For example, if a subordinate's performance peaks 3 months prior to appraisal every year, that suggest a different problem.

A critical question arose while analyzing the performance appraisal: “do junior employees' have the opportunity to appraise the superior staff.” Findings from the quantitative data revealed a dissatisfactory response with a mean score of (Mean =1.89). This finding was corroborated by the revelation of the

interviewees who explained that “under no circumstance can junior staff appraise the supervisors. They noted that it is not provided for under current appraisal system”. Respondents reported that this top bottom approach of appraisal was not appropriate since it foster large power distance and also creates an environment where employees were oriented towards showing the supervisor respect as opposed to interjecting their ideas and explain or defend their point of view.

Findings from this study further revealed that, though appraisal meetings were conducted once in a while, the environments in which the performance appraisal meetings were conducted do not foster interactive discussion which undermines the intention of the appraisal meeting. The study found that most appraisal meetings take place in the raters’ office which creates fear with in the subordinates. There was also lack of appraisal interview and deprivation of employees from the opportunity of discussing their performance strengths and weakness was a core drawback of the system, which in turn linchpin the performance improvement chances of employees. Lack of trust on the system of appraisal, creation of heart burning attitude of employees towards management, maintenance of status quo were the ultimate ramifications of this scenario.

Such findings point to the fact that LGs might not achieve the intended objectives for employee appraisal, were by according to Becker (2011) performance appraisal requires working competitively, it involves placing high value on people, considering their experiences, ideas and preferences. Their participation in organizations seems to be necessary because employees and managers have to discuss a company’s objectives together. It is fundamental to consider not only the staff specific qualifications needed for the positions in the organizational structure, but also their knowledge, experiences, skills and results for future innovations (Bowers, et al., 2014).

The study findings were also contrary to Walsh (2003) who indicated that it was only fair that organizations conduct face-to-face evaluation meeting or interview with the rater and a performance evaluation based on adequate opportunity to observe and evaluate employee behavior and work product. This was not the case for local governments as the finding indicated that there were neither interviews nor routine meeting aimed at evaluating employees’ performance.

The current appraisal system in LGs did not contain any provision for obtaining the comments of appraise about the quality of performance evaluation done by the appraiser. Consequently, if the appraiser had intentionally overlooked some aspects of the employee’s performance outcome for the purpose to give him/her poor ratings, the employee could not raise the protest against the unfair evaluation which was incompatible with his actual performance results/outcome.

More so, findings from this study revealed that data on performance was not analyzed regularly which makes feedback a problem. In the absence of feedback, employees were deprived of the opportunity to know about their performance short comings leading to maintenance of status quo. The poor performers among the employees’ fail to improve their performance by overcoming their performance pitfalls. Similarly, mediocre remain complacent with their existing performance level and makes no efforts to overthrow the yoke of maintaining performance status quo.

Given the findings of the current study and the views expressed by other scholars, it could be concluded that the prevailing performance appraisal process in LGs has numerous deficiencies. Nonetheless, if the deficiencies in the performance appraisal system were to be addressed successful, it would improve the behavior of employees, their confidence level will be boosted up and their morale strengthened which in turn could prove beneficial for both the employees’ and the organization. Employees’ improvement was possible through the identification of areas in need of improvement, the establishment of performance goals, and feedback, monitoring, and support.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Local Governments should be allowed to develop their performance appraisal system which suits their situation and provides an easy way of feedback instead of the current one (Consider a 360 Appraisal system). It should be mandated in the evaluation process that the appraisers provide the employees with regular feedback so they may work toward enhancing their performance and correcting any faults they may have. Formal written feedback must be provided to the staff in addition to verbal input. Employee productivity and performance will increase, but it will also boost the caliber and reliability of the appraisers' performance reviews.

Findings from this study revealed that though performance appraisals are carried, they lack any kind of discussion. In order to close this gap, performance evaluation report forms intended for different employee grades must include a mandatory section requiring the employee to discuss their job performance and accomplishments with the reporting officer. This section must also be duly signed by the reporting officer and the officer being reported upon. This will significantly increase the employees' proactivity regarding their performance review from their direct supervisor, as opposed to their reactive

According to the results of this study, the majority of respondents said that their appraisers' biased attitudes were a substantial source of concern for them. They have also stated that they believe the appraisers' biased attitude has a negative impact on their performance and production. There needs to be a strong check and balance mechanism in place regarding the appraisers' use of their discretionary powers when assigning evaluation ratings to employees in order to stop their reckless tendencies. The appraisers must be placed under a legal embargo, warning them that they would face consequences if their performance reviews were discovered to be prejudiced or discriminating. Nonetheless, it is essential that appraisers possess some level of authority and power, and that the appraisers are aware that the appraisers have the ability to exercise and enforce this authority. The main point is that in order to stop the misuse of power and authority, a suitable system of checks and balances must be in place.

REFERENCES

1. Idemobi E., Onyeizugbe C., Akpunonu E. (2011). *Compensation Management as tool for improving organizational performance in the public sectors: A study of the civil service of Anambra State of Nigeria*. Sacha Journal of Policy and Strategic Studies Volume 1 Number 1.
2. Zulfqar, A., Bilal, S., Affan S., Muhammad K. (2011). *Impact of human resource practices on employee perceived performance in banking sector of Pakistan*. African Journal of Business Management Vol. 6(1)
3. Mello, J. (2005). *Strategic Human Resource Management* (2nd ed.). South-Western College McMillan, Basingstoke.
4. Randall, S.S. (2000). *The internationalization of human resource management*. Journal of International Management Vol 6 239-260
5. Gould-Williams, J. (2003). *The importance of HR practices and workplace trust in achieving superior performance: a study of public-sector organizations*. International Journal of Human Resource Management.
6. World Bank. (2008). *Local Government Discretion and Accountability: A Local Governance Framework. Economic and Sector Work Report No. 41053*. Washington. World Bank.
7. Aggarwal, A. & Thakur, G.S.M. (2013). Techniques of performance appraisal: A review. International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology (IJEAT), 2(3).
8. Shah, A., and Shah, S. (2006). The New Vision of Local Governance and the Evolving Roles of Local Governance. In A. Shah, Local Governance in developing countries (pp.145). Washington DC: World

Bank.

9. Garry, D. (2005). *Human Resource Management*, 10th ed., Pearson Education Inc., New Jersey, USA, 2005,P-310.
10. George, T., Stephen, F. (2007). *Principles of Management*, 8th AITBS Publishers, Delhi.
11. Ugwu, C.C. & Okojie, J.O. (2016). Human resource management (HRM) practices and work engagement in Nigeria: The mediating role of psychological capital (PSYCAP). *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Review*, 6(4):71-87, December.
12. Rao, M.S. & Rao, M.S. (2017). Innovative tools and techniques to ensure effective employee engagement. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 49(3):127-131, March.
13. Armstrong, M. (2010) *Armstrong's Essential Human Resource Management Practice—A Guide People Management*. US Kogan Page Limited, London.
14. Kreitner, R. (2006). *Management* (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
15. William, B., Werther, J. (1996). *Human resource and personnel management* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
16. Akinyele, S., (2010). *Performance appraisal systems in private Universities in Nigeria: A Study of Crawford University, Igbesa Nigeria*. *Educational Research*, Vol. 1(8)
17. Douglas, A. (2003). *Key events and lessons for manager in a diverse workforce*. Manhattan, Centre for creative leadership.
18. Akinyele, S., (2010a). *Performance appraisal systems in private Universities in Nigeria: A Study of Crawford University, Igbesa Nigeria*. *Educational Research*, Vol. 1(8)
19. Subba, R. (2003). *Essentials of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations*. Himalaya Publishing House.
20. Ngu, M. (1990). *An Introduction to Personnel Management in Nigeria*. Institute of Administration, ABU, Zaria, Nigeria.
21. Maicibi, N. A. (2005). *Pertinent Issues in Employee Management*. Kampala MPK Graphics Publishers
22. McGregor, D., (1997). *An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal*. *Harvard Business Review*, January- February. p. 60.
23. Fowler, A. (1995). *Human Resource Management in Local Government: Its special purposes, conditions and tasks* (2nd Edition). London. Pearson Professional Limited.
24. Harper, S. (1993). *A development approach to performance appraisal*. *Business Horizons*, September/October.
25. Quchi, W., (1997). *A conceptual framework for the design of organization and control mechanism*, *Management Science*, 25:
26. Amin, M. (2005). *Social Science Research. Conceptions, Methodology and Analysis*. Makerere University Printery.
27. Okafor, C.A. (2019). *Performance Management and Employee Productivity: A Study of Selected Firms in Anambra State*. *International Journal of Business and Management*.
28. Otopo, P. (2011): "Globalization, economic governance, and African Countries" during the Expert Group Meeting organised by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
29. Kamoche, Y, Michael, A. (2013). *Human resource management practice* (8th edition) Koga n
30. Walsh, M. (2003). *Perceived Fairness of and Satisfaction with Employee Performance appraisal*.
31. Wachiuri, J.W. (2017). *Effect of performance appraisal on organizational performance: a case study of Kpmg Kenya*.
32. Byars, L. L., & Rue, L. W. (2014). *Human resource management* (7th ed). McGraw
33. Maher, A. (2011). *Reforming Government Employees Performance Appraisal System in New Egypt (After the 25th January Revolution)* *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS)* 2 (5): 399-401
34. Kagambirwe, K., E. (2010). *Performance appraisal in Uganda's civil service: Does administrative culture matter?*
35. Maher, A. (2011). *Reforming Government Employees Performance Appraisal System in New Egypt (After the 25th January Revolution)* *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management*

Sciences (JETEMS) 2 (5): 399-401

36. Maher, A. (2011). *Reforming Government Employees Performance Appraisal System in New Egypt (After the 25th January Revolution)* Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS) 2 (5): 399-401
37. Robert C., Seward J. (2000). *Australian Human Resource Management (Frame work and Practice)* 3rd ed. McGraw Hill Book Company Australia Pty Limited, 4 Barcoo Street, Roseville NSW 2069, Australia.
38. Becker, G. and Bannister, S. (2011), 'Investment in human capital: A theoretical analysis', The Journal of Political Economy, Vol; 70, Issue No. 5, Pp 9—49.