



Perspectives on Performance Appraisal Practices in Organizations

Dr. Y. Dauda, ¹ B.N Luki²

¹Lecturer, Department of Management and HRM
Ghana Communication Technology University
P.O Box MC 3262
Takoradi, Ghana
ydauda@gctu.edu.gh

²Lecturer, Department of Management and HRM
Ghana Communication Technology University
P.O Box MC 3262
Takoradi, Ghana
blukki@gctu.edu.gh

Abstract

This paper explores the connotations of performance appraisal (PA) as visualized by scholars and its application in organizations. It is a concept that traces its beginnings to the epoch of the Industrial Revolution, and assumed the trappings of a systematic approach that appeared to offer interchange, parity and suitability in the assessment of workers and institutions. It completely overhauled the erstwhile methods of compensation of workers that linked rewards to output in a manner that appeared irrational, uninformed and haphazard. Performance appraisal gained universal acceptability, and affected the planning processes and ambitions of virtually every institution globally.

Currently, performance appraisal has come under closer analysis, and many scholars have questioned its methods, seeking to expose its seeming inherent weaknesses that make it unsuitable as a good standard for evaluating efficiency in establishments. These critics contend that PA is subject to human influence, and is often used by supervisors at workplaces, to promote the upward movement of those they adore, while they thwart the progress of those they abhor. On the whole however, PA appears to remain the most widely accepted staff and organizational

assessment tool, despite the recent introduction of a new assessment method called performance management.

Keywords: perspectives, performance, appraisal, practices, organizations

1.0 Introduction

Organizations must aim to attain higher efficiency in their operations so as to remain viable and competitive. In this regard, they are implementing schemes that attempt to measure their progress by systematically evaluating the output of their employees' as well as the establishment as a whole. The absence of a reliable tool of assessment of their work would bring about inaccurate end result leading to deficient planning and incorrect decision making. [36] opines that regardless of size, all organizations must count on certain devices to evaluate their growth and efficiency. To him, these tools largely have to do with appraising activities, employees, products and attributes to make certain that the establishment is meeting the requirements and objectives of production and client service. Performance appraisal (PA) is an imperative instrument that is employed by establishments to assess their own productivity and that of their workers. In the Industrial Revolution era, performance appraisal schemes were used to rate the output of workers (Avery, 2004). Objectives were well-defined, and were used to control wages. North (2010) and Reeves

(2016) state that performance appraisals came about in an attempt to link wages to production in a reasonable fashion. Wages of workers were increased or reduced depending on their output. Lately, Chowdhury (2008) determined that nearly all institutions in India seek to watch closely the productivity of their workforce by an evaluation procedure. Comparable to a carrot and stick setting, he asserts that rewards are given to those who achieve higher production, whereas those who underachieve are punished. [51] holds the view that performance appraisal schemes, with the potential to bring about desired growth, became influential in America in the mid-20th Century. On the usefulness of this innovative paradigm, [27] states that performance appraisal has become a compelling feature of integrating human resource activities with institutional undertakings, and is now commonly employed by institutions to evaluate the accomplishment of their employees so as to decide their salary.

Performance appraisal has supported worker and organizational assessment practices over the past several decades, having come to

take the place of the irrational and unreliable schemes that preceded it, when earnings were linked to production. A key objective of PA is to determine accomplishment in the establishment to initiate restorative events in a bid to push the enterprise to reach greater success. Performance appraisal is the measurement of the amount of output and its effects, using the scale and index that can determine the required quantity and quality fairly and with precision. Performance is the manner by which workers undertake their responsibilities, and appraisal is judging the achievement of employees [21]. Performance appraisal systems (PASs) have progressed over a period into an intricate and expensive management support scheme.

2.0 Performance Appraisal

While it is generally recognized as an established Western paradigm, performance appraisal has become valuable in the catalogue of implements available to the management of organizations globally to measure their progress. Notwithstanding the apparent standing of these schemes, there appears to be too little knowledge about their functions and implementation in non-western countries [27]. Going further, [27] indicates that there are innumerable issues concerning the implementation of performance appraisals. Some of these are:

who is the key subject of assessment? Who planned the system? How often is assessment conducted? And which methods of assessment are used? [57].

In organizational praxes over the past several decades, performance appraisal has been among the most discussed, condemned and applauded [38], and yet, it is regarded as one of the least recognized procedures of human resource management. Administrators' themselves have inconsequential faith in their PA processes [9] as they have to play the roles of both judge and jury [9]. [9] also observed that generally, supervisors are not competent enough to deal with troubles that occur from adverse reactions. [32], in deliberating on the tutoring of evaluators and workers, cited the importance of continuous coaching of workers and human resource managers, particularly fresh supervisors. [57], established three rules for tutoring in performance appraisal:

- Increase managers' expertise.
- Deal with the performance challenges of ratees.
- Deliberate on the improvement requirements and professional ambitions of workers.

To confirm effective implementation, the PA scheme needs to be thoroughly understood, approved, and upheld.

For good appraisals, supervisors must be supportive and open, and simple output targets should be established. The appraisals must only be used for administrative purposes, and must be devoid of grading partialities [30]. [3] states that in performance appraisals, accuracy and fairness in assessing the efficiency of workers are especially essential. To evaluate the work of employees, performance appraisal is the favoured tool. It is a system that concentrates on supervisory actions that are guided by the proper standards. In the long run, it becomes the process for guaranteeing that a vocation is initiated for the skilled, and that the worker is compensated for his or her good work [4].

Thus, appraisals, with several types of procedures, have become a common feature in organizations. For the small-scale institutions in which the employees know each other, relatively casual appraisals are most likely acceptable. However, bigger organizations recognise that a methodical assessment technique is critical for effective administration, since in its absence, there would be no information on the achievements of employees, and there

therefore would be no basis to undertake the ranking of workers performing similar jobs [21].

2.1 The Concept of Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal is a practice in which a senior official evaluates the productivity of a subordinate. PA systems have procedures that steer the exercises and guidelines for giving feedback on the events. Mostly, it is a formal process, and is considered to be a component in the blueprint of managing employees. Many establishments rely on a formal or an informal evaluation method that ranks the output of workers [16]. To [19] performance appraisal is an approved process in which, for a specified period, the accomplishment of an employee together with his conduct are reviewed by a supervisor and comments given to the organization.

[35] opines that performance appraisal embraces a collaborative event between an overseer and an employee specifically for the purpose of appraising that employee's past productivity and deciding on significant areas for future performance. [24] established that PA is an undertaking that has gained wide-ranging acceptance and has become established in an organized

background that requires both predictable and inferred outcomes.

[34] describes performance appraisal as the human resource management function that is used to ascertain the degree to which workers are doing the jobs given to them, while [17] states that performance appraisal points to the methodical portrayal of the job-relevant aptitudes and limitations of an employee or a group, whereas performance is an employee's achievement. Performance appraisal, thus, is a procedure for assessing and giving information to workers concerning their rating, and instituting a schedule for their advancement. [24] states that performance appraisal is the procedure through which an organization gives a 'score' to show the degree of output of a specific person or people. [27] on his part, sees performance appraisal principally as "activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, enhance performance and distribute rewards".

[25] states that performance appraisal is a systematic official discourse between a lower member of staff and a higher officer that typically comes on recurrently, to assess the output of the lower member of staff, with the purpose of getting to know their capabilities and their failings, so as to offer

them openings for advancement and the upgrading of their talents. [39] sees performance appraisal as the method by which organisations assess the conducts and attainment of their workers in order to point out shortfalls in their output. Performance appraisal is a conventional procedure for preparing and assessing the productivity of workers which comprises questioning the workers [14]. This scholar sees PA as a prescribed procedure that is used from time to time, to assess the efficiency of personnel in well-ordered organizations, so as to steer them towards attaining their set goals.

PA is the method of identifying, assessing and bettering the work performed by employees in an organization, to make sure that organizational objectives are realized and then thankfully rewarding the employees, getting feedback, and offering career guidance [37]. Quality appraisal ensures a good position from which the effectiveness of other skills are influenced [3]. Terminologies such as performance assessment, performance appraisal, and performance management are all used to explain productivity procedures. While performance appraisal has been contradicted by some intellectuals, it appears to remain a significant factor of organizational function. [46] offer several accounts concerning why

administrative appraisals should be sustained in organizations. They suggest that administrative assessments are necessary to validate many managerial decisions such as increase in pay, promotions, dismissals, and so on.

[6] outlines the record of PASs in the Industrial Revolution period when they were the gold standard for the evaluation of work. Well-defined goals were established and these were linked to compensations. [51] and [53] add that PAs came about in a bid to reasonably link remunerations to work done, that is, it was used to determine fair wages for workers, and was closely tied to definite productivity. Those whose output fell below established targets suffered a reduction in rewards. Conversely, if their attainment went higher than expectation, they enjoyed an increase in rewards. [51] remarks that this arrangement was not always reliable. Consequently, the long-established reliance on incentives to motivate output was abandoned in the long run. In the 1950s, the promise of PA as a means of inspiration and progress was steadily accepted in the US. [27] appeared to come under the influence of the growing suitability and reputation of modern PAs when he stated that performance appraisal has progressively become a feature of a more tactical method

to incorporating human resource events and business strategies, and has come to be considered a general expression that includes an array of occupations by which enterprises attempt to evaluate workers, grow their skills, improve productivity and allocate payments. Hence, together, practitioners and scholars have abandoned the restricted attention on behavioural assessment, while embracing developmental performance appraisal [48], citing [44], [24], [23], and [45]. Pointing to [13], [48] describe developmental PA as all attempts at improving behaviours, knowledge and aptitudes that advance the efficiency of workers. They also cite [1] who regard PA as a step by step, authorized, officially approved event, typically taking place once every year, with distinctly prescribed output targets that guide the appraisal practices. The aims of the appraisal schemes are to deliver correct assessments of the attainments of workers. Additionally, PA is an instrument for determining, examining and categorizing the contrasts between employees in the work place. It concerns an official scheme of assessment, during which a worker is matched with others and graded. An appraisal system is an instrument for administrators, and its application hinges on both the opinion of the organization's

requirements and how well they have been instructed in its application [5].

2.2 Features of Appraisal Process

Seemingly, extensive systematic research has not been carried out on the usefulness of present-day performance appraisal programmes in an institutional background. This could be attributed to the intricate composition of the procedures involved and in picking suitable assessment instruments. [50] propose that the effectiveness of all human resource procedures as well as performance appraisal need to be evaluated. They demonstrate that problems with programmes running currently for evaluating PA processes show a certain degree of the very crucial difficulties facing professionals. [10] indicate that the efforts at appraising performance are inadequate. Consequently, researchers have identified procedures that present a better prospect to have an efficient performance appraisal scheme.

[40] proposed a characteristic performance appraisal outline that contained 13 interconnecting features: aspects of the rank, characteristics of the organization, the purpose of the assessment, the appraisal method, standardization, means of appraisal, appraiser and features of the process, the

results and their storage, the retrieval of the results and the actions to be taken, assessment of the results, description of the output and lastly, executive decisions.

[49] argue that the following main themes are aspects of an appraisal procedure: Appraisal tools and methods, the appropriateness of the appraisal technique for the organization, the design of the system, the proper manual of the system, and, directing system practitioners. The authors emphasize that the performance appraisal process should be designed to match the objectives of the establishment and the activities they engage in. They assert that a key factor in effective performance appraisal is openly disclosing the purpose of the analysis. Possibilities include monetary rewards, career advancement, details of movement of employees, appraisal of duties, supervision and coaching.

To [49], a complete appraisal activity involves the following factors:

1. Performance appraisal episodes that include quick feedbacks and long-term occupational issues.
2. A decision on who establishes what performance is.
3. How performance will be assessed.
4. Who will evaluate performance?

5. What process will be employed to gather information on performance?
6. Proper, speedy and effective feedback, put across by an appropriate supervisor.

Appraisals must be undertaken to correspond with the characteristics of the job, and at periods that do not interrupt work processes. Management needs to support the performance appraisal programme so as to provoke the required commitment from middle level heads. Building appeal processes into the appraisal scheme for malcontent employees to get their assessment results reconsidered affords trustworthiness to the appraisal system.

[50] contend that when the following instances exist, performance appraisals are expected to be accepted by the workforce:

1. Assessments are conducted regularly.
2. Availability of a standard assessment format.
3. Knowledgeable supervisors.
4. Presence of appeal processes in the appraisal procedure.
5. Recognition of achievement.
6. Introduction of corrective mechanisms to deal with existing faults.

7. A congenial ambiance at the work place.

[49] recommend that researchers pay attention to how PA schemes are perceived by workers. This would promote the accuracy of performance appraisals. Moreover, they suggest that institutions must consider the roles of the information obtained from performance appraisal to determine if they are ideal for the policy.

[20] supports the concept that while performance appraisal is an important segment of performance management, it is only one tool among several instruments that can be set up to deal with productivity. They also emphasize that because evaluation of performance is often carried out by intermediate staff, rather than HR specialists, it is important that they have adequate knowledge of their role in the programme and the right competences to perform them expertly. [47] maintain that while performance appraisal tries to accurately determine the effectiveness of a person's work, including improving organizational appraisal programmes, it is not feasible to standardize the setting inside which the evaluation occurs, or undoubtedly, the staff who are either evaluating or being evaluated. This in addition, worsens aspirations, ending in the

criticism that performance appraisal occasionally gets. [42] similarly listed comparable essential elements, but incorporated an estimation of valid requirements, that is, creation of an assessment instrument, selection and teaching of overseers and motivations for achievement.

In spite of the criticisms, performance appraisal in many organizations is authorized, planned and desirable. The practice is generally considered to comprise a discourse between the evaluator and the worker as well as facts on performance required for the official appraisal process. Performance appraisal seems to be dreaded by workers, and [28] state that performance appraisals usually invoke the same amount of keenness as paying taxes.

2.3 An Outline of Appraisal Processes

The progression of performance appraisal goes along a set plan, during which an employee's work is occasionally assessed by his managers. The ensuing typically make up the key stages of an appraisal process:

Establish performance standards: When creating a task and framing its description, output requirements are usually established for a matching position. These requirements must be well-defined and calculable to such

an extent that it can be known and quantified. Weights and points should be given to every aspect of these benchmarks, and must be specified on the appraisal sheet. These are applied for assessing the work of the staff.

Communicate performance expectation to employees: It is not easy for employees to tell what is required of them. Hence, the benchmarks of performance should be conveyed to the employees. To make the dissemination of information successful, 'feedback' is necessary from the juniors to the supervisor. Reasonable feedback guarantees that the information conveyed by the supervisor has been received and comprehended in the manner it was envisioned.

Measure actual performance to determine what it is: Particularity should be given to what is to be appraised and how to do it. Four origins of data are often used to determine real accomplishment: individual examination, statistical records, verbal accounts and written documents.

Compare actual performance with standards: The employee's appraisal is performed and he or she is rated for consideration for upward movement in the organization. Efforts are made to observe the variance

between ‘standard performance’ and ‘actual performance.’

Discuss the appraisal with the employee:

The findings of the appraisal are deliberated upon

occasionally with the employees where good talents, poor showings and problems are specified in order to push up productivity. Feedback on the appraisal results significantly impacts the future performance of employees. Giving glad tidings is straightforward for both supervisor and junior, however, it is very hard when output fails to meet set targets.

Initiate corrective action, if necessary:

Remedial proceedings can be of two sorts. One is instant and contends mostly with observed signs. The other is elementary, and focusses on the reasons. Instant remedial acts are sometimes called “putting out fires,” whereas elementary remedial acts go to the cause of aberration and attempt to correct the variance for good. Guiding and assisting may be carried out or specific tasks may be set, employees may be assigned for prescribed educational lessons, and executive assignment and authority may be assigned to the assistants. Proposals may also be made for improvement in rewards or elevation, if appraisal results find it essential.

3.1 Dissatisfaction with Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal has been in operation for some time now. However, this dynamic paradigm has not received sufficient recognition in organizations because of the perception that it is a vocation of the administration and possessed by the Human Resource Department rather than unit supervisors. In spite of the current widespread application of performance appraisals and their palpable impact, arguments concerning their effectiveness are considerable. Over several years, surveys have found implicit dissatisfaction with the efficacy of performance appraisal processes in both informal and public organisations [22].

Professionals are unable to find common ground concerning the achievements and the failings of PASs [53]. [51] observes that lots of scientists, professionals, psychometricians and others have voiced reservations about the soundness and consistency of PASs. For example, [4] suggests that the technique is so intrinsically defective that improving it appears impracticable. Disapproval of PASs have emanated from [43], [18] and [53] who maintain that while most organizations have accepted procedures of performance

appraisal, they have become a foremost topic of disagreement in administration, and that their success is still a matter of disagreement. They contend that a significant part of the disagreement comes from the belief that certain evaluations mirror the private predilections and biases of the assessor rather than the efficiency of the employee being reviewed, a condition called the halo and horns effect [6]; [52] citing [54]. Pointing to [4], [54] states that the halo effect is when an evaluator allows a single factor of a worker's accomplishment impact the appraisal of other qualities of their output. Generally, an evaluator performs an appraisal on the foundation of the total productivity of a worker. In this instance however, an evaluator falls short of separating the levels of output on different performance scopes. Conversely, a negative halo or devil's horns effect occurs when the employee's rankings on every other attribute is reduced erroneously due to a correct mediocre grade on one aspect.

[3] opines that it is old-fashioned, and a means of maltreating the workforce instead of unearthing their capabilities. Also, [5] states that PA procedures are isolated and have no link with vocational application, and that supervisors often say it is unproductive. Similarly, [5] asserts that

unsatisfactory knowledge of supervisors to perform effective appraisals culminates in partiality and reduces it to a dishonest annual ritual in the opinion of the employees.

[53], states that a PA gives a manager the chance to rate the output of a worker. [53] nevertheless indicates that antagonists of the scheme contend that PAs only exhibit the personal opinion of an evaluator. In circumstances where a manager loathes a worker, the PA turns into an apparatus to injure them. On the contrary, [53] states that when there is rapport between the employee and the manager, an appraisal may be biased to the benefit of the employee, and this corrupts the appraisal process. Hence, two persons both with equivalent productivity achievements can be rated very differently depending on the caprices of the assessor tilting the grades in support of a certain person [6]; [52] citing [54]. [18] states that one more failing of PAs is that while the assessor may be impartial, his attention is greater towards the conduct of the ratee than at his input to the organizational efficiency. His opinion is that in spite of constant efforts to perfect established PA processes, managers and the junior ranks do not support most existing procedures. He asserts that on the other hand, they are generally

detested as a time-wasting irritant, a cause of conflict and employee anger and an impediment to the attainment of the organizational objectives. Ending his discourse, [18] states that in summary, appraisals often fall short of providing a reliable assessment of the significance and input of employees who are evaluated. On the theme of mismanaged appraisals, [53], emphasises that employees generally pay more attention to the difficulties of PAs, and that this influences confidence and work principles. She states that a poor appraisal with antagonistic or biased reports can lead to profound problems at work. Sloppily performed appraisals can lead to severe penalties and litigations when managers unlawfully victimize staff on account of race, creed, age, sex or disability. She contends that managers must comprehend fair labour regulations and employee liberties. Thus, while entrepreneurs recognize the essence of appraisal systems, they are often frustrated by them [43]. In general, the usual appraisal system is not able to meet the prospects of the organization, and sometimes, they can generate more disturbance than their merit [6].

On this theme, [15] showed that only 20 percent of American companies were very

pleased with their performance appraisal systems. A 1990 Industry Week survey of readers showed that just 18 percent of the respondents affirmed that their appraisals were very effective. This had declined from 20 percent in 1987. Thirty-one percent of the participants said appraisals were not very effective or a waste of time [58]. A Wyatt Company survey of 900 companies showed that just ten percent of them indicated satisfaction with their staff assessment schemes (Small Business Report, 1993). Thirty percent were displeased and 60 percent could not decide. A 1997 national study of management specialists by the Society for Human Resource Management established that only five percent of the participants were pleased with their organization's performance appraisal process and that 42 percent were displeased to a certain degree [3]. It must be noted that much of this information was obtained from surveys usually performed by professionals in management and other officials and do not show any difficulties associated with reviews of performance appraisal procedures.

3.2 Support for Performance Appraisal

Certain intellectuals are ardent supporters of PAs. [7] for instance, states that modern-day

commerce relies on evaluation of achievement. That evaluation must align with the policy of the establishment and offer essential facts concerning major procedures, attainments and outcomes. Facts and figures sustain a number of organizational aims like strategy, examining achievement, expanding productivity and matching organizational attainment with that of rivals or with best practice standards. [41], regards PA as possibly the most decisive characteristic of organizational existence. Progressively, a PA grants a supervisor the opportunity to give his opinion about the performance of a worker, give ideas concerning his conduct and give the employee a standard for goals [53]. Moreover, a sound PA can become the starting point for the establishment of a just system for pay rises for employees - the initial reason for Pas [21]. PAs also grant workers the chance to know their ranking and how to enhance it [53]; [31]. Employee appraisals may reveal out-of-date or incompetent corporate procedures. Good employee appraisals integrate objectives to better both entrepreneurs and their staff via the institution of proper and timely response and coaching [31]. Avery also maintains that in deploying appraisals, organizations are eager to know who their topmost employees

are and the level of their productivity. The appraisal procedure is occasionally used as a retrenchment implement to unearth out of place employees of the organization. In several organisations, appraisal findings are utilized to determine compensations such as wage increases, elevations, windfalls, tuition, downgrading, pay cuts and dismissals [6]; [52] citing [55]; [56].

[51] contends that certain scholars argue that PA possesses a lot of significant staff advancement applications, but rebuff any effort to connect the procedure to remuneration endings such as pay increases and elevations. That these academics suggest that the connection to payment endings lessens or wipes out the advancement consequence of appraisals. They see the reward-linked procedure as condemnatory, penal and disturbing. Further, North raises concern about those employees who are more prone to discard their inadequacies or deficient efficiency if they become aware that it would impact their elevation and salary increase. Adverse appraisal results of employees could give rise to bitterness, severe erosion of confidence, workplace disorder, bad-tempered relations and a drop in output. Adherents of the reward method say that establishments must put in place a method

by which incentives can be clearly and justly allocated to those most worthy on the strength of distinction, hard work and output. Consequently, [51] states that PA is the one method existing to facilitate the attainment of just, fitting and reliable pay endings. On pay-linked appraisals, [31] cites [8] who state that workers appear to have greater assent to appraisal process and feel more contented with it when the process is directly associated with bonuses. This conclusion and many others critically oppose scholars who try to discredit appraisal findings and pay outcomes. [11], referring to [4] and [12], stated that in the current aggressive moneymaking space, establishments can only match their competitors by taking on advanced human resources. They hold forth that this can be successful by having an effective and precise appraisal system. They trust that employees are likely to accept and participate significantly to a given PAS if they see it as an opening for elevation and personal advancement. However, if employees make out PA as an arbitrary effort by the administration to apply tighter command over them, many consequences may result. PA will be efficient if the appraisal procedure is plainly described to, and acceded to by the workers involved [2].

When conducted incorrectly, a PA can lead to depressed confidence.

3.3 Performance Appraisal and Performance Management

Whereas this paper attempts to address the perspectives of scholars on PA practices in organizations, it will not lengthily concern itself with the question regarding the sameness or dissimilarity between performance appraisal and performance management. PA and PM are two common employee assessment paradigms. Some authorities argue that the two models are the same, while others think they are different. Performance management came to replace performance appraisal when the latter became the target of harsh criticisms for perceived human interference, and thus rendering it unsuitable as an accurate employee evaluation tool. The purpose of both approaches is similar, that is, to assess efficiency in the organization so as to induce remedial events to realize higher productivity [21]. Although their procedures may diverge, nonetheless, their aims remain the same. For this reason, literati disagree on their identicalness. For example, [26] states that the expressions 'performance appraisal' and 'performance management' are often used synonymously, but that they are different. They posit that

performance management attaches more importance to front-end planning rather than looking backward, unlike appraisals, and concentrates on the continuing discourse instead of rankings and appraisal forms. Similar to this argument, [29] for instance stresses that an appraisal does not equal performance management. To him, an appraisal manifests past performance, while performance management is about the future. *“Performance management is the total process of observing an employee’s performance in relation to job requirements over a period of time, (that is, clarifying experiences, setting goals, providing on the job coaching, sorting and recalling information about performance) and then making an appraisal of it. Thus, information gathered from the process may serve as a feedback into the appraisal interview to determine the relevance of individual or work group performance to organisational purposes to improve the effectiveness of the unit and improve performance of employees”* [17]. Because of the non-existence of a well-defined disparity between the two representations, they may be assumed to be the same.

4.0 Summary

The essay indicates that performance appraisal, having attained comprehensive usage in organizations, is inclining to replace the old-fashioned appraisal systems. It is an assessment procedure that organizations employ to evaluate their movement in the direction their established goals. In spite of its extensive recognition, it seems to draw intense disapproval for reportedly being surrogate to human influence and therefore not a very reliable tool to measure employee and organizational performance. The countless types of PA processes are also a concern to practitioners who are unable to choose the most appropriate one for their establishments. Notwithstanding these criticisms, PAs appear efficient enough, and seem to be achieving good results for organizations, as there appears to be no better stand-in in sight. This review is a synopsis of the principles and matters relevant to the performance appraisal debate in organizations. Some scholars even now, perceive a drawback in the use of performance appraisal in organizations because of the apparent human influence in the process which they contend may lead to subjectivity and cause employee dissatisfaction for the appraisal praxes.

References

- [1] S. D. Angelo and D.P. Robert, (2006). Management and Organization Review 2:2 253 – 277, 1740 – 8776
- [2] W.P. Anthony, P.L. Perrewe and K.M. Kacmar, (1999). “Human Resource Management: A Strategic Approach”, Harcourt Brace, New York.
- [3] M. Armstrong, (2001). Human Resource Management Practice, (8th ed.) London: Kogan Page Publishers. Bertone, S., et al.,(1998), Developing Effective Consultation Practices: Case Study of Consultation at work: Melbourne: South Pacific Publishing.
- [4] M. Armstrong, (2003). A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice, 11th edn., Kogan Page, London.
- [5] M. Armstrong, (2010) A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice, 11th edn., Kogan Page, London.
- [6] S. Avery, (2005). Appraisal Systems not living Up to Their Objectives, Bacal and Associates, Ontario, Canada.
- [7] R.D. Averson, (1998). High-performance work systems and occupational safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 77.
- [8] B.D. Bannister and D.B. Balkin, (1990) Performance Evaluation and Compensation Feedback Messages: an integrated model, *Journal of Occupational Psychology* Vol. 63, June, British Psychology Society, pp 8.
- [9] M. Beer, (1981). Performance appraisal: dilemmas and possibilities. *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(3), 24 – 36. Retrieved August 24, 2007, from Business Source Premier Database, <http://search.epnet.com>
- [10] H.J. Bernardin, C.M. Hagan, J.S. Kane & P. Villanova. (1998). Effective performance management. In J.W. Smither (ed.), *Performance appraisal: state of the art in practice*: 3–48. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [11] F.O. Boachie-Mensah and P.A. Seidu, (2011). Employees Perception of Performance Appraisal System: A Case Study, in Zahaf, M., et. al., (eds.), *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 7, № 2, Jan. 2012.
- [12] G. Bohlander and S. Snell, (2004). *Managing Human Resources*, South Western, Mason, Ohio.
- [13] W.R. Boswell and J.W. Boudreau, (2002). “Separating the developmental and evaluative performance appraisal uses. *Journal of Business & Psychology*”, Vol. 16.

- [14] P. Boxall and J. Purcell, (2011). *Strategy and Human Resource Management*. 3rd edn. Macmillan, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- [15] J.W. Briker, (1992). *An Activity-based Approach to Early Intervention*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- [16] S.J. Carrol and C.E. Scheier, (1982). *Performance appraisal and review systems*. Glenview. IL: Scott, focesman.
- [17] W.F. Cascio, (1996). *Managing for maximum performance*. HR Monthly (Australia), September, 10–13.
- [18] S.N. Chowdhury, (2008), *Appraisal Systems for Performance Leadership in Banks*, Cab Calling Content, cab.org.
- [19] T. Coens and M. Jenkins, (2000). *Abolishing Performance Appraisals*, San Francisco, CA, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- [20] CIPD. (2008b). *The Role of Front Line Managers in HR*. Factsheet [Internet]. Available from: <<http://www.cipd.co.uk/subjects/maneco/general/rolefrntlinemngers.htm>>[Accessed 21 May 2008].
- [21] Y. Dauda and B.N. Luki, (2020). *A Comparative Review of Performance Appraisal and Performance Management*. International Journal of education and applied research. IJEAR Vol. 10, Issue 2, July - Dec 2020 International Journal of Education and Applied Research W WW. I J E A R. O R G Issn : 2348-0033 (Online) Issn : 2249-4944 (Print)
- [22] Y. Dauda, and G. Singh, (2018). *Assessment of human resource management best practices among private and public institutions*. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 8. No. 1.
- [23] A.A. De Waal, (2003). "Behavioral factors important for the successful implementation and use of performance management systems", *Management Decision*, Vol. 41 No. 8.
- [24] A.S. DeNisi, T. Cafferty, and B. Meglino, (1984). "A Cognitive View of The Performance Appraisal Process: A Model and Research Propositions", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol:33, pp. 360-396.
- [25] V. Dulewicz, (1989), *Performance Appraisal and Counseling*, in Herriot, P., (ed.), *Assessment and Selection in Organisations: Methods and Practices for Recruitment and appraisal*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, pp. 645 – 649.

- [26] EDUCBA, (2019), Performance Appraisal vs Performance Management, www.educba.com/performance-management-vs-performance-appraisal/
- [27] C. Fletcher, (2001). Performance Appraisal and Management: The Developing Research Agenda, in Petterson, F., (ed.), *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 74, Issue 4, pp. 379 – 562, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- [28] R. Folger and D. Lewis, (1993). Self-appraisal and fairness in evaluations. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 107-131). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [29] M. Gibbs, (2019), Difference between Performance Appraisal and Performance Management, <https://study.com/academy/lesson/difference-between-performance-appraisal-performance-management.html>
- [30] S.J. Goff and C.O. Longenecker, (1990). Why performance appraisals still fail. *Journal of Compensation and Benefits*, pp.36-41.
- [31] Griffin, D., (2016), Types of Employee Appraisal Systems, Studio D, Houston Chronicle, Texas, USA.
- [32] D. Grote, (2002). *The Performance Appraisal Question and Answer Book: A survival Guide for Managers*. [E-book] New York: American Management Association.
- [33] P.A. Grobler, S. Wörnich, M.R. Carrell, N.F. Elbert and R.D. Hatfield, (2011). *Human Resource Management in South Africa*. United Kingdom: Cengage Learning EMEA
- [34] J.M. Ivancevich, (2001). *Human Resource Management*. (8th Ed.). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- [35] S.H. Karol, (1996). *The Influence of Planning Activity on Employee Performance Review*. Unpublished Dissertation, Evanston, IL
- [36] R. Kimmons, (2017), Differences between Performance Management and Performance Appraisal, <https://bizfluent.com/list-7245767-differences-performance-management-performance-appraisal.html>
- [37] R. Lansbury, (1988). *Performance Human Resource management*. Australia, p.44-55
- [38] E. Lawler, (1994). *Performance management: The next generation*.

- Compensation and Benefits Review*, 26 (3), 16-20.
- [39] Lawrence, J., (2014), What are the Different Types of Performance Appraisal Systems?, Sift Media, Bristol, UK.
- [40] F. J. Landy and J. Farr, (1980). Performance rating. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87(1), 72-107
- [41] J. Lawrie, (1990). Assessment: Prepare for performance appraisal. *The Personnel Journal*, 69(4), 132
- [42] G. P. Latham and K. N. Wexley, (1981). *Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- [43] K. Lewin, K., (2004) "Planned Approach to Change", in, Faems, D., Filatotchev, I., and Siegel, D., (eds.) , *Journal of Management Studies*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd and Society for the Advancement of Management Studies
- [44] J. Lefkowitz, (2000) The role of interpersonal affective regard in supervisory performance ratings: a literature review and proposed causal model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. Vol 73. pp67–85.
- [45] P. E. Levy and J. R. Williams, (2004). The social context of performance appraisal: A review and framework for the future. *Journal of Management*, 30(6), 881-905.
- [46] C. O. Longenecker and L. S Fink, (1999). Creative effective performance appraisals. *Industrial Management*, 41(5), 18-23.
- [47] G. T. Milkovich and A. K Wigdor, (1991). *Pay for Performance: Evaluating Performance Appraisal and Merit Pay*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- [48] Mohammed, et. al., (2014) The Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal Systems: A Case Study of Unilever Ghana Limited, in *ADRRI Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, Vol. 3, No.3 (1).
- [49] A.M. Mohrman, S. M. Rensic-West and E.E. Lawler, (1989). *Designing Performance Appraisal System: Aligning Appraisals and Organizational Realities*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- [50] K.R. Murphy and J.N. Cleveland, (1991). *Performance appraisal: An organizational perspective*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- [51] A. North, (2010), *Introduction to Performance Appraisal*, www.performance-appraisal.com

- performance *measurement*. International Journal of Public Sector Management. Vol 18, no.5. pp 386-400.
- [52] P. Q. Radebe, (2015), Managers' Perceptions of the Performance Appraisal System in the Local Municipality of Gauteng Province in South Africa, Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, Vol 6 No 1 S1, MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy.
- [53] L. Reeves, (2016), *Pros and Cons of Performance Appraisals*, Demand Media Inc. Santa Monica, CA.
- [54] S. P. Robbins, (2001). Organizational Behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications (9th ed.): NJ:Prentice Hall.
- [55] C. A. Rowland and R. D. all, (2012) *Organizational Justice and Performance: "is appraisal fair?"*, in EuroMed Journal of Business, Vol.7, No.3, pp.280-293.
- [56] R.R. Sing, and S.Vadivelu, (2016) Performance Appraisal in India – A Review, in *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, ISSN 0973-4562, Volume 11, Number 5, (2016), pp 3229-3234 © Research India Publications,
<http://www.ripublication.com>
- [57] P. Taylor & M. O'Driscoll, (1994). Functions and Implementation of Performance Appraisal Systems in New Zealand Organizations. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources 32, 20-3
- [58] M.A. Verespej, M.A. (1990)"When you put the team in charge," Industry Week, December 3, 1990, pp.30-31.