



THE POLITICS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND EMPLOYEE SERVICE DELIVERY IN ENUGU STATE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Prof. Walter Ezeodili (PhD)

*Department of Public Administration,
Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu*

Nebo Gerald (PhD)

Department of Marketing, Enugu State University of Science and Technology Enugu

Abstract

This study examined the politics of performance appraisal in Enugu State Civil Service Commission and Employee Service Delivery. Performance appraisal involves performance rating, employees' performance review, personal appraisal, performance evaluation, etc. Data were collected from both primary and secondary sources. Also focus group discussion complements data collected from the field. Data were presented in tables and analysed using percentage and frequencies. Chi square non parametric statistical test was used to test the hypotheses. Major findings revealed that Enugu State Civil Service Commission has had disagreement in the past with its employees as a result of bias in performance appraisal. It was discovered that the Commission the result of staff appraisal was scarcely used in taking decision of employee promotion. Following the above findings, the major recommendations include that a combination of two or more appraisal methods should be adopted, this in no doubt will offer the best alternative to general application to be adopted.

Keywords: Appraisal, evaluation, performance rating

Introduction

In recent years, much attention has been given to the subject of employee's appraisal, as a result of the role it plays in organization effectiveness. Performance appraisal is an important programme. Thus, the process of appraisal is inevitable in any organization, though the way it is carried out varies and is within the control of organization's decision makers. Performance appraisal, which is also called performance evaluation process, is designed to offer or provide consistent annual review for all employees. The process is designed to offer both the employee and appraisal (usually the direct supervisor) improved communication, fair assessment and objective view of abilities that relate to the job responsibilities. In a work group, employees do not work at the same level of intensity and commitment. There are top performers; nothing is as discourage and frustrating as the practice of paying all these workers at the same level and falling to reward excellent performance.

According to Eze, (2002) "there should be some incentive for superior work, and motivation stimulate the marginal performance". Performance appraisal is about appraising the workers contribution to the productivity objectives of organizations. The employee is employed, initiated into organization, trained and matched to particular job in organization. The commonly used appraisal technique according to Thierauf (1982) includes essay appraisal method, graphic rating, field review, and forced-choice rating, critical incident appraisal, management by objective (MBO), working standard, ranking method and assessment centres. No one technique has the ability to achieve all purpose for which management institutes

performance appraisal method to desired performance goal. A performance appraisal process is directed towards two fundamental goals; to create a measure that accurately assesses the level of an individual's job performance and create an evaluation system that will advance one or more operational functions in an organization.

Although, all performance appraisal system encompasses both goals, they are reflected differently in two major research orientations. One that grows out of the measurement tradition, the other from human resources management and other fields that focus on the organizational purpose of performance appraisal. It is said that the biblical Adam and Eve were evaluated by God, and this marked the first attempt at evaluating workers performance. The only difference is that these couples were not employees in any form. In our daily activities in the organization, the supervisor is continually evaluating his impression about us in usually informal manner, patting the workers at the back or showing disapproval through one expression or the other. The subject of this work therefore is to determine to what extent the above lapses are true in the process of performance appraisal in the Federal Inland Revenue Service Awka.

Statement of the Problem

More often than not, we hear some employees of most government organizations complaining bitterly about the performance appraisal system of the organization. It is either that the method of appraising the performance of employees is no satisfactory or that the management does not employ appraisal results in making decisions of who and who should be promoted to the next rank. Actually appraisal scheme is purely designed to assess past performance indirect relation to merit salaries, awards, promotion and also to describe schemes designed to improve the performance of the employees. It is suggested that there is more likelihood of appraisal leading to action on the part of the individual being appraised depending on whether or not the appraisal exercise was on objective reflection of job performance. Also, there will be a negative attitude on the part of employees where the results of the appraisal were reflected in making decisions on salary, promotion and so on

Objectives of the Study

- (1) To determine the extent Civil Service Commission Enugu apply the appraisal decision in the promotion of officers
- (2) To determine whether the appraisal system in Civil Service Commission Enugu is carried out without bias.

Hypotheses

- (1) Enugu State Civil Service Commission uses the decision of staff appraisal in the promotion of staff.
- (2) The process of staff appraisal in Enugu State Civil Service Commission is biased.

Literature Review

Conceptual Framework

Concept of Performance: Performance in business setting means the extent to which an objective has been or is being met. Put in another way, performance refers to the degree to which organizational goals are achieved. Performance is measured from concepts — efficiency and effectiveness. Efficiency refers to the rate of resource utilization, i.e. cost incurred in the course of work done, while effectiveness refers to the extent in which results are achieved by way of units of goods produced or sold, value of content executed etc (Unyimadu, 2008)

Both aspects of performance are relevant in this paper. In evaluating and assessing performance of a business enterprise, attempt is made to examine not only the resultant outcome of the company's efforts in terms of returns (profit and its other derivation), but also those aspects of the company's financing and asset structure which indicate its ability survive or its disposition to avail itself of future opportunities. In practical parlance, performance is looked at in the context of the delivery to its promise made to stakeholders. This is why many oil producing firms in the Niger Delta in Nigeria have problems with their host communities because they continue to fail to make good their promises even when there is full degradation of the soil during their operations (Unyimadu, 2008; Koontz, Odonnell and Weihrich, 2000).

Concept of Purposes of Performance Appraisal

Productivity improvement concerns almost all organizations, especially during periods when the rates of productivity increases are relatively small. Yet, although the productivity of most organizations is a function of technological, capital, and human resources, many organizations have not sought to increase productivity by improving the performance of their human resources. Nevertheless, what employees do or do not do influences the productivity of organizations, and this behavior can be measured and evaluated, particularly job performance and absenteeism. *employee Job performance* (or simply performance) describes how well an employee performs his or her job, while *absenteeism* refers to whether the employee is there to perform his or her job. Job performance can be measured by an employee's job-related *attributes* (e.g., extent of cooperation or initiative), *behaviors*, and *outcomes* (e.g., quantity of output).

The impact that job performance and absenteeism can have on productivity has not been entirely lost on organizations, however. Recent quality circle and Quality of Work Life (QWL) programs at many large corporations, such as Ford, General Motors, General Electric, Motorola, and Westinghouse, have been aimed at increasing productivity through reducing absenteeism and improving the quality of employee job performance. While the dollar value of increased job performance can be substantial, the dollar value from reduced absenteeism alone is enormous. Recent surveys in this country estimate that approximately 500 million work days are lost each year from absenteeism, at an estimated cost of between \$10 and \$25 billion. At General Motors alone absenteeism is estimated to cost \$1 billion (Schuler and Youngblood, 1986).

In addition to the relation between performance appraisal and productivity, an effectively designed performance appraisal form serves as a contract between the organization and the employee. This contract acts as a control and evaluation system enabling performance appraisal to better serve the following purposes:

- 1 *Management development*: It provides a framework for future employee development by identifying and preparing individuals for increased responsibilities.
- 2 *Performance measurement*: It establishes the relative value of an individual's contribution to the company and helps evaluate individual accomplishments.
- 3 *Performance improvement*: It encourages continued successful performance and strengthens individual weaknesses to make employees more effective and productive.
- 4 *Compensation*: It helps determine appropriate pay for performance and equitable salary and bonus incentives based on merit or results.
- 5 *Identification of potential*: It identifies candidates for promotion.
- 6 *Feedback*: It outlines what is expected from employees against actual performance levels.
- 7 *Personnel planning*: It audits management talent to evaluate the present supply of human resources for replacement planning.
- 8 *Research on legal compliance*: It helps establish the validity of employment decisions made on the basis of performance-based information or to defend management actions such as demotion or termination. This, in turn, can minimize the financial losses due to unsuccessful court room defenses (Schuler and Youngblood, 1986; Akanwa, 1997; Foot and Cook, 2005).

Concept of the Relationships of Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal has critical relationships with job analysis, selection, compensation, and training.

Job Analysis

The foundation of the performance appraisal form is the job analysis. According to the uniform guidelines:

There shall be a job analysis which includes an analysis of the important work behaviors required for successful performance. Any job analysis should focus on work behavior(s) and the tasks associated with them. If a formal job analysis has not been conducted to establish the validity of the performance appraisal form, and thus the job-relatedness of a selection procedure, the courts may deny the validity claim.

Selection

To help increase the likelihood that applicants selected from the job applicant pool perform better on the job than those not selected, valid selection tests are used by organizations. Because empirical validation of a selection test usually requires correlating test scores with performance scores, it is dependent upon the performance appraisals. Without it, performance scores cannot be established. When used in this way, the appraisal form should be based upon job analysis. This helps produce a job-related form that increases the likelihood of selecting a good performer and meeting the requirements of the Uniform Guidelines.

Compensation

Performance appraisal can motivate employees by serving as a basis for distributing compensation. A valid appraisal of employee performance is necessary in order for an organization to provide contingent rewards (that is, those based on performance). Performance appraisal information can be used in the determination of pay levels as well as pay increments.

Training

Because employee performance is in part determined by ability as well as motivation, training can improve it. In order to provide the appropriate training, however, it is necessary to know the employee's current level of performance and what aspects of it are unacceptable (Schuler and Youngblood, 1986; Akanwa, 1997; and Foot and Cook, 2005).

Rationale for Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal according to Manoharan (2009) is employed to achieve several objectives that include improvement in the communication between supervisor and subordinate through the use of feedback between them. It can be used to identify the scope for performance improvement and individual training and development needs. All these are evaluative and developmental use of the appraisal system, which will require the rater to objectively reach a conclusion about performance. Such rating system assumes that the rating tool is reasonably objective and accurate. However, in reality, Ivancevich (2011) argues that the raters' memories are quite fallible, and raters subscribe to their own sets of likes, dislikes, and expectations about people, which may or may not be valid. That is, raters have their own parameters with which they "subjectively" view their subordinates.

These biases produce rating errors, or deviations between the "true" ratings an employee deserves and the actual rating assigned. Rating errors according to Dessler (2008) reduce the reliability, validity, and utility of performance appraisal systems, which can manifest themselves in many forms. Some of the most common types of rater biases according to Robert and John (2000) are namely, halo effect and horns effect. In the case halo error, rater perceives one factor as having more importance and gives a good rating to an employee based on this one factor. In this situation, the rater fails to discriminate between the employee's strong points and weak points; and the halo is carried over from one dimension to the other (Robert and John, 2000). Horns effect on the other hand occurs when the appraiser gives an unfavorable rating to overall job performance essentially because the appraisee has performed poorly in one particular aspect of the job which the appraiser considers all-important (Cardy, 2004). All these errors can limit the ability of an organization to adequately capture employees' performance and align them with the organizational goals and objectives.

Methodology

The research design adopted is survey design. Specifically descriptive research method was used. Enugu State Civil Service Commission was studied. Data were collected using questionnaire, face to face interview, focus group discussion and observation. Data from secondary sources complement primary data. Chi-square non parametric statistics was used in the test of hypotheses.

Data Analysis

Questionnaire Distribution and Return

A summary of distribution of questionnaire among staff of Federal Inland Revenue Service Awka.

Test of Hypotheses

(1) Civil Service Commission Enugu uses the decision of staff appraisal in the promotion of staff.

This hypothesis was tested using the data below:

Table 1

OPTIONS	POSITIVE RESPONSE	NEGATIVE RESPONSE	TOTAL
MANAGEMENT/ADMIN STAFF	0	4	4
SENIOR STAFF	11	13	24
JUNIOR STAFF	14	22	36
CLERICAL STAFF	12	14	26
TOTAL	37	53	90

Negative response = (undecided, disagree and strongly disagree)

Positive responses = (strongly agreed and agree)

Formula for X^2

$$X^2 = \frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe}$$

Where fo = frequency observed

fe = frequency expected

Level of significance 0.05

$$\text{Using } fe = \frac{CT \times RT}{GT}$$

Where CT= column total

RT= row total

GT= grand total

$$Fe1 = \frac{32 \times 4}{90} = 1.42$$

$$Fe2 = \frac{32 \times 24}{90} = 8.53$$

$$Fe3 = \frac{32 \times 36}{90} = 12.8$$

$$Fe4 = \frac{32 \times 26}{90} = 9.24$$

$$Fe5 = \frac{53 \times 4}{90} = 2.36$$

$$Fe6 = \frac{53 \times 24}{90} = 14.13$$

$$Fe7 = \frac{53 \times 36}{90} = 21.2$$

$$Fe8 = \frac{53 \times 26}{90} = 15.31$$

CELL	FO	FE	$FO - FE$	$(FO - FE)^2$	$\frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe}$
1	0	1.42	-1.42	2.02	1.42
2	11	8.53	2.47	6.10	0.72
3	14	12.8	1.2	1.44	0.11
4	12	9.24	2.76	7.62	0.82
5	4	2.36	1.64	2.69	1.14
6	13	14.13	-1.13	1.28	0.09
7	22	21.2	0.8	0.64	0.03
8	14	15.31	-1.31	1.72	0.11
					4.44

$$DF = (C-1) (R-1)$$

$$= (4-1) (2-1)$$

$$= 3 \times 1 = 3$$

With level of significance = 0.05 and df = 3, the critical value of $X^2 = 7.81$

Decision rule

Reject H_0 if the calculated X^2 is greater than the critical value of X^2 . do not reject if otherwise

Decision

Since $X^2_{cal} = 4.4$ and our critical value = 7.81, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that Civil Service Commission Enugu does not use the decision of staff appraisal in the promotion of staff.

(2) The process of staff appraisal in Enugu State Civil Service Commission is biased.

This hypothesis was tested using the data below:

Table 2

OPTIONS	POSITIVE RESPONSE	NEGATIVE RESPONSE	TOTAL
MANAGEMENT/ADMIN STAFF	1	3	4
SENIOR STAFF	22	2	24
JUNIOR STAFF	25	11	36
CLERICAL STAFF	22	4	26
TOTAL	70	20	90

Negative response = (undecided, disagree and strongly disagree)

Positive responses = (strongly agreed and agree)

Formula for X^2

$$X^2 = \frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe}$$

Where fo = frequency observed

fe = frequency expected

Level of significance 0.05

$$\text{Using } fe = \frac{CT \times RT}{GT}$$

Where CT= column total

RT= row total

GT= grand total

$$Fe1 = \frac{70 \times 4}{90} = 3.11$$

$$Fe2 = \frac{70 \times 24}{90} = 18.67$$

$$Fe3 = \frac{70 \times 36}{90} = 28$$

$$Fe4 = \frac{70 \times 26}{90} = 20.22$$

$$Fe5 = \frac{20 \times 4}{90} = 0.89$$

$$Fe6 = \frac{20 \times 24}{90} = 5.33$$

$$Fe7 = \frac{20 \times 36}{90} = 8$$

$$Fe8 = \frac{20 \times 26}{90} = 5.78$$

CELL	FO	FE	FO – FE	(FO – FE) ²	$\frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe}$
1	1	3.11	-2.11	4.45	1.43
2	22	18.67	3.33	11.08	0.59
3	25	28	3	9	0.32
4	22	20.22	1.78	3.16	0.15
5	3	0.89	2.11	4.45	5.0
6	2	5.33	-3.33	11.08	2.08
7	11	8	3	9	1.13
8	4	5.78	1.78	3.17	0.55
					11.25

$$DF = (C-1) (R-1)$$

$$= (4-1) (2-1)$$

$$= 3 \times 1 = 3$$

With level of significance = 0.05 and df = 3, the critical value of $X^2 = 7.81$

Decision rule

Reject Ho if the calculated X^2 is greater than the critical value of X^2 . do not reject if otherwise

Decision

Since $X^2_{cal} = 11.25$ and our critical value = 7.81, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the process of staff appraisal in Enugu State Civil Service Commission Enugu is biased

Discussion of Results

The first hypothesis was tested using tables .1. Results revealed that Enugu State Civil Service Commission does not use decision of staff appraisal in promoting staff.

The second hypothesis was tested using tables 2. Results showed that the process of staff appraisal in Enugu State Civil Service Commission is biased.

Summary of the Findings

1. The study revealed that majority of employees in Enugu State Civil Service Commission are not satisfied with the organization's performance appraisal system.
2. The research finding also revealed that employees in the Enugu State Civil Service Commission perceive that performance appraisal system has encouraged mediocrity in the service.

3. Furthermore, from the research findings, it was revealed that APER system is used to report performance appraisal in Enugu State Civil Service Commission.
4. Also it was gathered that Employee appraisal consistent in Enugu State Civil Service Commission.

Recommendations

1. A combination of two or more principal appraisal method offers the best alternative for general application. No single appraisal system can meet all needs. Therefore, rating method used alone does not always achieve all appraisal objectives. It must be combined with some other method for effectiveness.
2. Management of Enugu State Civil Service Commission should carry out employee performance appraisal in a manner that its staff will have confidence in the fairness of the exercise. And whatever perceptions employees have of the appraisal process should be carefully considered.
3. In order to minimize bias and favouritism in any performance appraisal, it is recommended that employees be allowed to read through what has been written about them and thereafter pass their comments. Also, the opinion of a second level supervisor should be required and considered.
4. Closed system of performance appraisal in which the boss does rating and keep it secret from the rest should not be a general practice in public organization, such as Federal Inland Revenue service, Awka.
5. Finally, for a more successful performance appraisal, it is recommended that employees be fully informed of appraisal policy, its purpose, with clearly stated objectives, focusing the attention of subordinates on the level of performance that is expected of them so as to minimize uncertainty and potential resistance. Employees understanding will increase the potential for positive results from appraisal.

References

- Armstrong, M (2006). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (10thed.). U.K: Kogan Page Ltd
- Armstrong, M. (2009). *Armstrong's Handbook of Performance Management An Evidence based Guide to Delivering High Performance*.UK: Kogan Page
- Boyce, M. (2008), *Personnel Management*. Great Britain, McDonald and Evans Ltd.
- Cardy, R.L. & Leonard, B. (2011). *Performance Management: Concepts, Skills and Exercises*. (2nd). New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Ltd.
- Carroll, S.J. and & Schneider, C.E. (2002). *Performance Appraisal and Review System*; Glenview III: Foresman.
- Chukwuemeka, E (2006), *Research Methods and Thesis Writing: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*. Enugu, HRV Publishers.
- Cummings, L.C. & Schwab, D.P. (2009). *Designing Appraisal System for Information Yield California Management Review*, summer, pp 18-25.
- Dessler, G. (2008). *Human Resource Management (11th ed)*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Ltd.
- Ejiofor, p. (1990), *Management in Nigeria: theories and issues*. Onitsha African Educational Publishers Nigeria ltd.
- Ewuim, N and Ubochi, I (2007), *principles of personnel management in Nigeria*. Lagos, Dominican publishers.
- Gbeja.O (2011). *Performance Appraisal and Management in the public Service*. A Paper delivered at the First Annual Conference of South African Association of Public Administration and Management, November 22nd – 24th.
- Grubb, T. (2007). "Performance Appraisal Reappraised: It's Not All Positive". *Journal of Human Resources Education*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Ikemefuna, C.O. (2005). *Management: Theory and Practice*. Lagos: Concept Publications.
- John, O, (2009), *Business Research Methodology*. Enugu, Meteson publicity company
- Manoharan, T. R., Muralidharan, C. & Deshmukh, S. G. (2009). *Employee Performance Appraisal Using Data Envelopment Analysis: A Case Study*". *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 17(1), 92-111.
- Manoharan, T. R., Muralidharan, C. & Deshmukh, S. G. (2009). *Employee Performance Appraisal Using Data Envelopment Analysis: A Case Study*". *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 17(1), 92-111.
- Mbieli, P. (2009), *Personnel Administration: management of human resources at work*. Lagos, West African Book Publishers ltd.
- Muo, I. K. (2007). "Improving the Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal as an Evaluative Instrument in the Workplace." *Nigerian Journal of Labour Law and Industrial Relations*. Vol.1, NO.3, pp.133-146

Udoji Commission Report (1974). *Staff Appraisal and Evaluation*; and (1976) *Annual performance Evaluation Report Guidelines*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Establishments Publication.