

Personality as a Determinants of Effectiveness of Employee Performance Appraisal System: A Survey of Public Universities in Nakuru County

Elizabeth Nambuswa Makokha^{1*}, Prof. Gregory Namusonge¹, Prof. Christopher Kanali²
Alice Chepkorir Milgo¹

1.School of Human Resource Development, Department of Entrepreneurship and Procurement.Jomo
Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, P.O. Box 62000 - 00200, Nairobi Kenya

2.School of Engineering, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology
P.O. Box 62000 - 00200 Nairobi Kenya

* Email: enambuswa@gmail.com

Abstract

A performance appraisal system is important to any organisational work performance; it determines the organization's success or failure. Several studies such as Nzuve (2007), Armstrong (2012), Yee and Chen (2009) define PA as a means of evaluating employees' work performance over a given period of time. According Horsoo (2010) reports that employees viewed performance appraisal as discriminatory, punitive and judgemental processes, where cronyism and biased considerations dominated objectivity and thus ineffectiveness of the appraisal system. The main objective of the present study was to assess the effects of personality factors on the effectiveness of employee performance appraisal system in institutions of higher learning in Nakuru County. The study adopted a survey design. The study population comprised of all academic personnel in public universities Nakuru County. A sample size of 224 respondents was selected randomly from a population of 507. This number was distributed among academic staff across all the departments and sections. The instrument for collecting data was a questionnaire which was used to collect get both qualitative and quantitative data. The questionnaire was distributed amongst the all academic staff in public universities in Nakuru County. A total of 220 out of 224 academic staff completed questionnaires, which represented all public universities in the county with varying demographic backgrounds. Analysis of quantitative data was done to test hypothesis using the ANOVA and regression analysis. The results indicated that job related factors (training and development, promotion and tasks in organisation had a positive impact on the effectiveness of employee performance appraisal system among the selected institutions of higher learning in Nakuru County. An effective performance appraisal system enables organizations realize their goals as well as employees personal growth.

Keywords: Employee performance appraisal system and personality.

1.0 Introduction

Performance appraisal (PA) refers to a process, which studies and evaluates the job performance of personnel formally (Armstrong, 2012, Mondy, 2008, Najafi *et al.*, (2000)). Performance appraisal evaluates the individual overall contribution to the organization through assessment of his internal characteristics, working performance and his capability to pursue higher position(s) in an organization (Gruman & Saks, 2011). Nzuve (2007), Yee and Chen (2009) define PA as a means of evaluating employees' work performance over a given period of time. Appraisal is an effective instrument in the human resources management, which if performed correctly and logically, the organization will get its personnel to achieve their interests (Rezghi, 2000). EPAS is a key task towards managing the human resources of an organization in particular positions (Moon, *et al.*, 2007).

Human resources are arguably the most valuable assets of any organization and obviously constitute the largest corporate investment (Roslender *et al.*, 2009). Employees' skills and competencies have significant bearing on organizations' productivity, profitability and continued survival (International Labour Conference, 2008). Therefore, in order to achieve corporate goals and remain in business there is the need to assess employees' job performance and device strategies to manage them in an effective manner. Performance appraisals are indispensable for the effective supervision and costing of staff (Jabeen, 2011). It is an important factor in identifying people's talents and capacities and its results can make them aware of advancements, plans and goals (Hamidi, 2010).

The issue of employees' performance in relation to achieving organizational goals has occupied the attention of managements for a long time. Differences in levels of employees' performance are attributed to differences in skill and ability in one part and difference levels of motivation in another (Boachie-Mensah and Dogbe, 2011). Inadequate skills and ability are usually rectified through training and development (Soh, 1998), while differences in motivation are corrected through appropriate motivational strategies and policies.

Therefore, for well- functioning organizations, the use of performance appraisal cannot be overemphasized. However, the extent to which appraisals play a valuable role in the organization depends on how it is conducted.

PA is arguably an important aspect of contemporary human resource management, where each individual institution/organization sets out uniform criteria and processes, and procedures for assessing output of staff in terms of quality, quantity, cost, and time over a period, usually during the preceding year.

Performance appraisal widely used for determining wages and salaries, promotion, training and development, providing performance feedback, and identifying employee strengths and weaknesses (Mathis & Jackson, 2005; Noe, et al. 2006; Khan, 2008). Bohlander and Snell (2007), and Mathis and Jackson (2005) identified two uses of performance appraisal information: (a) developmental uses, and (b) administrative uses. Developmental uses include, providing performance feedback, identifying individual strengths/weaknesses, recognizing individual performance, assisting in goal identification, evaluating goal achievement, identifying individual training needs, determining organisational training needs, reinforcing authority structure, allowing employees to discuss concerns, improving communication, and providing a forum for leaders to help (Bohlander & Snell, 2007). Administrative uses include, documenting personnel decisions, determining promotion candidates, determining transfers and assignments, identifying poor performance, deciding retention or termination, deciding on layoffs, validating selection criteria, meeting legal requirements, evaluating training programs/progress, personnel planning, and making reward/compensation decisions (Bohlander & Snell, 2007).

Generally, PA performs three functions; to provide adequate feedback to support employees' development; to serve as a basis for modifying or changing behaviour to produce more effectively for organization; and to provide useful information to supervisors (Erdogan; 2000; Coens and Jenkins, 2002; Law, 2007). There are various traditional appraisal techniques presently used by different organizations according to their objectives. Yee and Chen (2009) identify different techniques of performance appraisal, including: ranking; trait scale; critical incident; narrative; and criteria based. Terrence and Joyce (2004) also identifies other methods of measuring staff job performance including management by objective (MBO); work planning and review; 360 degree appraisal; and peer review. Some organizations would choose the multifactorial approach, that is to "mix and match" or combine different techniques for their own performance appraisal that would meet their organizational needs. All available methods have their advantages and disadvantages. Whatever the method of an appraisal, it must effectively address a particular organization's human resource deficiencies. A well designed and an effective performance appraisal system should help the organization achieve its goals and objective if it is properly implemented. But a poorly designed appraisal system can create anxiety and sometimes can provoke the morale of employee (Chen and Mia, 2004; Mulvaney, McKinney and Grodsky, 2008).

This analysis draws on the work of Brown and Heywood (2005), and four groups of variables are included as explanatory factors in our regression equation: workforce characteristics, level of job control, complementary HRM practices and structural factors. According Horsoo (2010) reports that employees viewed employee performance appraisal systems as discriminatory, punitive and judgemental processes, where cronyism and biased considerations dominated objectivity and thus ineffectiveness of the appraisal system. This study therefore focused on analyzing personality as a determinants of effectiveness of employee performance appraisal system in selected institutes of higher learning in Nakuru County which were Egerton University and Laikipia University.

2.0 Effect of Personality Factors on Effectiveness of Employee Performance Appraisal System

Hogan and Shelton (2006) pointed out that the personality theories examine the variances and similarities in a person. The similarities can be used to predict one's performance and behaviour, as they provide the collective attributes of human nature. Whereas, the variances provide the measures of individual's performance and are used to describe human performances and behaviours. Experts in the field of personality are of the view that the individuals in fact have a stable and long term traits that affects behaviours at work (Denissen et al., 2011; Gerber et al., 2011). With reference to research on personality, some scholars captured that personality is the effective tool that predicts job performance (Ozer & Benet-Martinez, 2006; Schulman, 2011). The technique is mostly adopted at the time of personnel selection procedure (Barrick & Mount 2000).

Studies on personality and organizational outcomes have received enormous attention by researchers in the organizational behaviour research stream. Latest studies illustrate that personality effects the environments in which individuals are living (Chen, 2004; Barrick et al., 2003) and plays a significant role to select the situation in which individuals decide to stay in. According to Barrick and Mount (2005) the preference for organizational environments, the cycle of individuals one choose to interact with and the kind of activities one enjoys strongly relies on one's personality. Cook and Crossman (2004) maintain that appraisal satisfaction is significant as it is found inter-correlated with perceived fairness. Colquitt, Conlon, Christopher and Ng(2001) and Bies (2005) have recommended that increase in pay of the employees is more effective for appraisal satisfaction. On the area of performance appraisal, Kuvas (2006) performed a cross-sectional survey of 593 employees from 64 Norwegian savings banks. His results reinforce that there is a direct relation between performance appraisal satisfaction and affective commitments along with turnover intentions. Thurston, McNall (2010) have found that appraisal satisfaction may not be achieved without organizational justice.

2.1 Motivation

According to Mullins (2007) and Daft (2003) motivation is made up of forces internal and external which direct the way and persistence of action through enthusiasm. Motivation refers to “the reasons underlying behavior” (Guay et al., 2010). Paraphrasing Gredler, Broussard and Garrison (2004) broadly define motivation as “the attribute that moves us to do or not to do something. Intrinsic motivation is motivation that is animated by personal enjoyment, interest, or pleasure. Motivation involves a constellation of beliefs, perceptions, values, interests, and actions that are all closely related. Daft states that employee motivation affects productivity and consequently profitability of the company. No one works for free, nor should they. Employees want to earn reasonable salary and payment, and employees desire their workers to feel that is what they are getting. Money is the fundamental inducement, no other incentive or motivational technique comes even close to it with respect to its influential value (Sara et al, 2004). It has the supremacy to magnetize, maintain and motivate individuals towards higher performance.

Frederick Taylor and his scientific management associate described money as the most fundamental factor in motivating the industrial workers to attain greater productivity (Adeyinka et al, 2007).

Research has suggested that reward now cause satisfaction of the employee which directly influences performance of the employee (Kalimullah et al, 2010). Rewards are management tools that hopefully contribute to firm’s effectiveness by influencing individual or group behavior. All businesses use pay, promotion, bonuses or other types of rewards to motivate and encourage high level performances of employees (Reena et al, 2009).

To use salaries as a motivator effectively, managers must consider salary structures which should include importance organization attach to each job, payment according to performance, personal or special allowances, fringe benefits, pensions and so on (Adeyinka et al, 2007).

Therefore, it is the manager’s job to channel motivation towards the accomplishment of organisational goals and thus having effective performance appraisal system. It is widely recognized in the human resource literature that promotion of the motivation of workers in both private and public organisations leads to a higher quality of human resources and optimum performance (Adeyinka et al, 2007). Consensus is also growing among managers about the significance of combining good human resource performance approaches on motivation incentives to encourage good performance. Investment in workers through motivational measures are made today with the hope of future benefits for an organisation.

A motivated and qualified workforce is crucial to increase productivity and the quality of the organisational services in order to achieve organisational objectives. The challenge and dilemma for many managers is how to create this type of motivation (Dieleman and Toonen, 2006). While there are many theories surrounding the notion of motivation, two distinct areas of motivation are usually mixed (Dieleman and Toonen, 2006). That is the emphasis placed on motivation to be rooted in a job and motivation to perform (Dieleman and Toonen 2006). Both are very vital and managers have to critically understand the impact of their activities in both areas (Dieleman and Toonen 2006:1).

Motivation is significant because even people with the required knowledge, skills, and abilities will perform poorly if they are not motivated to devote their time and effort to work (Harris in Milapo, 2001). Workers have needs which a workplace must fulfil in order to avoid demotivation. When workers lack motivation they tend to resort to anti-work behaviours such as absenteeism, negligence of duty, late-coming, failure to meet deadlines, display of open frustration and all these factors work negative to the performance and credibility of an organization. Organizations need to place all efforts to ensure that incentives such as intrinsic motivators, extrinsic motivators and performance management approaches are used in order to retain, attract, increase workers efforts, satisfaction and commitment.

2.2 Attitude

Attitudes and perceptions towards various aspects of performance appraisal systems and processes (e.g. perceptions of fairness and accuracy, appraisal determinants items, appraisal interview behaviors, appraisal satisfaction, and personal variables) have long been recognized (Landy et al., 1978; Pooyan and Eberhardt, 1989; Lathman and Wexley, 1994; Lee and Son, 1998). Previous research has attempted to identify characteristics of appraisal systems and processes that are related to employee satisfaction with the system and process. Landy et al. (1978) tested appraisal systems in general and found that employee perceptions of the appraisal processes of fairness and accuracy were a function of the frequency of evaluation, identification of goals to eliminate weaknesses, and supervisor knowledge of the subordinate’ duties and performance. Investigating employees’ attitudes towards various aspects of the performance appraisal system, Pooyan & Eberhardt (1990) found that open, two-way communication, mutual trust, opportunities for ratees to participate in goal setting, the supervisor’s knowledge of ratees’ performance, being evaluated on. As has been previously noted, the research linking employee attributions to enhanced individual and organisation performance is scarce. In one of the very few works that examined the potential influence of PM systems on employee attitudes and behaviours. Biron, Farndale, and Paasuwe (2011) argued that particular structural configurations might drive employees’ attention to performance related issues, which are important from the organisational standpoint. Similarly to Bowen and

Ostroff (2004), Biron et al (2011) claimed that organisational approach to selecting, designing, and utilizing HRM practices, sends signals potentially influencing employees' attitudes and behaviours.

In another recent work, Boon, Den Hartog, Boselie, and Paauwe (2011) investigated the relationship between employee perceptions of HRM practices and employee outcomes from the perspective of person-organisation (P-O) and person-job (P-J) fit. They have found that some relationships between the perception of HRM practices and employee outcomes appeared to occur indirectly, through P-O and P-J fit. The authors concluded that managing employee perceptions of HRM might be a worthwhile goal for firms, as they can affect organisational performance.

2.3 Perception

In today's competitive business world, it is understood that organisations can only compete with their rivals by innovating, and organisations can be innovative by managing their human resources well. The human resource system can become more effective by having a valid and accurate appraisal system used for rating performances of employees (Armstrong, 2009; Bohlander & Snell, 2004). Unfortunately, the number of organisations using an effective performance appraisal system (PAS) is limited (Hennessey & Bernadin, 2003).

Perceptions of employees about the targets, outcomes and uses of performance appraisal (PA) results would be beneficial depending on a number of factors. For example, employees are more likely to be receptive and supportive of a given PA programme if they perceive the process as a useful source of feedback which helps to improve their performance (Mullins, 2007). Employees are likely to embrace and contribute meaningfully to a given PA scheme if they perceive it as an opportunity for promotion, and as an avenue for personal development opportunities, a chance to be visible and demonstrate skills and abilities, and an opportunity to network with others in the organisation. On the other hand, if employees perceive PA as an unreasonable attempt by management to exercise closer supervision and control over tasks they (employees) perform, various reactions may result. Perceptual processes are potent determinants of behaviour. According to Messer and White (2006), employees' perceptions of fairness affect their likelihood to demonstrate organisational citizenship behaviours. PA will be effective if the appraisal process is clearly explained to, and agreed by the people involved (Anthony et al., 1999). Without adequate explanation or consultation, PA could turn counterproductive.

In addition, staff motivation, attitude and behaviour development, communicating and aligning individual and organisational aims, and fostering positive relationships between management and staff are essential for successful appraisal (Armstrong, 2009).

In order to obtain accurate PA information, raters must provide objective and unbiased ratings of employees. Due to difficulty in developing an accurate performance checklist, managers' subjective opinions are frequently called for. Many organisations use some combination of subjective and objective assessment for actual PA. Yet, there are numerous problems in actual assessment of employee performance (Corbett & Kenny, 2001). The existence of such problems suggests that PAS may be fraught with biases or errors, resulting in compromised evaluations of employees' accomplishments and capabilities. And the PAS of the institution of study might not be an exception. For a PAS to be perceived as fair, it must be free of bias. It is known that appraisal errors can harm perceptions of pay system fairness by confusing the relationship between true performance differences (Miceli et al., 1991). The importance of effective PA in organisations cannot be overemphasised as appraisals help develop individuals, improve organisational performance and feed into business planning. An understanding of the phenomenon, therefore, in every sector of human endeavour is imperative.

3.0 METHOD

The study employed a survey design a target population of 507 where a sample of 224 respondents were selected. The questionnaire categorized personality factors as one of the important factors influencing effectiveness of an appraisal system in higher learning institutions (Egerton and Laikipia University). This factor was subdivided into three: motivation, attitude and perception. Motivation had six items, attitude 5 items and perception 3 items. Analysis of the factors and their dimensions realized the following results for motivation, attitude and perception. In order to carry out appropriate analysis, variable scores for each dimension were summed up to get the total scale score for further analysis. The items scale were ordinal from a low of 1 – strongly disagrees to a high of 5 – strongly agree.

4.0 Results

4.1 Motivation

It is widely recognized in the human resource literature that promotion of the motivation of workers in both private and public organisations leads to a higher quality of human resources and optimum performance (Adeyinka et al, 2007). Motivation is significant because even people with the required knowledge, skills, and abilities will perform poorly if they are not motivated to devote their time and effort to work (Harris in Milapo, 2001).

On motivation and compensation system, respondent indicate compensation system is attractive and therefore a

motivation. Those that thought otherwise were represented by 17.3 and 6.1 percent as 10 percent were unsure. Internal equity in salary was another measure of motivation which indicated that 57.5 percent of those surveyed agreed to salaries being internally equitable. 21.2 percent had different opinions 6.1 percent strongly agreed and another 5 percent strongly disagreed. When salaries are considered equitable internally then employees are motivated to work harder since there is fairness in reward and compensation.

External Equity in salary revealed that majority of respondents 59.6 percent disagreed that they did not think there was external equity in salary. This was followed by a group that comprised of 19.7 percent who agreed that there was a presence of equitable external salary while 14.6 percent indicated that they were not aware of presence of equitable external salary. 5.1 strongly disagreed and 1.1 percent strongly agreed. Respondents were asked whether they thought the salary they received was commensurate to work they do. Here, 46.4 percent disagreed with a further 11.2 percent disagreeing strongly. 25.1 percent agreed and a further 2.8 percent agreeing strongly that salary reflected performance.

An acceptable salary should reflect the standard of living expected by the employee. Results revealed that 48 percent disagreed that salary improved standard of living, but only 14 percent agreed with 3.4 percent agreeing more. 20.3 percent strong disagreed while 13.6 were not sure.

4.2 Attitude

Pooyan & Eberhardt (1990) found that open, two -way communication, mutual trust, opportunities for rates to participate in goal setting, the supervisor's knowledge of rates' performance, being evaluated on. Attitude and perceptions towards performance appraisal systems and process have been recognized by various scholars Attitudes towards seniors has a greater influence on how the rating exercise will be viewed by subjects. This can also extend towards other colleagues and groups of employees.

Table below contain a summary of data relating to attitude of respondents towards the institutions where they work, colleagues, relationships and discipline. For instance table 4.11 indicates their 54.2 percent of the respondents of this question are satisfied with their work. 21.8 percent more in agreement while 12.8 percent disagreed or were not satisfied with their work.

Following closely on the issue of attitude was the question on whether the responders felt valued as workers. Results revealed that 34.6 percent did not feel valued as workers. Those feeling valued comprised 16.8 and 12.8 percent, including those who felt more strongly. As a result a slightly high proportion 11.7 percent strongly disagreed that they did not feel valued . A further 24 percent were not sure.

The study also sought to find out whether relationships with co-workers were good. From the summary from the table, 32.6 percent and 7.3 percent agreed and strongly agreed respectively that the interpersonal relationship at work was good. 30.9 percent disagreed, 1.7 percent strongly disagreed that interpersonal relationship at work is good. 27.5 percent were unsure.

Between work groups, the relationship was stated as good as shown on table as follows. 34.3 percent and 3.9 percent agreed and strongly agreed respectively that the intergroup relationship at work was good. 32 percent disagreed, 1.7 percent strongly disagreed that intergroup relationship at work is good. 28 percent were unsure. This is made to improve relationship between groups to enhance productivity through seamless work relationships. Intergroup cohesiveness is good for productivity. Highly homogeneous group are less dysfunctional. Therefore encouraging group unity and function is necessary in any organization.

Discipline is important at the work place. It relates to self control and taking responsibility for ones action. Discharging one duty with little or no supervision is a function of individual discipline. So is discipline highly observed among academic staff members of the universities involved in this study? The answer to this question revealed that 45.8 percent disagreed that discipline, sincerity, dedication are highly observed, 12.3 percent strongly disagreed. Only 21.2 percent agreed and 3.9 percent strongly agreed that discipline, sincerity, dedication are highly observed. 16.8 percent were unsure of the same. The table below illustrates that effectiveness of employee performance appraisal system is made to improve discipline. This can be achieved through having a policy on conduct of individual members of staff at the universities.

4.3 Perception

According to Messer and White (2006), employees' perceptions of fairness affect their likelihood to demonstrate organisational citizenship behaviours. PA will be effective if the appraisal process is clearly explained to, and agreed by the people involved (Anthony et al., 1999). Without adequate explanation or consultation, PA could turn counterproductive. Perceptions of employees about the targets, outcomes and uses of performance appraisal (PA) results would be beneficial depending on a number of factors. For example, employees are more likely to be receptive and supportive of a given PA programme if they perceive the process as a useful source of feedback which helps to improve their performance (Mullins, 2007).

Perception by respondents on appraisal system was further measured using three items. The first was to find out whether the opinion of respondent considered rating of performance as based on performance and not personality or other matters. Here 56 percent agreed to the evaluation being objectives as not influenced by other external factors on the other hand total of about 43 percent (22 and 20.9) disagreed. This is also linked to the question of

absence of bias when evaluating capability of performance. The “Yes” and “No” groups were divided equality 39.5 percent that rating is given without regard to how the rate will receive it. The rating given was also indicated as consistent by 34 percent while those opposed were 40 percent hence it appears then that there is some inconsistency in the rating of employee performance in the said universities. Twenty percent level unsure about this.

Correlation Coefficients between the Dimensions and Personality

Table 1 on coefficients below involving the three dimensions of personality reveal that attitude has the strongest and positive relationship with personality 0.894 which is also significant. This is followed by motivation with a correlation coefficient of 0.812 and lastly perception 0.788. All the relationships were positive and significant at 5 percent one tailed test. Consequently, effort to strengthen personality factors must focus on attitude change first followed by motivation.

Table 1 Correlations

Spearman rho.	Motivation.	Attitude.	Perception.
RHO Personality factors	.812**	.894**	.788**
	.000	.000	.000
	166	166	166

**Significant correlations at 0.05 level.

The correlation between personality factors and effectiveness of appraisal system (PAS) show that the association positively and moderately strong (0.511). This is also significant with N=155. This is revealed by table 2 below. Personality factors when regressed against appraisal effectiveness showed that variation in perceptions about effectiveness of appraisal was explained by personality factors between 30.3 and 42.2 percent. The model summary table 2 generated from a logistic process of analysis is shown below.

Table 2

			Personality Factors.
Spearman's rho	Effective Appraisal.	Correlation Coefficient	.511**
		Sig. (1-tailed)	.000
		N	155

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Finally, the logistic regression model constructed of the form:-

$$Ln \left(\frac{pi}{1 - pi} \right) = e - z$$

Where:-

$$Z = \alpha + \beta X_i + \mu_i \quad \hat{Y} = \alpha + \beta X_i + \mu_i \quad ; X = \text{Personality factors}$$

Table 4 Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% EXP(B)	C.I.for Upper
Step 1 ^a	Personality Factors	.155	.026	36.216	1	.000	1.168	1.110	1.228
	Constant	-7.646	1.173	42.464	1	.000	.000		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Personality Factors.

This is interpreted as; when personality factors increase by a unit, the probability of effectiveness of the appraisal system increases by 1.168 times or 16.8 percent (see table 4above).

5.0 Discussion

The present study shows that effectiveness of employee performance appraisal system in higher learning institution is equally important if only the personality factors (motivation, attitude and perception) are be put into consideration. Satisfaction level with EPAS at Egerton and Laikipia universities among members of academic staff is how only 39% of respondents were satisfied while 40 percent were dissatisfied. Respondents were 169 and 51 from Egerton and Laikipia universities respectively. The objective of this study was to assess the effect of personality factors on effectiveness of employee performance appraisal systems in institutions of higher

learning in Nakuru county. Below, the major conclusions drawn from this study are discussed as follows
Employee performance appraisal system is the only tangible metric way by which an organization can know the level of performance of its diverse employees. Although most employees are aware of the EPAS used in the public universities, the conclusion to that indeed at the universities studied, satisfaction is below average, there are problems with EPAS that can be addressed more accurately to improve performance of employees. In order to predict possibility of EPAS being judged as effective, a necessary tool for improving performance, personality factors should be addressed. The elements to target should be lead by nature of motivation, followed by attitude and lastly perception issues. The elements are positively and strongly related to personality factors. In turn, personality factors influence EPAS.

6.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

The conclusion to that indeed at the university studied, satisfaction is below average but there are problems with EPAS can be addressed more accurately to improve performance of employees. In order to predict possibility of EPAS being judged as effective and therefore a necessary tool for improving performance, personality factors should be addressed. Personality factor is enhanced by attitudes. A change of attitude would provide a more significant impact that would change the way EPAS will be viewed when administered. Motivation issues must also be considered alongside attitude change to improve perceptions of academic staff member about EPAS. Perception and attitudes are closely related and would share a lot (interactive). Therefore overall, a change of attitude that staff members may be having would be more important.

The University management starting from chairman of department to policy making organ should pay attention to how staff members are being evaluated because the existing system is not satisfactory. There is a problem either with the way EPAS is being conducted or what is contained as measurement parameters. This is the reason satisfaction level is below 40 percent. If this is not done the quality of teaching is likely to fall leading to a fall in the standards among students of the university. Attention should first be given to how EPAS is constructed level of participation, parameter and that link between EPAS and personality factors be appreciated. Personality factors are positively and significantly related to EPAS. Strengthening these factors through respective elements would promote effectiveness of any appraisal system. There exists a significant change of improving the current system of appraising university staff. A unit improvement in personality factors increases the probability of viewing EPAS effective by about 13 percent. Personality factors are intrinsic in nature but can be enhanced by providing support systems that are external in nature to change attitude like regular counseling meetings, motion talks, regular trainings and encouraging social support system. The relationship between EPAS and the independent variable show all positive and significant at the 5% level. A lot of time and other resources can be spend on targeted elements already on motivation, attitude and perception as discussed to improve employee performance and view of appraisal systems.

References

- Anthony, W. P., Perrewe, P. L., & Kacmar, K. M. (1999). *Human resource management: A strategic approach*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Armstrong, M. (2012). *A handbook of human resource management practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (2003). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 2-50.
- Bies, R.J., J. Greenberg & J.A. Colquitt (2005). *Hand Book of Organizational Justice: Are Procedural Justice and Interactional Justice Conceptually Distinct*, Psychology Press.
- Biron, M., Farndale, E., & Paauwe, J. (2011). Performance management effectiveness : lessons from world-leading firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22 (6), 1294-1311
- Boachie-Mensah F, Dogbe O. (2011). *Performance-Based pay as a motivational tool for achieving organisational performance: an exploratory case study*. Intl. J. Bus. Manage.
- Bohlander, G.W.,& Snell, S. (2007). “*Managing Human Resources*”. (14th ed.). Cengage Learning. New York.
- Bohlander, George & Scott S. (2009). *Managing Human Resources*. South Western: Thompson.
- Boon, C., Den Hartog, D.N., Boselie, P., & Paauwe, J. (2011). The relationship between perceptions of HR practices and employee outcomes: examining the role of person – organisation and person-job fit. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(1), 138-162.
- Brown M, & Heywood J.S, (2002), *Paying for performance: an international comparison*, M. E. Sharpe Inc. Armonk: NY: M.E. Sharpe Publishers.
- Chen H.M & Min K.J (2004). *The role of human capital cost in accounting*. Journal of Intellectual capital,5(1):116-131.
- Coens T, & Jenkins M, (2002). *Abolishing performance appraisal: Why they backfire and what to do instead*. Berrett-Koekler, San Francisco,C. A. USA.
- Colquitt, Jason, A., D.E. Conlon, M.J. Wesson, C.O.L.H. Porter & K.Y. Ng, (2001). Justice at the Millenium: A

- Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3): 425-445.
- Cook, J. & A. Crossman (2004). Satisfaction With Performance Appraisal Systems: A Study of Role Perceptions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(5): 526-541.
- Daft, R. (2003) "Motivation in organisations", Chapter 17, Management Thompson.
- Dieleman, & Marjolein (2006) *The Match between Motivation and Performance* Management on Health Sectors. Mali.
- Erdogan B. (2002). *Antecedents and consequences of justice perception in performance appraisals*. *Hum. Resource Management Rev.* 12(4): 555-578.
- Gerber A. S., Huber, G. A., & Doherty D., (2011). *Personality Traits and Participation in Political Processes*. *The Journal of Politics*, 73 (03), 692-706.
- Gruman & Saks (2011). *Performance management and employee engagement*. *Human Resource Management Review* 21 123–136
- Hamidi Y. (2010). *The effect of performance appraisal result on personnel's motivation and job promotion*. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences* 4(9): p. 4178-4183.
- Hogan, R., & Shelton, D. (2006). A socioanalytic perspective on job performance. *Human Performance*, 11(2/3), 129-144.
- Horsoo, S.K., (2010), Employee Performance Appraisal, Rewards and Recognitions - A Case Study of Barclays Bank of Ghana Limited, Kumasi, Institute of Distance Learning, KNUST.
- International Labour Conference, 97th Session, (2008). *Skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development*. International Labour Office, Geneva
- Jabeen M (2011). *Impact of performance appraisal on employees motivation*. *European Journal of Business and Management*.
- Kuvas, B., (2006). Performance Appraisal Satisfaction and Employee Outcomes: Mediating and Moderating Roles of Work Motivation. *Human Resource Management*, 17(3): 504-522
- Landy, F. L., Barnes, J. L. & Murphy, K. R. (1978), *Correlates of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, pp. 371-377.
- Latham, G.P., Longenecker, C. & Fink, L. (1999), *Creating Effective Performance Appraisal*. *Industrial Management*, 41, 5, , pp, 18-26.
- Law DR (2007). *Appraising performance appraisals: A critical look at external control techniques*. *Intl. J. Reality Therapy*, 16(2): 18-25.
- Lee, Mushin & Byoungso Son (1998), *The effects of appraisal review content on employees reactions and performance*, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9:1, pp. 203-214.
- Mathis, R.L., & Jackson, J.H. (2005), "Human Resources Management". (3rd ed.). Thompson, Bangalore.
- Mathis, L. R., & Jackson, H. J. (2012). *Human Resource Management: Essential Perspectives*. USA:South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Messer, B.A.E & White, A.F. (2006). Employee's mood, perceptions of fairness and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(1), 65-82.
- Moon, C., Lee, J., Jeong, C., Lee, J., Park, S. & Lim, S. (2007), *An Implementation Case for the Performance Appraisal and Promotion Ranking*, in IEEE International Conference on System, Man and Cybernetics, 2007.
- Mullin L.(2002), *Management and Organisational Behaviour*, London: International Thomson Business Press
- Mullins L. (2007), *Managing and organisational Behaviour*, London
- Najafi L, Hamidi Y, Vatankeh S, Purnajaf A. (2010). *Performance appraisal and its effect on employees' motivation and job promotion*. *Australian J. Basic. Appl. Sci.* 4(12): 6052-6056.
- Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B. & Wright, P. M. (2006). *Human Resource Management: Gaining a Competitive Advantage*. Burr Ridge, Illinois: Irwin.
- Nzuve S.N.M (2007), *Management of human resources; a Kenyan perspective*, Nairobi, basic modern management consultants
- Pooyan, A. & Bruce J. E.(1990), "Predictors of performance appraisal satisfaction: the effect of gender", *Asia Pacific Human Resource Management*, 28 (1), pp. 82-89.
- Rezghi R.T (2000). *Performance evaluation system*, Tadbir Publication, No, 114.
- Roslender R, Kahn H, & Stevenson J, (2009). *Recognizing workforce health as a key organisational asset: a study of current thinking and practice*. The Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland CA House, 21 Haymarket Yards Edinburgh, UK.
- Schulman, S. (2011). *The Use of Personality Assessments to Predict Job Performance* Burlington: The University of Vermont.
- Snell, S., & Bohlander, G. (2012). *Managing Human Resources*. USA, Manson: Cengage Learning.
- Soh K.B.K, (1998). *Job analysis, appraisal and performance assessments of a surgeon – a multifaceted approach*. *Singapore Med J.*, 39(4):180- 185. PMID: 9676152

- Terrence H.M, & Joyce M (2004). *Performance appraisals*: ABA labour and employment law section, equal opportunity committee.
- Thurston P.W.J. and L. McNall, (2010). Justice Perceptions of Performance Appraisal Practices. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 5(3): 201-228.
- Yee CC, Chen YY, (2009). *Performance appraisal system using multifactorial evaluation model*. *PWASET*, 41: 231-235

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Recent conferences: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

