

Performance Appraisal System: Its' Impact on Performance of Employees at Kumasi Technical University

YaaAmponsahNsiah

Kumasi Technical University, P.O.Box 854, Kumasi, Ghana,

ABSTRACT

Performance appraisal is an important management practice that is conducted to assess skill-set, ability and commitment level of employees in any organization. Employees of tertiary institutions both academic and administrative like other employees in the public sector expect to be appraised and not to be evaluated. Over the last three decades, the effectiveness of performance appraisal (EPA) literature has grown, notably entailing empirical evidence about its measurement criteria. But little evidence exists on the reliability, validity, problems and effectiveness of performance appraisal on employee performance at the university. The study aims to fill this gap by focusing on the reliability, validity, problems and effectiveness of performance appraisal on employee performance at the Kumasi Technical University. The researcher adopted a descriptive study that is explanatory in nature. The total population for the study was three hundred and fifty-four (354). The study used all the population for the study. The data collection instrument was a questionnaire which was coded in Google Forms. Data collected from the respondents was analyzed based on the dependent variable and independent variables using factor analysis, descriptive statistics, and regression analysis. The study revealed that reliability and validity of performance appraisal system, quality of performance appraisal system, effectiveness of performance appraisal system, and problems of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance. The study found that all the independent variables were statistically significant to the dependent variable. the study conclude that reliability and validity of performance appraisal system, quality of performance appraisal system, effectiveness of performance appraisal system, and problems of performance appraisal system account for only 31.7% of the variation in the effect of employee performance.

KEYWORDS: performance appraisal system, employees, effectiveness, reliability and validity

Date of Submission: 16-08-2020

Date of Acceptance: 02-09-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

Research on performance appraisal returns at any rate like the mid-1920s, and has continued to the current day(Denisi & Pritchard, 2006).Performance appraisal system continues being one of the most essential limitation of human resource management in the 21st Century (Ahmad & Bujang, 2013). Performance Appraisal (PA) is the productive assessment of the partner of administrators and with regard the constraints of an individual for extra unforeseen new development and improvement (Raj, Rahangdale, & Yadav, 2019).Performance appraisal is an essential management practice that is made to assess skill-set, limit and responsibility level of employees in any institution(Grint, 2007; Tripathi, 2001). Over the latest couple of decades, performance appraisal has been regularly drawn in as a touch of human resource packs' in the assessment of strategic human resource management(Ngo et al., 2008; Bjorkman & Fun, 2002).

Starting late, performance appraisal has been free as a key bit of human resource development as it helps in picking tremendous legitimate decisions with respect to degrees of progress, compensations, transfers, end, learning and improvement. Performance appraisal can in like manner fill in as an uplifting contraption as it is used for evaluation interviews, counseling, and participation in target setting and work coordinating (Rao, 2009). Performance Appraisal assists with investigating the availability and advancement needs of workers. Performance Appraisal offers grounds to representatives to address their slip-ups, and it in like manner gives true direction and evaluation to expert's frightening unexpected turn of events. Performance Appraisal offers prize to better execution. Performance Appraisal assists with improving the correspondence plan of the institution(Raj et al., 2019).Performance appraisal requests that the employees know their quality and deficiencies and how they can reliably improve it (Bashir, 2020).

Armstrong (2001) sees that issues of precision and sensibility in performance appraisal is one of the key assessment premiums in the field of human resource management. Performance appraisal may be used as a frameworks for surveying performance(Bitange, Narok, & Simeon, 2010). The accomplishment of any tertiary institutions depends on the quality and properties of its employees(Daoanis, 2012). The authorities become a

pivotal factor in any relationship since they are the point of convergence of the alliance. Tertiary institutions can't achieve their objectives and focuses without them (Daoanis, 2012). Employees of tertiary institutions both academic and administrative like other employees in the public sector expect to be appraised and not to be evaluated (Analoui and Fell, 2002). Kumasi Technical University have administrative and professional faculty performance appraisal system designed to provide documented, obliging responsibility as for performance needs, spike improvement and development likewise as give a sensible and reasonable means to pick prizes for obligations to the university.

The 'non-teaching staff' (both senior staff and senior members) are measured by their breadth of knowledge, vitality about occupations and obligations to the university's significant course of action. The appraisal procedure as prerequisites be offers a fundamental opportunity to focus on work activities and objectives nearly as observe and right existing issues, and to invigorate better future performance. Thus the performance of the whole tertiary institution is improved (Roger, 1995). Performance appraisal is done at the Kumasi Technical University. Target are set at the beginning of the year and the final appraisal is carried out at the end of year at Kumasi Technical University. At Kumasi Technical University, an equivalent kind of assessment of performance appraisal are used to evaluate senior staff and senior members. Some of the information are not material to senior staff. The condition of performance appraisal at Kumasi Technical University is that there is no feedback given to employees. It is difficult to administer as exhibited by clear and assessment for staff planning didn't rely on performance appraisal. An area of the appraiser don't contemplate their subordinates and no part to check such officers, beginning now and into the not so distant, there is the basic for review committee to review the appraisal and offer back to the employee.

During the time various tertiary institutions have been concerned over the mistake of their performance appraisal structures, unequivocally about improving employee performance, adding to a wide level of human resource works, and understanding the most remarkable limitation of this work on with respect to convincing feasibility (Chiang & Birtch, 2010; Kallio, Kallio, Tienari, & Hyvönen, 2016; Karkouljian, Assaker, & Hallak, 2016). The starting late referenced issues have made to a stage at which some performance appraisal specialists and aces have felt made obligated to suggest disposing of performance appraisal absolutely (Adler et al., 2016). By 2015, around 30 Fortune 500 organizations had surrendered their performance appraisal systems. Regardless, some other performance appraisal monitors despite everything don't fortify invalidation of the practice (Iqbal, Akbar, Budhwar, Zulfiqar, & Shah, 2019). Believe it or not, they have referenced more refinements in the research and practice of performance appraisal (Goler, Gale, & Grant, 2016).

Over the scope of the latest three decades, the effectiveness of performance appraisal literature has grown, obviously including exploratory confirmation about its estimation norms (Cappelli & Conyon, 2018; Ikramullah, Van Prooijen, Iqbal, & Ul-Hassan, 2016; Iqbal et al., 2015). Several studies have been done on factors (Bashir, 2020), effectiveness (Iqbal et al., 2019), and performance appraisal system on earnings management (He & Chen, 2020). Of the many studies conducted on performance evaluation systems (Adler et al., 2016; Mihai et al., 2017; Pulakos, Hanson, Arad, & Moye, 2015), very few have provided in-depth research on the performance evaluation system from the perspective of the employees (Sharma, Sharma, & Agarwal, 2016). Also, little evidence exists on the reliability, validity, problems and effectiveness of performance appraisal on employee performance at the university. The study aims to fill this gap by focusing on the reliability, validity, problems and effectiveness of performance appraisal on employee performance at the Kumasi Technical University.

H1: Reliability and validity of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance.

H2: Quality of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance.

H3: Effectiveness of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance.

H4: Problems of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Bashir (2020) found that Manager biasness impacts the performance appraisal of the company. The employees won't be totally convinced to fill in as they grasp that they are not getting the prizes which they completely merit that is the explanation a bit of the employees wouldn't worry less that much about the prizes yet a lot of the employees that is 80% administrators perceive that it impacts their performance appraisal and which is the explanation 84% of the employees take the chief supposition or assessment really while the remaining 16% are reasonable about it.

Raj et al. (2019) acknowledged that the most fundamental effect of performance appraisal structure on the employee commitment in the Banking Industry when the employees says that "Master's wellsprings of information are used for the connection's improvement by the Performance Appraisal System" and it "Changes the lead of the laborers" and at an equivalent it is less convincing when the laborers says that it "Partners in

laborers stresses for objectives of the organization". In the assessment the Alternate theory is seen as it shows a fundamental Impact of Performance Appraisal System on Employee commitment in the cash related Industry.

Iqbal et al. (2019) found that understanding the deliberateness of performance appraisal is a need of performance appraisal embellishments; ratee reactions as deferred outcomes of performance appraisal structures are seen as obliging in picking the achievement of a performance appraisal system. The exposures of this paper report that ratee perspective on performance appraisal purposes expect a principal development in anticipating ratee individual and association referenced ratee reactions, accordingly developing their impression of propriety of effectiveness of performance appraisal. Regardless, the current evaluation explained the complete point of view on performance appraisal purposes, i.e., disregarding standard individual-focused performance appraisal purposes (administrative and developmental), it separated the occupations of position-focused (work definition) and affiliation focused (key) performance appraisal purposes in making ratee reactions. Second, the connection between performance appraisal purposes and effectiveness of performance appraisal close by ratee reactions as an instrument vital this relationship in a non-Western setting paper is observationally attempted. Standing out from the sufficiency of performance appraisal, this paper incited that individual-focused performance appraisal better serves the agent perspective, at any rate position-and affiliation focused performance appraisal better serves the diverse leveled perspective.

Bitange et al. (2010) considered that performance appraisal system is the basic noteworthy estimation course by which a coalition can know the level of execution of its different employees. In any case, most employees consider such a performance appraisal system used in the tertiary institutions, such structures are not developed on any ensured fitting purpose for which they were created. The reasonableness of performance appraisal systems in the private universities are fundamentally chosen expecting to the administrators related with the rating/appraising process and are multi-rating structures. Unequivocally, considering the way that performance appraisal structures used in tertiary institutions are not convincing and that they exist identically as an issue of formalities, the private universities can't measure employees' performance from this time forward making it difficult to achieve the proposed Human Resource Management goals

Arthur (2015) uncovered that the troubles of performance appraisal ought to be wide and bound to the brand name thought of the job being inferred, as uncovered through the careful business appraisal (Blunt and Popoola, 1985). For most part, the particularities of dynamic life in the western world bear this hurting paying little regard to the way that as Beveridge (1975) and Child (1980) explain they are, from appraisal point of view, on occasion straight. In Africa and Ghana indeed, in any case, ordinary issue of performance appraisal are exacerbated by different various thoughts (Blunt and Popoola, 1985). All the issues recorded above as upsetting the beneficial execution of performance appraisal approach of the Ghanaian public sector technical universities correspondingly as those in various relationship in making countries could be summed up in the issue of 'particularism'. This is the issue of pondering the connection between the appraisers and the appraisees as opposed to gathering the evaluations concerning what the employees have accomplished inside the granted time span.

Denisi & Pritchard (2006) thought about that enduring an enticing framework was the best way to deal with oversee consolidate the specific coincidental things that had been conglomerating, and suggest an assessment plan focused upon performance improvement. Denisi & Pritchard (2006) suggests that motivation might be high when all the motivation affiliations are high. One low association can pass on low motivation whether the rest are high. This suggestion on the multiplicative effect of the motivational affiliations should be attempted in future research. This will combine a fairly staggering research design, at any rate such research is fundamental to ensure the specific validness of our hypothetical recommendation.

III. METHODOLOGY

There are three types of research design namely, descriptive, exploratory and explanatory. The researcher adopted a descriptive study that is explanatory in nature. The study used a quantitative research approach. The study was done at Kumasi Technical University at Kumasi in the Ashanti Region of Ghana as indicated in the scope of the study. The population for the study were senior staff, senior members and all non-teaching staff of Kumasi Technical University. It is the population to which a researcher wants to generalize the results of a study (Muianga, Barbutiu, & Hansson, 2019). The total population for the study was three hundred and fifty-four (354). All the population was used as a sample size since they were not many. The data collection instrument was a questionnaire which was coded in Google Forms. A link to the questionnaire was shared to the participants of the study through WhatsApp. Data collection instrument that was used for the study was a questionnaire. The questionnaire for respondents was close-ended (Ngitoria, 2014). Simple sentences were used for the wording such that respondents could understand the instructions. Five-point Likert-type scales were given ranging from '1' to '5' - from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. Items in the questionnaire were developed based the variables of the study. Items were coded to represent the variables such that independent

variables, reliability and validity of performance appraisal system was represented as RVPAS, quality of performance appraisal system was represented as QPAS, effectiveness of performance appraisal system was represented as EPAS, problems of performance appraisal system was represented as PPAS.

The dependent variable, effect of employee performance was represented as EEP. In all, five items were used under reliability and validity of performance appraisal system. Four items were used under quality of performance appraisal system. Five items were used under effectiveness of performance appraisal system. Ten items were used under problems of performance appraisal system. Sixteen items were developed under effect of employee performance. Most of the items were adopted from a study by Daoanis (2012). The items in the questionnaire were reliable since reliability test of the Cronbach's Alpha for the study was .747. Data was collected within three weeks. A letter of permission was sent to all the participants through the principal and the various department of Kumasi Technical University to permit the researcher to use the place for the research site and the senior staff, senior members and all non-teaching staff as participants for the study. Participants were brief about the study but the researcher could not go there to administer the questionnaires because of the worldwide pandemic (Glass & Song, 2019). Prior notice were given to the participants as to when the researcher will need their response. The researcher gave them a telephone number to call for further explanation if needed. Priorities were given as to whether participants wants to take part or not, if 'Yes' then the participants will proceed on to answer the items in the questionnaire.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

Analysis of data was done through the use of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 (Baran, Bilici, Sari, & Tondeur, 2019). This software was selected because of its reliability, accuracy, user friendliness interface and the most employed package for analyzing data. Data collected from the respondents was analyzed based on the dependent variable and independent variables using factor analysis, descriptive statistics, and regression analysis.

4.1.1 Factor analysis

From the extraction part of table 1, it shows that none of the items were below .3, therefore there is no problem with any of the items used in the study.

Table 1: Communalities

Communalities	Initial	Extraction
RVPAS1	1.000	.934
RVPAS2	1.000	.893
RVPAS3	1.000	.901
RVPAS4	1.000	.907
RVPAS5	1.000	.940
QPAS1	1.000	.888
QPAS2	1.000	.912
QPAS3	1.000	.892
QPAS4	1.000	.890
EPAS1	1.000	.808
EPAS2	1.000	.760
EPAS3	1.000	.946
EPAS4	1.000	.867
EPAS5	1.000	.926
PPAS1	1.000	.858
PPAS2	1.000	.913
PPAS3	1.000	.950
PPAS4	1.000	.800
PPAS5	1.000	.870
PPAS6	1.000	.955
PPAS7	1.000	.823
PPAS8	1.000	.812
PPAS9	1.000	.840
PPAS10	1.000	.886
EEP 1	1.000	.872
EEP 2	1.000	.967
EEP 3	1.000	.862

EEP 4	1.000	.940
EEP 5	1.000	.904
EEP 6	1.000	.983
EEP 7	1.000	.953
EEP 8	1.000	.912
EEP 9	1.000	.868
EEP 10	1.000	.897
EEP 11	1.000	.934
EEP 12	1.000	.803
EEP 13	1.000	.907
EEP 14	1.000	.852
EEP 15	1.000	.954

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

4.1.2 Regression analysis

From the R Square in table 2 the value is .317 which is greater than .3 and is considered as a good fit. The R square from table 2 is .317 which means reliability and validity of performance appraisal system, quality of performance appraisal system, effectiveness of performance appraisal system, and problems of performance appraisal system account for only 31.7% of the variation in the effect of employee performance. Therefore 68.3% of variation in the effect of employee performance is explained by other factors. So reliability and validity of performance appraisal system, quality of performance appraisal system, effectiveness of performance appraisal system, and problems of performance appraisal system explain most of the factors that explain the effect of employee performance.

Table 2: Model Summary

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.570 ^a	.325	.317	.37662

a. Predictors: (Constant), problems, effectiveness, quality, reliability

The significant value from table 3 of ANOVA is .000 which is below .001 and .005. This indicates that there is a statistical significant effect of reliability and validity of performance appraisal system, quality of performance appraisal system, effectiveness of performance appraisal system, and problems of performance appraisal system on the effect of employee performance.

Table 3: ANOVA

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	23.804	4	5.951	41.955	.000 ^b
	Residual	49.504	349	.142		
	Total	73.308	353			

a. Dependent Variable: effect

b. Predictors: (Constant), problems, effectiveness, quality, reliability

From table 4 the constant is the intercept in the regression co-efficient and that is 1.686. From table 4, .421, -.288, -.112, and .372 from the standardized coefficient standardize the contribution of the variables. Therefore the reliability and validity of performance appraisal system is higher than that of quality of performance appraisal system, effectiveness of performance appraisal system, and problems of performance appraisal system. From table 4, .421, -.288, -.112, and .372 representing the slow or rise for each unit of reliability and validity of performance appraisal system, quality of performance appraisal system, effectiveness of performance appraisal system, and problems of performance appraisal system respectively in a year. Thus, when the independent variables increase by two years, the regression co-efficient will be multiplied by 2 which will be .842, -.576, -.224 and .744 respectively. So as reliability and validity of performance appraisal system, quality of performance appraisal system, effectiveness of performance appraisal system, and problems of performance appraisal system on the effect of employee performance increase yearly, the employee performance rises. Under the correlation, the partial or semi-partial correlation is used to describe the unique contribution of each predictor variable.

Therefore the greatest unique contribution is for reliability and validity of performance appraisal system. The significant value for reliability and validity of performance appraisal system on employee performance is .000 which is below .01 and .05. Therefore, reliability and validity of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance. The significant value for quality of performance appraisal system on employee performance is .000 which is below .01 and .05. Therefore, quality of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance. The significant value for effectiveness of performance appraisal system on employee performance is .024 which is below .05. Therefore, effectiveness of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance but not much. The significant value for problems of performance appraisal system on employee performance is .000 which is below .01 and .05. Therefore, problems of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance.

Table 4: Coefficients

Coefficients ^a							
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	Lower Bound
1	(Constant)	1.686	.171		9.870	.000	1.350 2.022
	reliability	.421	.048	.508	8.757	.000	.326 .515
	quality	-.288	.048	-.320	-5.960	.000	-.383 -.193
	effectiveness	-.112	.049	-.103	-2.271	.024	-.208 -.015
	problems	.372	.071	.263	5.205	.000	.232 .513

a. Dependent Variable: effect

4.1.3 Descriptive statistics for independent variables

4.1.3.1 Reliability and validity of performance appraisal system

Table 5 shows that, the mean ranges from 2.0763 to 2.4350, this shows the center of the distribution. The measure of dispersion (standard deviation) widely spread the distribution by .62738 to .95134 representing the average distance a score is from the mean. The skewness is from -.195 to 2.068 which means the variable is sufficiently normal. The kurtosis of item RVPAS1 is less than 0 which means that it has less outliers relative to normal distribution. Items RVPAS2, RVPAS3, RVPAS4, and RVPAS5 is greater than 0 and less than 6 which means that, it has relatively few outliers and scores are more clustered around the mean.

Table 5: Reliability and validity of performance appraisal system,

Statistics		RVPAS1	RVPAS2	RVPAS3	RVPAS4	RVPAS5
N	Valid	354	354	354	354	354
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.4350	2.0763	2.0706	2.2740	2.1130
Std. Deviation		.85327	.62738	.84698	.72280	.95134
Skewness		-.195	.912	1.834	2.068	1.162
Std. Error of Skewness		.130	.130	.130	.130	.130
Kurtosis		-.691	2.183	4.325	5.773	1.606
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.259	.259	.259	.259	.259
Minimum		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maximum		4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

The mean value for RVPAS1 was 2.4350, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means three hundred and twenty-six of the respondents representing 92.1% strongly agreed (16.1%), agreed (32.2%), and slightly agreed (43.8%) that the result of the evaluation are openly explained and discussed to the employee concerned. The mean value for RVPAS2 was 2.0763, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means three hundred and forty of the respondents representing 96% strongly agreed (12.1%), agreed (72%), and slightly agreed (11.9%) that the performance appraisal system is aligned with the vision and mission of the institution. The mean value for RVPAS3 was 2.0706, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means three hundred and twenty-six of the respondents representing 92% strongly agreed (16.7%), agreed (71.5%), and slightly agreed (4%) that the appraisal system is accurate in terms of content and purpose. The mean value for RVPAS4 was 2.2740, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means three hundred and forty of the respondents representing 96% strongly agreed (4.2%), agreed (72%), and slightly agreed (19.8%) that the conducts of evaluation are honestly and fairly done. The mean value for RVPAS5 was 2.1130,

minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means three hundred and twenty-six of the respondents representing 92% strongly agreed (24.3%), agreed (52%), and slightly agreed (15.8%) that the performance appraisal system is relevant and reliable.

4.1.3.2 Quality of performance appraisal system

Table 6 shows that, the mean ranges from 1.7175 to 2.3616, this shows the center of the distribution. The measure of dispersion (standard deviation) widely spread the distribution by .60158 to 1.01227 representing the average distance a score is from the mean. The skewness is from -.590 to .843 which means the variable is sufficiently normal. The kurtosis of all the items QPAS1, QPAS2, QPAS3, and QPAS4 is less than 0 which means that it has less outliers relative to normal distribution.

Table 6: Quality of performance appraisal system,

Statistics		QPAS1	QPAS2	QPAS3	QPAS4
N	Valid	354	354	354	354
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.7175	1.7175	2.3616	2.3220
Std. Deviation		.60158	.60158	1.01227	.73613
Skewness		.213	.213	.843	-.590
Std. Error of Skewness		.130	.130	.130	.130
Kurtosis		-.585	-.585	.230	-.949
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.259	.259	.259	.259
Minimum		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maximum		3.00	3.00	5.00	3.00

The mean value for QPAS1 was 1.7175, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 3 which means three hundred and fifty-four of the respondents representing 100% strongly agreed (36.2%), agreed (55.9%), and slightly agreed (7.9%) that the objective of the appraisal tool is appropriate to the needs of the staffs and faculty. The mean value for QPAS2 was 1.7175, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 3 which means three hundred and fifty-four of the respondents representing 100% strongly agreed (36.2%), agreed (55.9%), and slightly agreed (7.9%) that the performance appraisal system is designed to motivate employees. The mean value for QPAS3 was 2.3616, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means two hundred and ninety-eight of the respondents representing 84.1% strongly agreed (15.8%), agreed (52%), and slightly agreed (16.4%) that the performance appraisal of the university is fair and objective. The mean value for QPAS4 was 2.3220, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 3 which means three hundred and fifty-four of the respondents representing 100% strongly agreed (16.1%), agreed (35.6%), and slightly agreed (48.3%) that the performance appraisal system recognize employee achievement and performance objectively.

4.1.3.3 Effectiveness of performance appraisal system

Table 7 shows that, the mean ranges from 1.7147 to 2.8927, this shows the center of the distribution. The measure of dispersion (standard deviation) widely spread the distribution by .60260 to 1.59134 representing the average distance a score is from the mean. The skewness is from .108 to .798 which means the variable is sufficiently normal. The kurtosis of all the items EPAS1, EPAS2, EPAS3, EPAS4, and EPAS5 is less than 0 which means that it has less outliers relative to normal distribution.

Table 7: Effectiveness of performance appraisal system

Statistics		EPAS1	EPAS2	EPAS3	EPAS4	EPAS5
N	Valid	354	354	354	354	354
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.8362	1.7147	2.8927	2.6130	2.1186
Std. Deviation		.61265	.60260	1.59134	1.18056	.99719
Skewness		.108	.221	.364	.798	.743
Std. Error of Skewness		.130	.130	.130	.130	.130
Kurtosis		-.447	-.592	-1.548	-.278	-.439
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.259	.259	.259	.259	.259
Minimum		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maximum		3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00

The mean value for EPAS1 was 1.8362, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 3 which means three hundred and fifty-four of the respondents representing 100% strongly agreed (28.2%), agreed (59.9%), and slightly agreed (11.9%) that those who got the highest rank are given appropriate rewards. The mean value for EPAS2 was 1.7147, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 3 which means three hundred and fifty-four of the respondents representing 100% strongly agreed (36.4%), agreed (55.6%), and slightly agreed (7.9%) that the appraisal system of the university is motivating to the employees. The mean value for EPAS3 was 2.8927, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means two hundred and twenty-five of the respondents representing 63.6% strongly agreed (20.1%), agreed (39.5%), and slightly agreed (4%) that the employees are satisfied with the way they are being evaluated and ranked. The mean value for EPAS4 was 2.6130, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means two hundred and eighty-one of the respondents representing 79.4% strongly agreed (12.1%), agreed (47.5%), and slightly agreed (19.8%) that the appraisal system is effective in encouraging employees to work hard. The mean value for EPAS5 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means three hundred and twenty-six of the respondents representing 83.8% strongly agreed (28.2%), agreed (47.7%), and slightly agreed (7.9%) that the performance appraisal system is relevant and reliable.

4.1.3.4 Problems of performance appraisal system

Table 8 shows that, the mean ranges from 1.4746 to 2.8842, this shows the center of the distribution. The measure of dispersion (standard deviation) widely spread the distribution by .62854 to 1.53177 representing the average distance a score is from the mean. The skewness is from -1.505 to 1.331 which means the variable is sufficiently normal. The kurtosis of all the items PPAS1, PPAS3, PPAS4, PPAS5, PPAS6, PPAS7, PPAS8, PPAS9 and PPAS10 is less than 0 which means that it has less outliers relative to normal distribution. Item PPAS2 is greater than 1 and less than 2 which means that, it has relatively few outliers and scores are more clustered around the mean.

Table 8: Problems of performance appraisal system

Descriptive Statistics									
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
PPAS1	354	1.00	3.00	1.9153	.62854	.065	.130	-.480	.259
PPAS2	354	1.00	4.00	1.8814	.72004	.868	.130	1.331	.259
PPAS3	354	1.00	5.00	2.8842	1.53177	.191	.130	-1.505	.259
PPAS4	354	1.00	4.00	1.7910	.84915	.804	.130	-.171	.259
PPAS5	354	1.00	4.00	1.8390	.88715	1.031	.130	.483	.259
PPAS6	354	1.00	5.00	2.3446	1.05910	.686	.130	-.121	.259
PPAS7	354	1.00	3.00	1.4746	.69858	1.144	.130	-.057	.259
PPAS8	354	1.00	4.00	2.1582	.88286	.381	.130	-.558	.259
PPAS9	354	1.00	4.00	1.9153	.89293	.839	.130	.052	.259
PPAS10	354	1.00	5.00	2.6412	1.05304	1.168	.130	.461	.259
Valid (listwise)	N 354								

The mean value for PPAS1 was 1.8362, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 3 which means three hundred and fifty-four of the respondents representing 100% strongly agreed (24.3%), agreed (59.9%), and slightly agreed (15.8%) that the current appraisal does rate the extra work of the employee. The mean value for PPAS2 was 1.7147, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means three hundred and thirty-nine of the respondents representing 95.8% strongly agreed (28.2%), agreed (59.6%), and slightly agreed (7.9%) that the result of the evaluation is not reliable and valid. The mean value for PPAS3 was 2.8927, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means two hundred and seven of the respondents representing 59.6% strongly agreed (24%), agreed (27.7%), and slightly agreed (7.9%) that the result of the evaluation are discussed and explained to the employee concern. The mean value for PPAS4 was 2.6130, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means three hundred and forty of the respondents representing 96% strongly agreed (44.6%), agreed (35.6%), and slightly agreed (15.8%) that the employees are involved in the formulation of tool evaluation.

The mean value for PPAS5 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means three hundred and twenty-five of the respondents representing 91.8% strongly agreed (40.4%), agreed (43.5%), and slightly agreed (7.9%) that the appraisal system of the university is not relevant. The mean value for PPAS6 was 1.8362, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means three hundred and fifty-four of the respondents representing 84.1% strongly agreed (20.9%), agreed (43.5%), and slightly agreed (19.8%) that the

criteria of the appraisal system is not accurate. The mean value for PPAS7 was 1.7147, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 3 which means three hundred and fifty-four of the respondents representing 100% strongly agreed (64.4%), agreed (23.7%), and slightly agreed (11.9%) that the reward system of the university is in place. The mean value for PPAS8 was 2.8927, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means three hundred and twenty-six of the respondents representing 92.1% strongly agreed (24.3%), agreed (43.5%), and slightly agreed (24.3%) that the performance appraisal system is not effective.

The mean value for PPAS9 was 2.6130, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means three hundred and twenty-six of the respondents representing 92.1% strongly agreed (36.4%), agreed (43.5%), and slightly agreed (12.1%) that the employees are rated according to the nature of their job and responsibilities. The mean value for PPAS10 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means two hundred and ninety-seven of the respondents representing 83.9% strongly agreed (4%), agreed (55.9%), and slightly agreed (24%) that the performance standards are clearly explained to the employees.

4.1.4 Descriptive statistics for dependent variable

4.1.4.1 Effect of employee performance

Table 9 shows that, the mean ranges from 1.8390 to 3.3503, this shows the center of the distribution. The measure of dispersion (standard deviation) widely spread the distribution by .74892 to 1.46214 representing the average distance a score is from the mean. The skewness is from -.749 to 1.366 which means the variable is sufficiently normal. The kurtosis of items EEP1, EEP2, EEP3, EEP5, EEP7, EEP8, EEP9, EEP10, EEP11, EEP12, EEP13, EEP14, EEP15 and EEP16 is less than 0 which means that it has less outliers relative to normal distribution. Items EEP4 and EEP6 is greater than 1 and less than 2 which means that, it has relatively few outliers and scores are more clustered around the mean.

Table 9: Effect of employee performance

Descriptive Statistics									
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
EEP1	354	1.00	5.00	2.5989	1.01969	1.092	.130	.217	.259
EEP2	354	1.00	5.00	2.0000	1.05648	1.015	.130	.606	.259
EEP3	354	1.00	4.00	2.3616	1.05341	.479	.130	-1.012	.259
EEP4	354	1.00	5.00	2.2740	.91636	.985	.130	1.354	.259
EEP5	354	1.00	5.00	2.5989	1.01969	1.092	.130	.217	.259
EEP6	354	1.00	5.00	2.4746	.98180	1.209	.130	1.203	.259
EEP7	354	1.00	5.00	2.6384	1.09041	.756	.130	-.375	.259
EEP8	354	1.00	5.00	2.7175	1.00106	.829	.130	-.030	.259
EEP9	354	2.00	5.00	2.5593	.85368	1.366	.130	.809	.259
EEP10	354	2.00	5.00	2.6328	.88785	1.132	.130	.085	.259
EEP11	354	2.00	5.00	2.8757	1.10693	.954	.130	-.539	.259
EEP12	354	1.00	4.00	1.8390	.83109	.726	.130	-.145	.259
EEP13	354	1.00	5.00	3.3333	1.46214	-.045	.130	-1.623	.259
EEP14	354	1.00	4.00	2.5593	1.06083	.352	.130	-1.311	.259
EEP15	354	1.00	3.00	1.9944	.74892	.009	.130	-1.212	.259
EEP16	354	1.00	5.00	3.3503	.97934	-.749	.130	-.490	.259
Valid (listwise)	N 354								

The mean value for EEP1 was 1.8362, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means three hundred and twenty-six of the respondents representing 92.1% strongly agreed (4%), agreed (60.2%), and slightly agreed (15.8%) that enthusiasm in performing job affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP2 was 1.7147, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means three hundred and twenty-six of the respondents representing 96% strongly agreed (39.8%), agreed (32.2%), and slightly agreed (20.1%) that efficiency and effectiveness affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP3 was 2.8927, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means two hundred and sixty-nine of the respondents representing 76% strongly agreed (19.8%), agreed (48.3%), and slightly agreed (7.9%) that initiative in doing work affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP4 was 2.6130, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means three hundred and twenty-six of the respondents representing 92.1% strongly agreed (16.1%), agreed (52.3%), and slightly agreed (23.7%) that attitude towards assigned task affect employee performance.

The mean value for EEP5 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means two hundred and eighty-three of the respondents representing 79.9% strongly agreed (4%), agreed (60.2%), and slightly agreed (15.8%) that punctuality and attendance affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP6 was 1.8362, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means three hundred and twelve of the respondents representing 88.1% strongly agreed (7.9%), agreed (56.5%), and slightly agreed (23.7%) that the attitude towards doing work beyond the said time affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP7 was 1.7147, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means two hundred and sixty-nine of the respondents representing 76% strongly agreed (7.9%), agreed (52.3%), and slightly agreed (15.8%) that loyalty to the university affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP8 was 2.8927, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means two hundred and eighty-three of the respondents representing 79.9% strongly agreed (4%), agreed (52.3%), and slightly agreed (27.7%) that motivation in doing work affect employee performance.

The mean value for EEP9 was 2.6130, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means two hundred and ninety-seven of the respondents representing 83.9% agreed (64.1%) and slightly agreed (19.8%) that interpersonal relationship affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP10 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means two hundred and eighty-four of the respondents representing 80.2% agreed (60.5%) and slightly agreed (19.8%) that productivity and output affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP11 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means two hundred and sixty-nine of the respondents representing 76% agreed (52.3%) and slightly agreed (23.7%) that knowledge and understanding of task affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP12 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means three hundred and forty of the respondents representing 96% strongly agreed (39.8%), agreed (40.4%), and slightly agreed (15.8%) that expertise of employees affect their performance. The mean value for EEP13 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means one hundred and eighty-two of the respondents representing 51.4% strongly agreed (7.9%), agreed (35.6%), and slightly agreed (7.9%) that work skills affect employee performance.

The mean value for EEP14 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 4 which means two hundred and forty-one of the respondents representing 68.1% strongly agreed (11.9%), agreed (52.3%), and slightly agreed (4%) that initiative in pursuing higher education affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP15 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 3 which means three hundred and fifty-four of the respondents representing 100% strongly agreed (28.2%), agreed (44.1%), and slightly agreed (27.7%) that leadership skills affect employee performance. The mean value for EEP16 was 2.1186, minimum value of 1 and maximum value of 5 which means one hundred and forty-three of the respondents representing 40.4% strongly agreed (4%), agreed (20.6%), and slightly agreed (15.8%) that technical skills affect employee performance.

V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study sought to identify the reliability and validity of performance appraisal system on employee performance. The study found that the result of the evaluation of performance appraisal are openly explained and discussed to the employee concerned. Furthermore, the performance appraisal system is aligned with the vision and mission of the institution. Moreover, the appraisal system is accurate in terms of content and purpose. Also, the conducts of evaluation of performance appraisal are honestly and fairly done. The performance appraisal system used at Kumasi Technical University is relevant and reliable. Secondly, the study sought to assess the effectiveness of performance appraisal system and found that the objective of the appraisal tool is appropriate to the needs of the senior staff, senior members and all non-teaching staff of Kumasi Technical University. Notwithstanding, the performance appraisal system is designed to motivate employees and the performance appraisal of the university is fair and objective. Furthermore, performance appraisal system recognize employee achievement.

Thirdly, performance objectively and senior staff, senior members and all non-teaching staff who got the highest rank are given appropriate rewards. Moreover, the appraisal system of the university is motivating to the employees and employees are satisfied with the way they are being evaluated and ranked. Also, the appraisal system is relevant, reliable and effective in encouraging employees to work hard. Fourthly, the study sought to find out the problems of performance appraisal system and found that the current appraisal does rate the extra work of the employee. Furthermore, the result of the evaluation is not reliable and valid but are discussed and explained to the employee concern. Although, employees are involved in the formulation of tool evaluation but the appraisal system of the university is not relevant, effective, and accurate. It is a fact that the reward system of the university is in place, employees are rated according to the nature of their job and responsibilities, their performance standards are clearly explained to the employees. Lastly, enthusiasm in performing job affect employee performance. Not only that but attitude towards assigned task, attitude towards doing work beyond the said time, loyalty to the university, efficiency and effectiveness affect employee performance. Furthermore, initiative in doing work, motivation in doing work, interpersonal relationship, knowledge and understanding of

task, punctuality and attendance affect employee performance. Also, expertise of employees, work skills, initiative in pursuing higher education, leadership skills, technical skills, productivity and output affect employee performance.

VI. CONCLUSION

All the independent variables were statistically significant to the dependent variable. The independent variable were reliability and validity of performance appraisal system, quality of performance appraisal system, effectiveness of performance appraisal system, and problems of performance appraisal system. The dependent variable for the study was employee performance. So, the reliability and validity of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance and quality of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance. Also, effectiveness of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance but not much and problems of performance appraisal system has a significant effect on employee performance. The study conclude that reliability and validity of performance appraisal system, quality of performance appraisal system, effectiveness of performance appraisal system, and problems of performance appraisal system account for only 31.7% of the variation in the effect of employee performance.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends that attention organizations and educational institutions should put their attention on the problems of performance appraisal system to improve its reliability, accurateness and validity. The effectiveness of performance appraisal system should be enhanced to meet evaluation of performance standards.

5.4 Future Studies

Further studies can be done on other factors that influence performance appraisal system.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Special thanks to Isaac Ampofo Atta Senior and Isaac Ampofo Atta Junior for their contribution.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Adler, S., Campion, M., Colquitt, A., Grubb, A., Murphy, K., Ollander-Krane, R., & Pulakos, E. D. (2016). Getting rid of performance ratings: Genius or folly? A debate. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9, 219–252. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.106>.
- [2]. Ahmad, R., & Bujang, S. (2013). Issues and Challenges in the Practice of Performance Appraisal Activities in the 21 st Century . *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(4), 1–8.
- [3]. Analoui, E. and Fell, E. (2002). Have you been Appraised? A survey of the administrative staff. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 16 (6), 279-287.
- [4]. Armstrong, M. (2001) *Human Resource Management Practice*, Kogan Page Publishers, 8th ed.
- [5]. Arthur, P. (2015). The challenges facing performance appraisal management : lessons for polytechnics in Ghana. *African Journal of Applied Research*, 1(1), 299–314. Retrieved from www.ajaronline.com
- [6]. Baran, E., Bilici, S. C., Sari, A. A., & Tondeur, J. (2019). Investigating the impact of teacher education strategies on preservice teachers ' TPACK. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(1), 357–370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12565>
- [7]. Bashir, A. (2020). *Factors Affecting the Performance Appraisal System in Service Organizations*. United International University.
- [8]. Bitange, R., Narok, N., & Simeon, K. (2010). The Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal Systems in Private Universities in Kenya: An Assessment of Kabarak University Performance Appraisal Systems. *African Journal of Business & Management*, 1, 123–134.
- [9]. Bjorkman, I. & Fan, X. (2002). Human resource management and the performance of Western firms in China, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13, 853-864.
- [10]. Cappelli, P., & Conyon, M. J. (2018). What do performance appraisals do? *ILR Review*, 71, 88–116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793917698649>.
- [11]. Chiang, F. F. T., & Birtch, T. A. (2010). Appraising performance across borders: An empirical examination of the purposes and practices of performance appraisal in a multicountry context. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47, 1365–1393. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14676486.2010.00937.x>.
- [12]. Daoanis, L. E. (2012). Performance Appraisal System : It ' s Implication To Employee Performance. *International Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 2(3), 55–62.
- [13]. Denisi, A. S., & Pritchard, R. D. (2006). Performance Appraisal, Performance Management and Improving Individual Performance : A Motivational Framework. *Management and Organization Review*,

- 2(2), 253–277.
- [14]. Glass, A., & Song, X. (2019). Planning Ahead : Using the Theory of Planned Behavior to Predict Older Adults ' Intentions to Use Hospice if Faced With Terminal Illness. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 38(4), 572–591. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464817690678>
- [15]. Goler, L., Gale, J., & Grant, A. (2016, November). Let's not kill performance evaluations yet. *Harvard Business Review*, 94(11), 90–94.
- [16]. Grint, K. (2007). What's wrong with Performance Appraisals? A Critique and a Suggestion. *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol.3, Issue 4, 134-149.
- [17]. Harrington, J. R., & Lee, J. H. (2015). What drives perceived fairness of performance appraisal? Exploring the effects of psychological contract fulfillment on employees' perceived fairness of performance appraisal in US federal agencies. *Public Personnel Management*, 44(2), 214-238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00910260145640>
- [18]. He, W., & Chen, L. (2020). Does new performance appraisal system (EVA) affect earnings management? *Nankai Business Review International*, 11(2), 191–216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/NBRI-10-2019-0051>
- [19]. Ikramullah, M., Van Prooijen, J., Iqbal, M. Z., & Ul-Hassan, F. S. (2016). Effectiveness of performance appraisal: Developing a conceptual framework using competing values approach. *Personnel Review*, 45, 334–352. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2014-0164>.
- [20]. Iqbal, M. Z., Akbar, S., & Budhwar, P. (2015). Effectiveness of performance appraisal: An integrated framework. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17(4), 510-533. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12050>
- [21]. Iqbal, M. Z., Akbar, S., Budhwar, P., Zulfiqar, S., & Shah, A. (2019). Effectiveness of performance appraisal : Evidence on the utilization criteria. *Journal of Business Research*, 101(May), 285–299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.035>
- [22]. Kallio, K., Kallio, T. J., Tienari, J., & Hyvönen, T. (2016). Ethos at stake: Performance management and academic work in universities. *Human Relations*, 69, 685–709. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715596802>.
- [23]. Karkouljian, S., Assaker, G., & Hallak, R. (2016). An empirical study of 360-degree feedback, organizational justice, and firm sustainability. *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 1862–1867. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715596802>.
- [24]. Kim, T., & Holzer, M. (2016). Public employees and performance appraisal: A study of antecedents to employees' perceptions of the process. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(1), 31-56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X14549673>
- [25]. Mihai, R. L., Bajan, I. F., & Cretu, A. (2017). Performance management in the context of globalization. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, 24(1), 203-208.
- [26]. Muianga, X. J., Barbutiu, S. M., & Hansson, H. (2019). Teachers ' perspectives on professional development in the use of SCL approaches and ICT : A quantitative case study of Eduardo Mondlane Xavier Justino Muianga , Sirkku Männikkö Barbutiu and Henrik Hansson Inocente Vasco Mutimucuiu. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology*, 15(2), 79–97.
- [27]. Ngitoria, D. J. (2014). *Effectiveness of microfinance institutions in empowering of women petty traders' performance: the case of pride Tanzania Ltd – Morogoro branch*. Mzumbe University.
- [28]. Ngo, H. Y., Lau, C. M. and Foley, S. (2008). The effects of Strategic Human Resource Management and Human Resource Practices on Firm Performance and Employee Relations Climate in China. *Human Resource Management*, 47: 73-90.
- [29]. Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., & Moye, N. (2015). Performance management can be fixed: An on-the-job experiential learning approach for complex behavior change. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 51–76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2014.2>
- [30]. Raj, K., Rahangdale, R. D., & Yadav, Y. (2019). *Impact of Performance Appraisal System on Employee Engagement in Banking Industry: An Empirical Study* (Manipal University Jaipur). Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3606324>
- [31]. Rao, S. (2009). *Personnel and Human Resource Management*. Himalaya Publishing House, New Delhi.
- [32]. Rogers, D. (1995) 'Choosing Performance Management: A Holistic Approach' CUPA Journal (Summer 1995).
- [33]. Sharma, A., & Sharma, T. (2017). HR analytics and performance appraisal system: A conceptual framework for employee performance improvement. *Management Research Review*, 40(6), 684-697. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-04-2016-0084>
- [34]. Sharma, N. P., Sharma, T., & Agarwal, M. N. (2016). Measuring employee perception of performance management system effectiveness: Conceptualization and scale development. *Employee Relations*, 38(2), 224-247. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-01-2015-0006>

- [35]. Tripathi,C.(2001). *Personnel Management and Industrial Relation*. Sultan Chand & sons, New Delhi.
- [36]. Trosten-Bloom, A., Deines, T., & Carsten, T. (2014). Positive performance management: Bold experiments, provocative possibilities. *Performance Improvement*, 53(5), 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.21413>

YaaAmponsahNsiah. “Performance Appraisal System: Its' Impact on Performance of Employees at Kumasi Technical University.” *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(8), 2020, pp. 01-13.