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ABSTRACT

The researcher carried out survey to investigate the employees views on the process of performance appraisal and its effect on the achievement of organizational objectives by both the academic and support staff of Kenya Methodist University.

Observed change of employees behaviour on meeting targets, increased cases of indiscipline, absenteeism is likely to be a pointer to the inadequacy of the performance appraisal in enhancing realization of organizational objectives. The performance appraisal process at the time was subjective other than the appraisers lacking adequate training on how to effectively appraise their subordinates.

The researcher sampled employees at Kenya Methodist University in which they were asked their views about the performance appraisal. Employees were clustered into two groups; the general staff and the Heads of department. Sample was drawn by systematic random sampling. Their responses were compared vis-à-vis their performance to find out if there was any connection in the two.

Results generated through this study should guide future managers how to approach the performance appraisal.
### List of Abbreviations

1. **MTI**  -  Methodist Training Institute
2. **KEMU**  -  Kenya Methodist University
3. **DLM**  -  Distance Learning Mode
Definition of terms

Performance appraisal – A formal and planned evaluation of the employee performance vis-à-vis the set targets.

Appraisal forms – A structured document that is completed by both the appraisee and appraiser in the process of performance evaluation.

Targets: - Predetermined goals to be achieved by the employees and to which the bases for evaluation is pegged.

Appraisal Process: - A sequential and systematic set of activities that precedes the evaluation of an employees performance.

Feedback: - Refers to communicating to an employee the results of his performance evaluation.

Appraisal Centred Discussion: A healthy free discussion between the appraisee and appraiser on the level of an employees performance.

Pre-interview Process: The preparations that needs to be done before the interview.

Support Staff: This refers to employees of the university other than the Academic staff.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 Introduction

Performance appraisals are inevitable in any organization that would wish to see overall growth in all dimensions of its operations.

The practice, however instrumental in the realization of the above aspirations, may fail to serve the purpose they were earlier intended. Factors such as subjectivity of the appraiser, their competence to perform an effective performance appraisal among others, may negatively affect the results of the appraisal.

Assumptions may as well have been made that all is well. However, it was important that investigations on how the employees viewed the performance appraisal and its effect on the achievement of organizational objectives was crucial.

The study tried to unearth the hidden side of this.

1.0 Background of the study

Kenya Methodist University is a Christian institution established in 1997 under Interim Authority awarded by the Commission for Higher Education. The institution in the formation years started as a Rural Training Centre and later was elevated to an Institute that was basically training Church Ministers.

It was in 1994 that the Methodist church nurtured the idea of establishing a University and with the facilities of the Institute at hand, it was the most logical and viable option to use the facilities for this noble undertaking. On inception, the university assumed the assets and liabilities of the Methodist Training Institute (MTI). Included in the transition was the inheritance of the staff serving under MTI.

Growth in the number of students has been steady having started with a paltry 7 and 4 business administration and Theology students respectively. This number has increased tremendously over the years such that the number now stands at 1,400 undertaking diversified courses at Diploma and Degree Levels.
A number of case studies have been conducted in the area of performance appraisal and its influence on productivity. Mani Bearne G (2002) has looked at how performance appraisal enhances productivity at East Carolina University. He states that; “appraisals may help poor performers improve performance by giving specific feedback about needs for development and appraisal may help employees who would continue to excel by giving positive improvement”. From the above scenario, improvement of poor performance and creating an atmosphere where the high achievers continue to do better in itself leads to high productivity of employees and hence the realization of organizational objectives.

In much as performance appraisal is a cherished mode of evaluation of employees’ productivity, question abounds as to whether employees are satisfied with the whole process. In the Kenyan context, the process of performance appraisal is practiced with the outcome of result enhancing decision making such as in promotion and training. However, no much scholarly work has been done to find out if employees are satisfied with the manner in which performance appraisal is performed. Do the employees regard the outcome of results as being fair? Is the process of interview seen to be adequate to provide a fair appraisal?

In the formative years, the university had loose administrative structure with one officer carrying out duties of at least four officers. The lecturers were equally overstretched in their teaching load. Nevertheless, the university aspired to achieve high productivity in terms of role performance.

Performance appraisal is an important tool in the management process as Gregorio B (2004 P.1) points out, “After employee selection, performance appraisal is arguably the most important management tool a farm employer has at her disposal. The performance appraisal, when properly carried out, can help fine tune and reward the performance of present employees”.

Birnberg and Associates (1995 p.1) on their part says, “The performance appraisal system is a tool to be used by both management and staff to motivate employees organize procedures, assess talents and seek solutions to problems.

Performance appraisal has been done at the University for the eight years of its existence with the aim of measuring the employees’ performance vis-à-vis the realization of organizational objectives.
Initial performance appraisal forms were developed. However, they lacked adequate coverage in terms of content such that some crucial aspects relating to employee performance were left out. On the other hand, the appraisal never had provision for the supervisor-subordinate discussion during the process. This led to a process of appraisal that was grossly inadequate and quite subjective as to cause any meaningful positive impact on the general organizational objectives.

However, as pointed out above, with the gradual increase in student population and donations from the sponsors, the University was able to fully develop administrative structures all aimed at improving efficiency and service delivery of its employees for the purpose of meeting the organizational objectives.

Realization of aspired organizational targets called for development of measurement tools of the inputs of the employees in relation to the organizational objectives. On this Gregorio B (2004 p.4) had this to say, "The evaluation in performance appraisal may provide ideas for refining established practices or instituting new ones. For instance, appraisal date may show that a former supervisor has had a number of interpersonal conflicts with other managers and employees".

A vibrant and dynamic Institution the University cherished to be could not continue using the inadequate and inefficient performance appraisal. This called for development of an appraisal process whose appraisal form content was detailed and captured every aspect of the employee at all levels of the appraisal. The first level is where the appraisee enters personal details like name, date of birth and education qualifications. The second step is where the appraisee details duties he has to perform and further indicates the level that he/she feels has accomplished the set targets. Response could be excellent, very good, good, fair and unsatisfactory. The next level is where the supervisor, upon receiving the completed appraisal form from the employee, invites him for a discussion on the performance. Details relating to duties an officer has to undertake and the level of accomplishment are looked into before overall assessment is done. This may include the need for further training and promotion. The next step is the final discussion by the appraisal committee, where results of the appraisal, generated at the lower level are put into perspective before a final verdict is made on the employee. Communication of the results and overseeing the implementation of the appraisal committee recommendations is done by the Human Resources office. The above sequential steps may be meaningful if we borrows Victor's et al (1999 p.4) proposition that,
"Performance appraisal should begin at the start of the year with goal setting continue with periodic performance reviews, and conclude with the traditional year-end appraisal. This is the performance appraisal cycle (PAC). PAC offers some clear cut advantages. First, it instills the idea that, "performance" isn't busywork, its effort directed toward predetermined objectives. Second, PAC ensures that the worker's progress will be monitored".

Over the years, performance appraisal has been conducted at the Kenya Methodist University and the assumption by the senior management is that the process is quite adequate and quite satisfying to the employees. To some extent this was an over simplification of a process whose evolvement and development in a dynamic set up could not escape blame from a few quarters. Insight of Gregorio B (2004 P.8) on the same about employees may explain this, "Although employees vary in their desire for improvement, generally workers want to know how well they are performing. A successful farmer recalled with sadness how as a youth he had worked very hard, along with his immigrant family, for a farmer who never seemed to notice the effort. Years later her and the former employee had asked why he had never made any positive comments about their work. The response from the boss was, "I feared you would stop working as hard". The employees' reaction to the introduction of the appraisal process at the University was quite exciting in view of benefits they expected from such a system. The first two years saw a general improvement in the realization of organization objectives attributed to inputs of the employees.

However, the remarkable realization of the organization objectives has of late steadily gone down. It was highly presumed that this was due to the manner in which performance appraisal was done at the University.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Performance appraisals are controls in any organization that ensure high productivity by employees. The process itself aims at evaluating employees' performance vis-à-vis the target sets. It is imperative that the realization of employee targets has the consequential effect of achieving the organizational objectives thereby guaranteeing its future growth and survival.
Kenya Methodist University in its endeavor to realize the above aspirations called for development of performance appraisal. This was done over the years such that it is now a routine annual activity. Assumptions by the management had all along been that the process of performance appraisal is rational and objective. However there have been observed cases of dissatisfaction over the years by employees that the process is not fair especially in the award of promotion, upgrading. A reasonable number of employees have remained indifferent and skeptical on this process claiming that they do not attach any importance on the same.

Generally, cases of lateness, poor performance have been noted over the years. The realization of the individual targets quite regularly fell short of the set standards. The question was whether the manner in which the performance appraisal was conducted contributed to emergence of these noted weaknesses. What were the employee's views on the performance appraisal? Assumption had been made that all was well in the whole process. However, this is an oversimplification of a process which may be open to human error of judgment or subjectivity. A look at the employees' view of the whole process of performance appraisal and how this relates to their performance in the realization of organization objectives was critical in this study.

1.3 The Objectives of the Study
The objectives of the study were:-

1.3.1 General Objective
To investigate factors influencing performance appraisal process in Kenya Methodist University

1.3.2 Specific Objectives
1. To investigate why performance appraisal process was not effective at Kenya Methodist University
2. To investigate if employees were satisfied with the appraisal interview process.
3. To investigate how employees views on the appraisal process affected the realization of organizational objectives.

1.5 Research Questions
(i) What are the employees' views of the appraisal process?
(ii) How do employees view results of appraisal awarded for their perceived inputs?
(iii) Are employees satisfied with the mode used to give feedback on employee performance?

(iv) What are the employees' feelings on the method of the actual interview setting?

(v) How does the employees' perception of the appraisal process affect the organizational performance?

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study would be of interest to managers of organizations that depend on performance appraisal as a tool to evaluate the performance of their employees. Of particular interest would be the revelation of the untold story of the employees' view of the performance appraisal.

Further afield, the study results would help improve on performance appraisal process especially on those areas the employees may regard as wanting.

It was further expected that the study would help highlight those areas that employees feel are adequately or inadequately carried out thereby enhancing the organization zeal in guiding against retrogression in areas with notable achievements while striving to improve on the weak areas.

1.7 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted at the Kenya Methodist University. The study captured the views of the employees at all levels of its organizational structure.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to look at the scholarly work that has been done in the area of performance appraisal with respect to employee satisfaction with the manner the exercise was conducted. The researcher through the literature on the subject identified gaps in the area of employee satisfaction or performance appraisal. Gaps so identified formed the backbone of this study.

2.2 Overview of Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal is not a recent phenomenon otherwise over the years the process has evolved in various diversified fronts such as the purpose of such appraisal to the manner in which the process is undertaken.

Keith David and John W. Newton (1989 p.154.) Say that the first recorded appraisal system in industry was Robert Owen's use of character books and blocks in his new Lanack Cotton Mills in Scotland around 1800. He adds that the character blocks recorded each worker's daily reports. The character blocks were coloured differently on each side to represent an evaluation of the worker ranging from bad to good and they were displayed at each employee’s workplace. Owen was quite impressed by the way blocks improved worker behaviour.

The findings of Owen especially on improved worker behaviour may have implied that the workers were reasonably satisfied with the process of appraisal.

However, in another study made by Victor et al (1994 p.10) at North Carolina University, it emerges "that a large population of employees, but not supervisors, are dissatisfied with the system; that neither the number of subordinates nor the time spent evaluating employees under the system affects supervisors’ satisfaction with the system and that employees perceptions of the
fairness of the system is related to trust and satisfaction with their supervisors but not with compliance with the programs' procedures”.

2.2.1 Forms of Performance Appraisal

There are various methods of performance appraisal ranging from observation method to more formal methods such as graphical ranking, critical incidents, and Management by Objectives. The method of performance appraisal that has always been used since the inception of the Kenya Methodist University is the graphical rating scale.

Milkoush T. George and Boudreau W. John (1988 p.195) say that in graphical rating scale, the evaluator uses a graph and rates employees on each of the characteristics listed. The number of characteristics rated varies from a few to several dozens. In this method, he adds, “The evaluator makes descriptive words ranging from unsatisfactory to outstanding. After assigning a score of five for outstanding and zero for unsatisfactory, evaluators can compute total scores.

The problem with this method is that the descriptive words are at times not measurable especially in a service organization like the one in which this study was being conducted. Chances were that if the parameters were not well-defined, there would be greater degree of subjectivity in the awards of the score thus leading to unsatisfaction. On this, Heinz Welrich and Harold Koontz (1988 p.392) says that effective performance appraisal should recognize the legitimate desire of employees for progress in their professions.

2.2.2 Appraiser Centered Methods of Appraising Employees

David A. Whelten and Kim S. Cameroon (1991 p.39) gives types of appraisal interviews that may dominate this process which range from a domineering appraiser to a mixed model interview. One of the extreme methods and one that is appraiser dominated is the tell-and-sell which as Whelten puts, is evaluative in nature in the which the appraiser tells the subordinate on the ways he/she can improve his performance.
This method is the least subjective because the evaluation is skewed towards the evaluators' perception of how such evaluation should be carried out. The inputs of the appraisee are not welcome, a situation that may keep the appraiser uninformed as to why the appraisee possibly performed below the expectation. This scenario, which negates the inputs of the appraiser, was definitely likely to lead to dissatisfaction and possibly poor performance of the employee.

He gave another approach and that is the tell and listen approach. In this approach, the appraiser first tells the employees his evaluation and listens to their reactions without displaying any agreement or disagreement. He adds that this system is evaluative but the appraiser's intention(s) is to get the subordinates view points and further work with subordinate to help him/her accept appraisal evaluation.

This approach as it stood out was not radical as the first one explained above as it fell-short of rational and objective appraisal method because the appraisee inputs much as they are welcome, the final word on how performance can be improved lies on the feelings of the appraiser. Such approach is like in the first one, likely to breed dissatisfaction.

Whelten goes further to give a more rational method of formal discussion in the appraisal interview as the problem solving interview. In this approach, the appraiser's role is to help the employee develop a plan for improving his or her performance.

On the surface, this approach appears logical and rational but falls-short of the expected standards in that it fails to recognize the inputs of the appraisee to the extent that the appraiser still has an upper hand like in the first two approaches. The relegation of the appraisee to be only on the receiving end is likely to breed contempt on the part of the appraisee thereby causing dissatisfaction.

David Whelten quoting, (Bear 1987), gives a fourth approach to performance appraisal interview as the mixed-model. This type of appraisal interview begins with a problem solving framework and ends the interview with a more directive tell-and-sell approach. In this way, he adds, the appraiser can help a subordinate meet the development goals and plan for development.
This approach appears to be the most objective of the other three. The inputs of the appraiser are well taken into consideration and even at some point when the appraiser has to tactfully tell and sell his idea, the appraisee is likely to own the ideas so expressed thereby leading to satisfaction and subsequent realization of organization objectives.

Nadler et al (1979 p.59).) supports bear's approach when he states that appraisal for development and counseling needs to focus on the strong and weak points of the individual performance from the point of view of how performance can be improved.

He further adds that, "the involvement of subordinates by superior in appraisal ensures that they are both in agreement with respect to what needs to be done, gives subordinates a chance to influence how performance will be evaluated thereby increasing commitment to the appraisal process.

Gerald M.Goldhaber (1974 p.70) brings the aspect of trust among all concerned parties. Where there is high trust there is a corresponding high performance and vice versa if there is low trust. Jonathan Sutherland and Diane Conwell (2004 p.239) almost echoes the same sentiments that framing an effective performance management system can be fraught with difficulties especially if there is no clear definition of measurement criteria.
2.3. Critical Review of the Major issue

2.3.1 Pre-Interview Process

Most organizations including the organization under study conduct performance appraisal yearly. This means that the appraisers may lose memory of the critical incidents that the appraisee may have performed. On the same, Don Hellriegel and John W. Slocum Jr (1992 p.414), say that because managers may not accurately remember details over a long period of time, they should consider keeping a diary of incidents. They can then refer to this diary when writing the review and just before the interview in order to be able to refer to specific events. He further adds that managers should have first discussed the incidents with the employee soon after they have happened.

Don Hellriegel and John W. Slocum Jr's assertion on this issue is quite important in that managers who do not keep a record of their subordinates' critical incidents are most likely to commit the error of recency. Depending on the nature of the recent critical incidents, the appraisee may be judged either positively or negatively. Lack of objectivity in such evaluation and especially where an employee is appraised positively when in the eyes of the other employee his performance is generally rated as poor, may attract dissatisfaction on the wider employee population. Alternatively where the employee is rated poorly when the appraiser takes into account his recent unacceptable incidents without regard to other acceptable incidents that he may have carried out during the review period, a lot of dissatisfaction is likely to be witnessed on the part of the employee, a situation that may have adverse effects on his performance.

Milkouch T. George and Boudreau W. John (1988 p.217) says that manager should work with the appraisee to develop a performance plan for the appraiser based on goals of the organization. Then he should sit with the appraisee to discuss and answer questions the appraisee may have. He further adds, "Before or during your performance appraisal planning session, you and your manager may discuss what he expects from you during the review period." With that in mind, the appraisee should think about:-

- How he will contribute during the performance period.
- Any additional responsibilities he can assume.
- Activities he can pursue for self development
The above insight shows that the pre-interview process if it is not properly followed, can lead to obscure and non-focused performance of the employee which subsequently may have a negative implication on the appraisees performance.

2.3.2 The Actual Interview.

This is a very important stage in the process of performance appraisal in that it is the time the appraiser and appraisee have a more formal encounter on the appraisee's performance and how this compares to the organization expectations on him.

Don Hellriegel and John W. Slocum Jr (1992 p.414) are of the view that managers and employees should exchange information about the employees strength and weaknesses. He adds that an effective manager recognizes that allowing an employee to express his feelings and ideas makes the session more worthwhile. He further adds that it is important that the manager focus on job-related performance and avoid discussing facets of personality.

A question arises as to whether at Kenya Methodist University the above virtues are upheld and if they are, the implication they have on the employee perception of the performance appraisal and in particular its overall contribution towards the achievement of the organizational objectives. This study will attempt to unearth the hidden facets of such scenario

Don Hellriegel further says that it is important that the manager and employee mutually agree on objectives for improvement. It is imperative that objective setting leads to a focused performance which has the consequential effect of the employees' high performance. The question is, can high performance be achieved without prior setting of realizable objectives? This study will attempt to bring to light the eventuality of such a scenario.

2.3.3 Rater Characteristics

Don Hellriegel and John W. Slocum Jr(1992 p.193) says that characteristics of the rater exert a subtle and often indirect influence on performance appraisals. Young and less experienced managers, who may have received low evaluations themselves, tend to rate others more strictly than older more experienced do.
The picture that is portrayed on this assertion by Hellriegel is that there are situations where there is subjectivity in the process of performance appraisal. It would be worthy finding out what effect this subjectivity is likely to lead to. However, without pre-emptying the finding of this study, it is likely that the appraisees may be dissatisfied with that kind of subjectivity. Hersey Paul et al (2001 p.254) had this advice to give “that in appraisal, don’t attack personality but focus on performance”.

He further adds, “Managers who have self-esteem, low level of anxiety, good social skills and emotional stability give more accurate performance appraisals than managers with the opposite personality traits.

Thus, it appears that the results of performance appraisal are dependent on who conducts the appraisal. Variation may be noted depending on the knowledge of the appraiser to conduct the appraisal on the nature of the process. An objective appraisal is likely to lead to satisfaction by the appraisee and a remarkable improvement in their performance.

The assertion by Don Hellriegel and John W. Slocum Jr. almost concurs with that by Milkouch, T. George and Boudreau W. John (1998) when they say that even a well-designed performance assessment system can cause problems if the evaluators are not suited to it. They add that a large portion of the variability in ratings may be due to the motivation or lack of motivation of raters. Motivation can be affected by rater’s trust in the assessment process, requirements that raters justify their ratings and training to handle the negative outcomes of assessments.

Heneman et. al (1989 p.12) on their part point out that managers will not be motivated to evaluate effectively unless performance appraisal is recognized as an important dimension of their job, a dimension that if performed will be rewarded.

The above views expressed by various writers portrays the appraisal as being an interplay of many factors that largely reduce this important exercise into mere paper work. Nadler (1979) while quoting Campbell et al, 1970 p.12 had this to say. Study after study has pointed out that the process of performance appraisal is done poorly in most organizations.
David A. Dcenzo and Stephen P. Robins (2004 p.375) almost confirming the above assertion say that it would be naïve to assume, however, that all practicing managers impartially interpret and standardize the criteria upon which the subordinates will be appraised. This is particularly true of those jobs that are not easily programmable and for which developing hard performance standards is most difficult if not impossible.

2.3.4 Establishment of Performance Appraisal Standards.

The level of employees input is closely related to how clear the organization’s expectations on him are. On this, Michael Armstrong (p.473) says that, “Performance appraisal provides the basis for regular and frequent dialogues between managers interns of on performance and development needs. He adds that objectives should be agreed not set, and this agreement should be reached through the open dialogue that take place between managers and individuals throughout the year. He further adds that, “Key questions will relate to how objectives, targets and goals are set, how managers and employees interact in work towards realizing their objectives, and the use made by employees of measurements as feedback in order to develop further.

The above assertion underscores the importance of setting objectives and achievable goals or targets that are measurable. The inputs of the appraisee on this crucial process is underscored by Pettidin et al (2001) quoted by Button (2001) that it is important that criteria used to judge performance are controllable by those being judged. A failure to do so affects morale and overall performance. The question is if such realistic objective settings are observed at Kenya Methodist University. The study will attempt to bring this to surface.

The complexity of setting standards are appreciated by another writer Jonathan Sutherland and Diane Conwell (2004 p.239) when he says that framing an effective performance management system can be fraught with difficulties. However, he gives some aspects that should be integral in the creation of such scheme as detailed below:-

1. A clear definition of measurement of performance is vital.
2. Content and measurement should drive from internal and external customers.
3. There should be a formal process of investigating and collecting situational influences and constraints on performance.

Expounding on the same view, Jonathan Sutherland (2004 p.241) adds, "The appraisal system need to have clearly defined rules and expectations and above all, the appraiser and the appraisee need to be speaking the same language. In addition, William F. Glueck (1980 p.683) say that one of the most crucial aspects of performance appraisal is the criteria managers use to appraise employees. It is important that these criteria be relevant, unbiased significant and practical.

No method of performance appraisal however well designed that does not have its weaknesses. The graphical rating method mentioned earlier is no exception. Jonathan offers a way out when he says, "A 360-degree appraisal system has rapidly become an integral part of performance management. A standard 360-degrees appraisal system requires face-to-face feedback sessions, where an employee is given an opportunity both to ask questions and to listen to feedback.

2.3.5 Subjectivity in Performance Appraisal

Wayne F. Casco (1992 p.269) say that personal values and bias can replace organizational standards. Thus unfairly low ratings may be given to valued subordinates so that they will not be promoted out of the raters department or outright bias may lead to favoured treatment for some employees.

The question we need to ask ourselves is how employees would view this kind of scenario. Is it likely to lead to satisfaction or dissatisfaction? It will be interesting to find out what this study unearths.

Some weaknesses as noted above may not miss in an appraisal system. Wayne (1992 p.275) has this to say on the same, "That it is not difficult to offer prescriptions for systems, but implementing them requires diligent attention by organizations plus a commitment to make them work. Related to that, Gregory Moorland and Rick W. Griffin (2001 p.190) say that organizations should attempt to provide more significant rewards to their higher performing employees than their lower performing ones."
2.4.6 Feedback to Performance Appraisal

David A. Whelten and Kim S. Cameroon (1991) say that the goal of performance appraisal system is to evaluate a member of an organization and after provides a means of giving feedback to a subordinate concerning ways to improve job performance. Andrew D. Szilagyi Jr. and Marc J. Wallace Jr (1983 p.367) say that without feedback, employees cannot be expected to change and improve their job's performance.

Nadler et al (1979 p.59) extends this further when he asserts that Performance Appraisal represents an opportunity to get feedback that help employees evaluate their own performance and learn how they are progressing in their own development. He further adds that if the evaluation is more negative than the individual expects, the situation is almost certain to end up in a disagreement about whether the measure of performance is valid. Closely related to that Dipbuye Robert et al (1994 p.415) add that the employees natural tendency to seek positive feedback and the superiors natural discomfort with giving negative feedback can lead to a conspiracy.

This brings the assumption that there may be situations where the validity of the evaluation may be lacking to the extent that it will cause disagreement between the appraisee and the appraiser.

Don Hellriegel and John W. Slocum (Jr) (1992 p.410) say that performance appraisal information helps managers decide on personnel movement. Who should receive promotion, demotion, transfer or terminated, the same is echoed by Nadler et al (1979 p.58) when he says that when rewards like pay are tied to performance, they motivate employees.

Don Hellriegel and John W. Slocum (1992 p.420) add that performance evaluations provide employees with feedback about their specific strengths and weaknesses as well as guidelines on how to build on the strengths and counteract the weaknesses.

Milkouch Y. George and Boudreau W. John (1988 p.203) say that the biggest hazard in performance assessment may be the employees reaction to the assessment. Evaluations can
provoke hostile responses from employees even when conveying favourable results. This may prompt to re-evaluate the manner in which feedback of an employee’s performance is made.

Milkouch T. George (1998 p.206) says that when evaluation results are used to determine pay increases, promotions, demotions or terminations, there must be some common denominator for comparisons among many individuals. Frequently, this implies a numerical rating of performance.

David A. DC Cenzo and Stephen P. Robins (2001 p.70) say that one nationwide model chain had advertised that “The best surprise is no surprise”. Employees like to know how they are doing. The annual appraisal where the Manager shares the subordinate evaluations with them can become a problem. In some cases, it is a problem merely because managers put off some reviews. This is particularly likely if the appraisal is negative. He points out that the solution lies in having the manager share with the subordinate both expectations and disappointments on a day-to-day basis. It was therefore necessary to determine whether this was the case at Kenya Methodist University.

2.4.7 Who Owns the Mantle of Performance Appraisal?
Milkouch T. George and Boudreau W. John (1998 p.192) says that potential performance assessors include the superiors, peers, subordinates or even the employees themselves. By far, the most common system is to have the employees immediate supervisor provide the performance assessment, usually reviewed by a higher level manager or personnel department.

The question is whether the decision of the employee’s immediate supervisor are upheld by the higher level manager. If there is variation, what are the likely consequences?

Heneman et al (1989 p.159) say that line managers are usually responsible for conducting the appraisals once the instruments are developed. Unfortunately, the results of their efforts are problematic. The greatest difficulty stems from the fact that individuals must conduct performance appraisals and managers are prone to many errors of judgement.
1.4.8 Informal Performance Appraisal Interview.

Nadler et al (1979 p.58) point out that much of the evaluation that takes place in organizations is informal, but some of it is part of the formal performance evaluation systems that most organizations have. He adds that whatever the system of performance appraisal either formal or informal, the importance of performance appraisal is to identify the results for which the person is responsible and it is because organizations need information on how well jobs are being done, if that they can to be controlled and directed effectively.

Milkouch T. George and Boudreau W. John (1988 p.192) says that the usefulness of performance assessment will depend on the opportunity to observe relevant behaviors, the ability to translate those behaviors into performance ratings and the motivation to provide useful performance ratings. He adds that several studies have examined the effectiveness of rater training in reducing rating errors, but in many of them it is difficult to tell whether the change in rating behavior reflected greater accuracy or just substituted one inaccurate rating pattern for another.

2.4.9 Fair Evaluation

Heneman et al (1989 p.164) say that if a measurement system reflects discrimination on the basis of age, sex or other similar factors, the subsequent action based on the results may have adverse impact on employees. For example, if older employees systematically receive lower performance appraisals than younger employees, but there are no time performance differences between younger and older employees, the older employee may be adversely affected in subsequent salary raises, promotions and participation in formal development activities.

On his part, Stephen P. Robins (2003 p.221) says that a vital question to ask on performance appraisal is, “Do people see effort as leading to performance and performance to the rewards that they value?” This study will attempt to provide insight to these questions.

2.5 Summary and Gaps to be filled

The above review depicts the scenario of performance appraisal being dynamic and complex in nature because of the high level of subjectivity in the whole process. This study went further a field
and looked at factors that influence the performance appraisal at KEMU and the causal effect this has on the realization of both employee and organizational objectives.

2.6 Conceptual Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Effects on Individual targets</th>
<th>Effects on Organizational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room setting</td>
<td>Extremely good</td>
<td>Excellent achievement</td>
<td>Excellently achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser/appraisee</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Highly achieved</td>
<td>Highly achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centered appraisal</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair appraisal</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fairly achieved</td>
<td>Fairly Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame in</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poorly achieved</td>
<td>Poorly achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Conceptual Model

The above model depicts how various attributes in a performance appraisal process may affect the individual and the organizational objectives. The study will tried to find out how the attributes so applied are viewed by the employees and how this affects the individual and organization targets.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This Chapter describes the methodology that was used including the study design, study site, study sample and its selection and sampling procedure and the research instruments.

3.2 Research Design

Descriptive survey research method was used as it helped describe the current status regarding the employees' views of the manner in which performance appraisal was conducted at Kenya Methodist University. Gay (1981 p.155) defines a survey as an attempt to collect data from members of a population in order to determine the status of the population with respect to one or more valuables. He further says that a descriptive study determines and reports the way things are and commonly involves assessing attitudes and opinions towards individuals, organizations and procedures.

3.4 Target Population

The target population for the study comprised of the employees of the University who included both the senior staff/managers in job group (MU 10 -16) and employees of the lower cadre (MU 1-9). Among the former and later cadres were employees both in the administrative departments and those in the academic departments. Total population of the study was 176 from which a sample population of 58 was selected.

3.4.1 Sample Selection

The researcher clustered the category of the employees that the questionnaire will be administered to. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Description</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) General Employees (administrative And Academic)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) Heads of sections/Departments  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(i) The general employees that have no position of leadership.
(ii) The heads of sections and departments that appraise employees under them.

3.5 **Sampling Method**

The researcher used systematic random sampling to get the required sample of population. This entailed the initial use of simple random sampling to get the number, say 5.

Based on that number, the researcher picked every 5th number of the population until the sample size was arrived at.

3.6 **Research Instruments**

The realization of objectives of this study required that the researcher use questionnaires as the main research instruments. These will be distributed to the sampled population and thereafter had them collected for analysis.

3.6.1 **Questionnaires**

Three types of questionnaires were used and these are:-

- Questionnaire for the general employees sampled from all departments.
- Questionnaire for the Heads of Departments.

The design for the questionnaires included both open-ended and closed questions which the respondents were expected to complete. The former enabled the respondent to give his/her feeling about a particular question asked whereas the latter gave the respondent a choice of responses through which they could choose from.
To win a favourable rapport with the respondent, the researcher explained the nature of the study through a covering letter that was attached to questionnaires.

3.7 Data Analysis and interpretation

Kombo D. K. and Tromp DLA (2006 117) puts data analysis as examining what has been collected in a survey or experiment and making deductions and influences.

Data collected was edited, coded and analyzed using both qualitative for non-figure based data and quantitative techniques for figure based data. In this, the use of tables, graphs and pie charts was instrumental. Kombo D. K. and Tromp DLA (2006 118) says the following qualitative research involves intensive data collection over an extended period of time in a natural setting. Specifically, the researcher will use the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) to analyze the data. This analysis was based on the coded data generated from the field.

3.8 Expected Output

It is expected that the manner in which performance appraisal was conducted would be viewed differently by the employees of the university.

Those that appeared to have benefited from the system of appraisal in any form positively view of the process of appraisal as effective.

However, observations made in the previously conducted performance appraisal had a pointer to the fact that majority of the employees regarded the process as ineffective. In this study it was expected that suggestions would be made by the employees on how the ineffective critical issues could be addressed.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 Data Analysis and Interpretation

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains presentations of the results and findings of the study. All completed questionnaires were edited for completeness and consistency before analysis. Data analysis was guided by objective presented in Chapter one. The data was summarized using frequencies, pie charts, percentages and mean scores.

4.2 An Analysis of Appraisal Process as Viewed by General Staff at Kenya Methodist University

4.2.1 Appraisal periods at the University

Table 1: Appraisal periods at the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 indicates the time frames that appraisal are conducted at the University. 77.4% put it that they had been appraised annually, 12.9 percent after six months while a small percent of 3.2 was appraised after 3 months.

For consistence, it would be appropriate if the appraisals are held within the same time frame. Diversified timing is likely to generate diversified results of the performance appraisal.
4.2.2 Notice period given before appearing for the appraisal

Figure 2: Time Frame Given Before Appearing for Appraisal

Figure 1 reveals the time frame given to respondents to appear for the appraisal interview. 42 percent indicated that they were informed to prepare a week to the scheduled time, 23 percent were informed to appear for the appraisal immediately while 35 percent falls under other time frame other than those indicated above. It would be more appropriate to give the appraises two weeks notice to enable them appropriately reflect on their performance during the whole of the review period. Regrettably 23% of the respondents indicated to have been informed to appear for the appraisal immediately. Such appraisees may feel unprepared and may not contribute towards the appraisal effectively.

4.2.3 Appraisees comment on notice period
4.2.3 Appraisees comment on notice period

Table 2: Comments on Prior Information of Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Sufficient</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sufficient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A simple majority (54.8%) of the respondents gave the time frame given prior to appraisal as being fairly sufficient while another 22.6% gave the time as not sufficient.

4.2.4 Prior information on reason for appraisal

Table 3: Informed on Reasons for Appraisal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A great majority (74.2%) of the respondents indicated that they were informed on why they had to be appraised while 25.8% said that they were never informed why they had to be appraised.

Feedback given by the appraisees on whether the time given to prepare or the appraisal interview is adequate may point at their ignorant that they should be given adequate time to prepare for the appraisal.
4.2.5 Overview of the appraisal content

A great majority (77.4%) of respondents indicated that issues of performance/career development are mainly discussed during the performance appraisal, while work improvement, expectations, job description took a 32% each. 12.9% represents those other issues discussed other than those discussed above.

The issues captured in the appraisal discussion generally reflect those that are advocated in the modern appraisal practice. Such kind of discussion would help improve both individual and organizational performance.
4.2.6 Reaction on the level of appraisee participation during the appraisal

Table 4: Was Appraisal Participatory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overwhelming majority (90.3%) of the respondents agreed that the appraisal was participatory while 9.7% indicated otherwise.

A participatory appraisal help cultivate a spirit of trust between the appraiser and the appraisee. However, we may only regard participation as effective if the appraisee is given at least 50% of the time to contribute. Interestingly 48.4% of the respondents indicated to have been given less than 50% of time to contribute towards the appraisal (please see table 6 below).

4.2.7 Appraisee time apportionment during the appraisal interview

Table 5: Your time apportionment during appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>90 to 100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71 to 80%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 to 70%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that a simple majority of 48.4 of respondents were allocated less than 30% of the appraisal time to contribute towards the same. 22.6% were allowed 51 to 70% of the time, 16.1% was allocated 91-100% while a paltry 12.9% was allowed only 70 to 80% of the appraisal time.
It is noted that barely 51.6% of the respondents were given more than 50% of the appraisal time to contribute during the interview. Appraisers who give less than 50% of the time should be advised to adhere to modern accepted practice of granting appraisees enough time to contribute during the appraisal interview.

4.2.8 Appraisers view on participatory time

Table 6: Views on you Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Too Short</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 indicates that a simple majority of 54.8% of the respondents felt that the allocated time was long enough while 29.0% felt the allocated time was too short. 9.7% of was indifferent while 6.5% agreed that both the appraiser and appraisee spent 50% of the allocated time during the appraisal.

Much as more than half of the respondents indicated that they were allocated more than 50% of the time, appraisers who allocate less than 50% of the time should be encouraged to improve. If the appraisals are yield any positive results.
4.2.9 Appraisal dwelt on major incidences.

Figure 4 Appraisal dwelt on major incidences

Figure 4 shows that 71% of respondents agreed that the appraiser dwelt on major incidences while 29% felt otherwise. It appears reasonably satisfactory that the appraisers dwelt on major incidences for discussion during the appraisal. Such incidences help the appraiser to make realistic and evaluation of his/her appraisees. What we need to ask ourselves the timing of occurrence captured during the interview. This is revealed in table 9 below.
4.2.10 When major incidences occurred

Table 7: When Major Incidences had Occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Review Period</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle of Review Period</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few Months Before Review Period</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Committal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows that 19.4% of the respondents agreed that incidences that were discussed during the appraisal were at the beginning of the review period, another 19.4% indicated the incidences occurred at the middle of the review period. While another 19.4% said that the incidences had occurred just before the review period. 35% had their incidences considered falling outside the time spelt down, 6.5% of the respondents were non committal.

This kind of scenario is likely to bring unbalanced appraisal results if all the incidences that had occurred the appraisal interview are not taken into consideration.

4.2.11 Feeling on timing of occurrence of major incidences

Table 8: Your Feelings on Major Incidences Occurrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Committal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows that 29.0% of the respondents indicated that timing of when the incidences being considered had occurred in the appraisal was poor. 19.4% percent felt it was okay, 16.1% felt there was need for improvement while another 16.1% was indifferent. Another 19.4% was non-committal.

This shows that there is need to impress on the appraisers to consider all the incidences that had occurred during the review period. The situation as it is now may not give a true picture of the appraisees performance thereby leading to dissatisfaction among them.

4.2.12 Appraisers verdict on appraisees performance

Figure 5 shows that a simple majority of 54.8% agreed that work was generally good while 29.0% said that work was exceptionally done. 9.7% of respondents had their work rates as below expectations while 6.5% had their work rated as fair.

Figure 5: Appraiser’s Verdict of Appraisees Performance
The above figures indicate that majority of employees were rated as having performed their duties in relation to the set target. It is expected that such high output by the employees should steer the organization to greater level of production.

4.2.13 Expectation on appraisers verdict on appraisees performance

Figure 6: Expectation on Appraisers Verdict on Appraiser’s Performance

Figure 6 shows that 77.4% of the respondents expected the verdict that was given by appraisers while 22.6% of the respondents said that their appraisers’ verdict were contrary to their expectations. The results of appraisal interview generally match the appraisees expectation.

A normal objective appraisal interview should give a picture that is acceptable to both the appraiser and appraisee if indeed there is open and free discussion of the appraisees performance during the whole of review period. The 26.4% of the appraisees that got the unexpected verdict may feel unfairly appraised and therefore may ultimately have negative about their performance. A discussion between the appraiser and the appraisee on why the latter’s results fell short of expectation would be very crucial.
4.2.14 Appraisers verdicts vis-a-vis appraisees’ expectation

Table 9: Appraisers verdicts vis-a-vis appraisees expectation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser Was</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser Was</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser Was</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher in an effort to find out reasons that may cause variations in verdict given in relation to the appraisees expectation asked them what they thought about that. Of the respondents interviewed, 38.7% said that the appraiser was biased, 32.3% said that the appraiser was objective while 29.0% indicated that the appraiser was strict.

The issue of strictness is acceptable so long as the appraisee is evaluated on realistic and reasonable objectives which should have been discussed between the appraiser and apprasiee at the beginning of the review period.

4.2.15 Employees feeling on the appraisers verdict

As shown in Table 10 below, 51.6% of the respondents are motivated by the verdict given by the appraisers, 38.7% were disillusioned while 9.7% were indifferent. The last two groups demonstrate lack of confidence in the appraisal process which may negatively impact on the organization performance. This is confirmed by the fact that 41.9% of the appraisees indicated that the results of the appraisal did not boost their morale while barely 58.1 percent indicated otherwise (please see table 13 below).
Table 10: Appraisees Feelings on the appraisers in Verdict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivated</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disillusioned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.16 Appraisees view of the appraisers’ competence to conduct the appraisal

Figure 7 shows that 83.9% of the respondents agreed that the appraiser was knowledgeable, 12.9% indicated that the appraiser was not knowledgeable while 3.2% did not give any comment.

Holding all other factors constant, it may be assumed that the results of the appraisal gives a true reflection of the situation on the ground.
4.2.17 Effect of appraisal results on morale

Table 11 shows that a simple majority of 58.1% of the respondent had their morale boosted by results of the appraisal. 41.9% of the respondent felt otherwise. To ensure that the appraisal boosts the morale of the appraisees across the board, parameter used to measure performance should clearly be explained to the appraisees.

Table 11: Did Results of the appraisal Results Boost Your Morale?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It emerged that simple majority indicated that the results of the appraisal boosted their morale to work harder while the other respondents indicated otherwise. This shows that there is need to find out why a reasonable number of respondents do feel encouraged by the results of the appraisal.

4.2.18 Fairness in appraisal

Table 12: Was Appraisal Fair?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that majority of the respondents indicated that the performance appraisal was fair while 32.3% of the respondents indicated that the appraisal was not fair.
4.2.19 Causes of unfairness in appraisal.

Table 13: Why You Think Appraisal was Unfair?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectively done</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent Appraisers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Clear Objectives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sought to find out why some respondents felt the appraisal was unfair. Table 13 shows that 29.0% of the respondent felt that the appraiser was subjective, 19.4% was indifferent, and 16.1% said that the appraisal is poorly organized; while another 16.1% said that there were incompetent appraisers.

The above responses indicate that the University need to improve on how it organizes the appraisal exercise. Clear objectives should be spelt-out as the appraisers endeavour to increase their level of competence. Issues of subjectivity should be completely discarded.

4.2.20: Releasing of review results

Table 14: How Soon You Got Review Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 2 Weeks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After one month</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 shows that 41.9% of the respondents got results of their appraisal one month after the appraisal. 19.4% got results after 2 weeks while 16.1% got the results immediately. It is noted that 21.6% never got back the feedback, all results should be processed and released almost at the same time. Regrettably 22.6% claimed not to have received their results. Such employees may not know which areas to improve on. It is thus imperative that employees get results of the appraisal with appropriate recommendations.

4.2.21 Relationship between Appraisal and Working Harder

Figure 8: Relationship between Appraisal and Working Harder

Figure 8 show that 61.3% of the respondents were encouraged to work harder by results of the appraisal while 38.7% indicated otherwise. Much as a reasonable number are encouraged to work harder there is need to find out others felt discouraged. Such group should be helped as appropriate.
4.2.22 Level of disappointment in appraisal

### Table 15

**Why Did Appraisal Disappoint**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Recognition of Inputs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Was Unclear</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was Ignorant of Appraisal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Committal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sought to find out why some respondents felt disappointed by the appraisal. Table 15 shows that 35.5% felt that the appraisal had no recognition of inputs, 16.1% felt that the appraisal was unclear, another 16.1% felt the appraiser was ignorant of the appraisal process, another 16.1% was indifferent while another 16.1% was non-committal.

This may be an indication that the appraisers do not have a holistic evaluation of the appraisees' inputs. Further the appraisal process need to be made clear to all the employees. This will definitely translate into the appraisees building confidence not only in the appraisal process but also in the appraisers.

### 4.3 An Analysis of the Head's of Departments/Sections Views on Performance Appraisal

The second category that was studied by the researcher were the Heads of Departments and Sections. The researcher sought to find out how their role in the appraisal process influences general performance appraisal at Kenya Methodist University.
4.3.1: Academic qualification of appraisers

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Qualifications</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Masters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sought to find out the academic qualifications of the Heads of Departments and Sections. Table 16 shows that 60% hold Master’s degree, 10.0% hold Bachelors, 10% hold Diploma, and 10% hold Certificate and another 10% fall under other’s category.

It is important that the University gets employees with higher academic qualifications to head the department and section especially in the sections headed by diploma and certificate level holders. This could explain why some appraisees felt the appraisers are not able to carry an objective appraisal.

4.3.2 Duration heads of departments and sections have held their positions

Table 17: Years Held the Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Held The Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 0 to 2 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 8 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows that 60.0% of respondents indicated that they have held their position for less than 2 years, 20% have had the positions for between 3-4 years and another 10%
have had the position between 4-8 years while another 10% have held the position over 8 years.

It may be reasonable to ensure that heads of departments and sections do not hold their positions for a very long period. Otherwise in a situation where a head of section does not get along well with an employee may always rate such employee poorly. Thus some appraisees may always be a victim of circumstance.

4.3.3 Employees in departments and sections

Table 18 shows that 50% of the respondents interviewed had between 4 and 5 employees in their departments, 30% have between 15 and 20 employees in their department while another 20% have over 20 employees working in their departments.

The numbers appear reasonable and manageable for effective supervision by the heads of departments and sections.

Table 18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 4 to 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 15 to 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4 Heads of departments and sections training in conducting performance appraisal

Table 19:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows that an overwhelming 90% of the respondents have never had any form of training on how to conduct performance appraisal while only 10% have had training on how to conduct performance appraisal.

An objective appraisal devoid of subjectivity may be realized if appraisers are trained on how to effectively conduct them. Majority of the appraisers have not been trained on how to conduct the appraisal a situation that can adversely affect the overall results of the appraisal interview. This is further confirmed by the appraisers responses that lack of training has to a great extent led to subjectivity in conducting performance appraisal (20%), it further leads to biased results (40%) and generally appraisals not well done (40%) as explained in table 22 below.
4.3.5 Effect of lack of training among the appraisers

Table 20:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did Lack of Training Affecting Your Appraising staff</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced Subjective Results</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced Biased Results</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Well Done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sought to find out the effect of lack of training on how to conduct performance appraisal may have affected the overall results. Table 20 shows that 40% of the results are normally biased, 20% produce subjective results, 10% are not well done while 30% produces other irregular results not indicated above.

The above responses by the appraisers are almost a reflection of the responses by the appraisees and which are quite telling that the University need to train its employees on the process and importance of conducting the appraisal if they are to overcome the above noted weaknesses.

4.3.6 Did appraisers give appraisees enough time to prepare for interview?

Table 21:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did You Give Staff Enough Time To Prepare for Interview</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 shows that of the respondents interviewed, 80% of the heads of departments gave their appraisees enough time to prepare for the interview while 20% indicated that they did not give them enough time to prepare.
The responses almost compare with those given by the appraisees where 22.65 said that time given to prepare was sufficient while 54.8 indicated that it was fairly sufficient. The few appraisers that are not giving their appraisees enough time to prepare for the appraisal interview should be advised to give enough time as required.

4.3.7 Preparedness of the appraisees during the appraisal interview

Table 22 shows that 60% of the appraisees are uneasy during the appraisal interview, 30% are confident while others were in situations falling outside what is given above. The fact that majority of the respondents are uneasy during the interview is a testimony that the appraisers may not have prepared them well to the extent that they (appraisees) may regard the interview as the forum condemnation.

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Prepared Were The Appraisees</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Were Confident</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were Uneasy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.8 Were the appraisees open and free during the interview?

Figure 9: Free and open discussion by the appraisees

Figure 9 indicates that 50% of the appraisees interviewed by Heads of Departments/Sections were open and free while the contrary was observed in the other 50%. Appraisees' openness during the appraisal depends to a large extent on how the appraiser create a conducive environment and encourages the appraisees to open up. The appraisee should strive to win the confidence of the appraisee if they are to feel part of the appraisal interview.
4.3.9 Why appraisees were not open and free during the interview

The researcher sought to find out why the appraisees are not open and free. Figure 10 shows that 30% of appraisees are ignorant of the purpose of appraisal, another 30% are not sure of expectations, 20% try to avoid conflict while another 20% fear to be victimized.

It also emerged that the appraisees do not wish to discuss sensitive matters during the appraisal. These are negative attributes that may hinder the objectivity of the appraisal interview thereby incapacitating the realization of both individual and organizational performance.
4.3.10 Recommendations that appraisers would come up with

Table 23:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations You Came Up With</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Promotions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demotions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 gives an overview of the recommendations that appraisers would normally come up with. 40% of the Heads of Departments/Sections can make recommendations on promotions, 50% for further training, while 10% make recommendations for demotions. These are some of the expected recommendations in appraisal system so long they are done with objectivity and fairness.

4.3.11 Variation of appraisers verdict by a higher committee.

Table 24:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was Your Verdicts Varied by Higher Committee</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sought to find out if recommendations made by Heads of Departments or Sections are varied by a higher committee. Table 24 shows that 60% indicated their
recommendations as having been varied by a higher committee while 40% indicated otherwise.

Much as variations may be effected if some irregularity has been noted in the preceding appraisal interview process, in a normal situation, an employee immediate supervisor knows the level of performance of employees working under them and thus their recommendations should be respected. Subjective variation of their recommendation may make them (appraisers) loose faith in the appraisal process.

4.3.12 Appraisers view on variations

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your View on The Variations</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should Not Be There</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Be Modest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should Be Varied Where Neccessary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an effort to find out the Heads of Departments/Sections reaction to the variations, responses given in table 25 shows that 40% of the Heads of Departments felt the variations should not be there, 30% felt the variations should be modest while another 30% felt that they should be varied as necessary.

There is mixed reaction on whether their recommendations should be varied. In all instances, variation should be an exception other than the rule.
4.3.13 Reasons why appraisers verdict are varied?

Table 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Poor Measuring Parameters</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 shows that 30% of the appraised results are varied because of poor measuring parameters, 50% because of the appraisers’ subjectivity while 20% are varied due to appraisers’ wrong perception.

The above reasons indicate that there are weak areas the University has to improve in such as devising proper measuring parameters, encouraging objective evaluation of the appraisees and fighting against employees’ wrong perception of the appraisal process.
4.3.14 Who gives feedback to employees?

Table 27:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Administrators</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 indicates that 70% of the feedback is given by Human Resources office while 30% is given by the Heads of Departments/Sections. It would be important if the practice is standardized to have the Human resources office charged with the responsibility of giving feedback to the employees on their performance evaluation. This will ensure that no employee is left-out from getting his/her results of the appraisal interview. The situation as it is now denies some appraisees knowledge on the areas to improve on.

4.3.15 How soon is feedback given?
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Figure 11: How soon is feedback given?
Figure 11 shows that 20% feedback on appraisal is given after one month, 40% is given after 3 weeks, 20% is given after 1 week while 20% is given almost immediately. Disparity is noted at the times feedback is given. A month’s duration appear adequate as to allow the offices concerned to make the necessary processing of raw data generated heads of departments and sections.

4.3.16 Appraisers feeling on feedback time

Table 28 shows that 40% of the Heads of Department/Section felt that the time framework giving feedback was okay, 40% felt it can be improved, 10% felt it is poor while another 10% felt it was counterproductive. The above figures shows that a reasonably big percentage of appraisees felt that the feedback time did not measure to their expectation. This is a strong indication that there is need to improve in that area.
4.3.17 Performance appraisal on staff/university performance

Table 29:

Performance appraisal influence on staff/university performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sought to find out if performance appraisal influences staff/company performance. Table 29 shows that 40% felt it has led to staff/company greater performance, another 40% felt that the staff/company performance are poor while 20% felt there is satisfactory staff/company performance.

It is generally noted that the appraisers agree that the performance appraisal has led to staff and company performance. However, the university should address those issues that may have prompted 40% of the respondents to indicate that performance appraisal has not led to both staff and company performance. Among the issues to address are subjectivity, biasness, competence of the appraisee to conduct the appraisal, discussion of all the major incidences that have occurred during the review period among others.
4.3.18 Why performance appraisal has not helped in both staff and university performance

Table 30:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Has Appraisal Not Helped</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Focus &amp; Vision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Proper Facilitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Skills &amp; Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a matter of confirming item 29 above, the researcher sought to find out why the appraisal may not have adequately enhanced greater staff/company performance. Table 32 shows that 30% of respondents felt that there was lack of focus, 50% felt there was subjective evaluation, 10% felt there was lack of proper facilitation while another 10% felt there was lack of skills and experience.

No performance appraisal may be rated as 100% perfect because the appraisers may not lack some level of subjectivity. However, devising proper measuring parameters and equipping the appraisers with the skills on how to conduct the appraisal will help produce more acceptable results.

4.4 Summary

An overview of the data analysis reveals that performance appraisal has had positive effects at the Kenya Methodist University. It is noted that appraisees generally indicated that they are satisfied with the process of performance appraisal although there were indication of appraisers disregarding practices such as according the appraisees enough time to contribute during the interview, failure to include all the major incidences that
had occurred during the review period, lack of effective recognition of employees inputs and variation of appraisers verdict on appraisees by a higher committee (performance appraisal panel committee).

The study also found out that feedback to the appraisees on their performance is done rather haphazardly without any time frame. Some respondents claimed not to have received any feedback on their performance evaluation. Centralization of this practice (giving feedback) to the human resources office was highly recommended.

The actual interview setting did not measure to modern appraisal practice Many respondents indicated never to have been informed on time when they were to be appraised. This could explain why (50%) of the respondents lacked confidence and were not open and free during the appraisal discussion.

Much as the appraisal process at the University has weaknesses which need to be addressed, it is noted with satisfaction that the process has been generally accepted as effective and has equally led to the realization of both the employees and Organizational performance.
Chapter Five

5.1 Introduction
This Chapter gives the recommendations and conclusions arising from the analysis of the previous Chapter (Chapter Four). The Chapter also incorporate what the researcher viewed as the limitations of this study including the suggestion for further research.

5.2 Recommendations

From the above discussion it is evident that performance appraisal are a necessary and inevitable practice in any organization. The analysis of data/information generated depicts a scenario of a system that is bedeviled with a bit of subjectivity. Based on that, the following recommendations are made.

Appraisers should be trained on how to conduct performance appraisal. This will reduce the level of subjectivity that appears to be quite critical in the area of study. From the previous discussion, it is noted that only 10% of the appraisers had been trained on how to conduct the performance appraisal. This means that the appraisers may not quite grasps the intricacies that involve the appraisal process thereby being open to a lot of subjectivity.

Performance appraisal process should be conducted in relation to how effectively an employee is able to realize both his/her individual objectives as well as the assigned organizational objectives. This can adequately be achieved if the appraisers are able to record all the major incidences that had occurred during the review period. The same should form the basis for the evaluation of the appraisees. Failure to capture all the incidences that have occurred during the review period may deter the effort of giving a holistic evaluation of the appraisees. This should guide the appraiser from bringing to focus only the most recent critical incidences.

Appraisers should also give their employees prior information on why and when they are to be appraised. This ensures that the appraisees are psychologically prepared thereby
help inculcate the spirit of open and free discussion between the appraiser and the appraisee.

Further mention should be made that the appraisees should be given at least 50% of the appraisal time to register their feelings, concerns and areas they need assistance from their supervisors. The appraiser should adequately respond to all issues raised. Such open discussion helps the appraisees to own the results of the appraisal.

It is further recommended that the appraiser’s recommendations on their appraisees should not be varied by the Appraisal panel committee unless there are glaring cases of oversight by the appraisers. This recommendation is made on the premise that appraisers know their subordinates better to the extent that they can reliably give a concise report on their level of performance. Haphazard variation of the results by the appraisal panel committee demotivates the appraisers who may end up regarding the process of appraisal as irrelevant and of no good consequence. Further, appraisers whose high rating by their superiors is reversed may feel disappointed and lack motivation to work harder.

Development of reliable measurement tools and parameters is also emphasized as crucial. This will help address the concerns of the appraisees who feel that there is unfairness in the appraisal process. Such development should address among others the issues on subjectivity, poor organization, and biasness among the appraisers that were noted as strong weakness among the appraisers.

5.3 Conclusion

The researcher’s perceived problem with the performance appraisal at the University was not as glaring as earlier perceived. It is noted that the appraisers and the appraisees registered a general satisfaction with the appraisal process. These therefore are taken as a true representation on the employees feeling about performance appraisal at the University.
However some weaknesses with the appraisal process have been noted. These include subjectivity among the appraisers, lack of appraiser’s competence to conduct the appraisal among others. It is important that these weaknesses are addressed adequately if the performance appraisal is to be more meaningful in future.

5.4 Limitations

The researcher carried out his study in a relatively sensitive area that the appraisees may have thought best to give responses that would make them appear not to be in conflict with what the University management uphold. It is through ‘hidden’ proof questions that the researcher was able to elicit important information that was critical in this study.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

A study to find the relationship between the performance appraisal and interdepartmental staff movement would be crucial.
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I am a post graduate student at Kenyatta University, Department of Business administration. Currently, I am carrying out a study on employees views on the process of performance appraisal and its effect on the achievement of the organizational objectives. From the study, I hope to draw broad conclusions so as to recommend on what should be done to make performance more meaningful and acceptable.

You have been selected to participate in this important research because of the important role you play as team player at KEMU. I consider your response invaluable to this research. Therefore, I kindly request you to complete the attached questionnaire as fully as possible. All information you provide will be treated with confidentiality and will be used solely for research purposes.

Thanking you for your cooperation

Yours faithfully,

Morris K. Muketha
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE TO GENERAL STAFF

1. Your Department: ___________________________ Section: ___________________________

2. Academic qualifications; (Diploma in Business Administration etc) __________________________

3. How long have you worked in the department? __________________________

4. Are performance appraisals conducted at the University? Yes/No: ______ Yes ______ No ______

5. If the answer to (7) above is yes, when were you last appraised on? __________

6. During the last performance appraisal performed to you, how long was the performance period that you were being appraised on?
   - One year [ ]
   - Six months [ ]
   - Three months [ ]
   - Others [ ]

7. How long before the appraisal interview were you informed that you would be appraised?
   - a. Immediately [ ]
   - b. After one week [ ]
   - c. Any other [ ]

   ___________________________ (please specify)
8. What is your feeling about the time frame between when you were informed you would be appraised and when the actual interview was conducted: 

9. Did your appraiser inform you why you were appraised? Yes  No

10. Briefly highlight what was discussed during the interview: 

11. Did your appraiser give you a chance to contribute towards the appraisal? Yes  No

12. If your answer to question (14) above is yes, what percentage of time did he give you? 

100-90% 80-70% 70-50% Below 50%

13. What is your feeling on (14) above?

14. Did the appraisal dwell on all the major incidences that had occurred during the review period? Yes  No

17. If the answer to (16) above is no, please tick when those incidences occurred. 

(i) At the beginning of review period 
(ii) At the middle of period under review 
(iii) Just a few months before the review period 
(iv) Any other (please specify)

18. What is your feeling on (17) above

19. What was your appraiser’s feeling about your performance during the review period (please tick where appropriate)

b. Work was exceptionally done 

c. Work was generally good 

d. Work was fair 

e. Work was below expectation

20. Did the appraiser’s assessment tally with your expectation? Yes  No
21. If No, why do you think there was this difference?
   The appraiser was objective
   The appraiser was biased
   The appraiser was strict

Any other, (please specify) ____________________________

22. In your opinion, did the appraiser sound knowledgeable to conduct the appraisal?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

   How has such revelation affected your view of performance appraisal
   1. Attach little meaning to appraisal ☐
   2. Indifferent about the appraisal ☐
   3. Disillusioned ☐
   4. Others (Please specify) ____________________________

23. How do you compare how your immediate supervisor appraised you with the final communication made to you after the evaluation of your performance by the performance appraisal panel?
   a. Results were the same ☐
   b. Results were better ☐
   c. Results were poor ☐
   d. Others ______________________________________ (please specify)

24. What was your feeling on that?
   a. Motivated ☐
   b. Disillusioned ☐
   c. Indifferent ☐

   Others (Please specify) ___________________________________________________________

25. Depending on your response to (23) above, did you feel more encouraged to put more efforts to meet your targets? ☐ Yes ☐ No __________________

26. In your own opinion would you regard the appraisal as being fair? Yes/No ______

27. If the answer to (26) above is no, please explain

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

28. How soon were you informed about the final results of your performance for the period under review?
Immediately ☐
After 2 weeks ☐
After 1 month ☐
Any other ☐ ____________________________ (Please specify)

29. Has the process of performance appraisal made you to work hard to meet your targets?  ❑ Yes ❑ No

30. If your answer to question (29) above is No, please explain why you held this attitude.
________________________________________________________________________________________

31. During your appraisal, were you rated as having met the set targets? Yes/No

32. If your answer to question (31) above is No, what may have caused you not to realize the set target?
________________________________________________________________________________________

33. If your answer to question (32) above is No, do you think your inadequate performance affected the improvement of the organizational performance? Yes/No

34. In your opinion, has performance appraisal helped to improve the organization's performance?
________________________________________________________________________________________

35. Are there situations the results of the performance appraisal discouraged you?  ❑ Yes ❑ No

36. What effect in your opinion has this had on your performance?
________________________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENT AND SECTION

1. Your Academic Qualifications: e.g. (Business Administration e.t.c)

2. Sex:

3. What level of responsibility do you hold? Section Head/Departmental Head?

4. How long have you been holding that position?

5. How many employees are in your unit?
   - Between 4-15
   - Between 10-15
   - Between 15-20
   - Above 20

6. Do you conduct performance appraisal to employees in your section? Yes No

7. If the answer to (6) above is Yes, after how long?
   - After one year
   - After six months
   - After four months
   - Others (please specify)

8. Have you ever been trained on how to conduct performance appraisal? Yes No

9. If No, how do you think this has affected the exercise of performance appraisal?
   - Results of the appraisal are subjective
   - Results of the appraisal are biased
   - Lacks basis knowledge on how to conduct appraisal
   - Any other
10. While appraising your employees, do you give enough time to prepare for the interview?  
   Yes  No

11. How prepared do you find the appraisees?  
   Are willing to be appraised  
   Are uneasy  
   Are indifferent  
   Others

12. During the interview, do the appraisee’s express their feelings on how they have fared during the review period?  
   Yes  No

13. If No, why do you think is the reason for this?

14. During the appraisal, what kind of recommendations would you make on a particular employee?  
   a. Promotion  
   b. Training  
   c. Demotion  
   d. Others (Please specify)

15. Are there situations the recommendations you make on an appraisee are varied by a higher committee?  
   Yes  No

16. If yes, what kind of variations have you noted in the past?

17. What is your view to these variations?  
   (i) Should never be there  
   (ii) Should be modest  
   (iii) May be varied as made necessary  
   (iv) Other

18. Why do you think there are variations on your recommendations?
19. Who gives feedback to the employees on how they have fared during the review period?

20. How soon is the feedback given?

21. What is your feeling on the time frame within which feedback is given?

22. How does the employees’ feedback affect their realization of organizational objectives and their set targets?

23. Do you think the current performance appraisal has helped the employees meet their targets and also the realization of organizational objectives? Yes/No

24. If No, what do you think is the cause for this?

25. In your own opinion would you regard the process of performance appraisal as fair?

Yes  No

26. If no, what improvements would you recommend towards the performance appraisal to enable meet its objective?