

Original Paper

Effectiveness of Employees' Performance Appraisal in the Nigerian Public Sector: An Empirical Study

Randy Oyovwevotu Sakpere^{1*}

¹ Department of Public Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University Ile-Ife, Nigeria

* Randy Oyovwevotu Sakpere, Department of Public Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University Ile-Ife, Nigeria

doi:10.22158/wjssr.v8n3p27

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/wjssr.v8n3p27>

Abstract

This study identified types of Performance Appraisal (PA) systems in use in the Nigerian public sector and investigated its effectiveness. It also examined the factors affecting effectiveness of PA systems in the Nigerian public sector. Purposive sampling technique was used in selecting top, middle and lower level staff from the various administrative departments within the selected Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs). The result identified annual review, general performance appraisal, evaluation studies, inventory turnover, performance reviews, 4-block metric reviews, performance improvement plans, employee self-appraisal and 360-degree performance appraisal systems as being used in the Nigerian public sector. However, only annual review, inventory turnover, performance reviews, employee self-appraisal and 360-degree appraisal are fairly effective on paper but not in practice. The finding also identified lack of objectivity, halo error, leniency, central tendency error, recent behavior bias, personal bias (stereotyping), manipulating the evaluation, employee anxiety, shifting standards, overall ratings, horn error, strictness and politicisation of rating as factors hindering the effectiveness of the appraisal system in the Nigerian Public sector. The study concluded that there are employee appraisal systems in place in the Nigerian Public Sector but they are not effectively implemented.

Keywords

Appraisal system, performance appraisal, employee performance, public sector, effectiveness, annual assessment

1. Introduction

The public sector in most countries is witnessing one form of reforms or another in order to position the service for efficient and effective service delivery that satisfies the needs and yearnings of members of the society. The essence of these reforms, according to Mayne and Zapico-Goni (1997), is to reinvent government. Faizal (2005) alleged that the process of reforming public administration is to improve service delivery with the available meagre resources. Otu and Anam (2018) admitted that effective service delivery by the public sector is a product of strong institutions. These institutions have put mechanisms in place to ensure that employee performance is measured in order to improve public service delivery. A key mechanism employed for carrying out reforms among the employees in the public sector is Performance Appraisal Systems (PAS).

Performance Appraisal (PA) describes the evaluation of employees in the workplace with regards to their performance at their undertaken job tasks. Landy, Zedeck and Cleveland (1983) recounts that PA or Performance Evaluation (PE) have been in existence and have been carried out since the times of Aristotle. Lopez (1968) asserted that the United States is considered to be the foremost country where legitimate employee PE or appraisal is believed to have evolved. And the appraisal was carried out in the United states military institution immediately after the inception of the republic. The regular evaluation of employee performance is expected to promote lucid or significant administrative decisions at the level of individual employee.

Some scholars and organisations (Thompson, Cook, Cottrell, Lewis, & Miller, 1998; CIPD, 2017; Bacal, 2007; Drucker, 2007; Heskett, 2006; Schuler & Jackson, 1996) describes PA as a strategic performance management mechanism employed by managers in assessing previous achievements and for planning subsequent advancement and enhancement of a particular employee performance vis-à-vis public sector performance. This is used for the transformation of organisational goals into personal goals. This benefits and outputs of PA led to its introduction in the Nigerian Public Sector. Administrators in public sector are continually under pressure to evaluate employee's performance, however, current system of PA in the public sector is inadequate to instill a culture of high performance.

The framework for assessing employees' performance in Nigerian public sector is neither comprehensive nor objective as it does not focus on performance planning and improvement. This has contributed to the less-dysfunctional PA structures and processes. Thus, despite the introduction of PA into the Nigerian public sector, the service is depicted by indiscipline, negligence, corruption, inefficiency, nepotism, absenteeism and unproductivity. This paper therefore identifies types of employees' PA systems utilised in Nigerian public sector, and assesses its effectiveness. It further examines the factors affecting the effectiveness of the employees' appraisal system in the Nigerian public sector.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Conceptual Clarification

Onah (2008) as cited in Sakpere (2014) avers that concepts suggest different meanings provided it is used in proper context. Effective PA system in the public sector has great impact on the success or failure of the service. Appraisal could be referred to as a process of evaluating the result of an employee effort in the course of discharging official duties within a period of time in an organization. In the same vein, Dyaji, Ibietan and Abasilim (2020) discloses that appraisal can be carried out frequently to evaluate the efficiency and quality of work done by an employee. Lambert, McCarthy, O'Donnell, and Wang (2009) concluded that the major aim of PA is to enhance productivity and competence level in the public service by obtaining useful evaluation of an employee performance based on how such an employee carries out job task in the service.

In time immemorial, appraisal procedure lay emphasis on employee traits, inadequacies and abilities. However, recent trend highlights current performance and future goals. It also emphasises employee's involvement in mutual setting of goals with supervisors. Hence Fletcher (2004) views PA as a plan of action employed in measuring employee's real performance in line with their ability to accomplish the goals of the organization. Armstrong (2004) describes PA as the process of evaluating employee's performance in order to recognise the development needs and ability, and ascertain how to enhance performance. In contrast, Wilson (2005) asserts that PA is neither a technique nor a single step, but a process that includes employee motivation to perform well, although, this has not been the situation in Nigeria public sector in particular, and Africa in general. Moura (2012) reveals that PA in the public sector is an essential tool for the achievement of a new culture, bearing in mind that only an assiduous unified appraisal model will expose discrepancy and deficiency of public organisations, in order to achieve their goals and, at the same time, involve all those who discharge their professional activity there. This is in contrast to the PA system in the Nigerian public sector.

Nevertheless, this paper aligns with the definitions of Robins and Couter (1999), who defines PA as the evaluation of an employee's job performance. This definition took into consideration two key purposes. First PA performs administrative function by producing data for instituting remuneration, promotion, and termination coupled with producing evidence that can support these decisions in court. Secondly, PA carries out a development purpose. The facts can be used to determine training needs, career planning etc. Feedback and coaching based on appraisal findings produces the rationale for enhancing routine performance.

2.2 Public Service and Performance Appraisal

The assertion by a section of the society that the public service in Sub-Sahara Africa is an inefficient, inept, corrupt and unproductive organization has attracted attention from scholars globally. One of such is Longenecker (1999) who reckoned that numerous rationales justifies the need for a comprehensive

PA system in an organization in order to discharge exact decisions as it affects promotions, demotions, pay packages and transfers. The appraisal of performance of public service employees is expected to improve their performance. In his own analysis, Mullins (1996) alleges that extensive appraisal is utilised to determine pay, job tasks, responsibilities, promotions and employees' training needs. This implies that PA system not only assists employees to know their strengths and weaknesses but it also helps managers to appropriate forecast and undertake actions timely to execute changes.

In recent years, all levels of governments globally have come under severe compulsion to enhance public sector performance. Some scholars (Parker and Guthrie, 1993; Clark and Corbett, 1999; O'Faircheallaigh et al, 1999; and Hoque and Moll, 2001) carried out studies on implementation of PA in Australia public sector and found that it is being implemented in the sector especially in the areas of health, employment, social welfare, education, and defence. Ho and Ni (2005) argues that performance assessment has been employed in public organisations for decades as an internal mechanism for assessing departmental operations and execute program and budgetary decisions.

Davis (1995) establish that PA is a mutual procedure which comprises both the superior officer (supervisor) and the subordinate, who recognise shared goals and linked it to the higher objectives of the institution. In the words of Wilson (2005), the nature of the PA is neither a technique nor a single step, it can be regarded as a continual process that includes employee motivation to perform well, knowledge of employees about what their managers expect of them and evaluation of their performance aimed at identifying areas where improvements are needed.

According to Armstrong (2001), unambiguousness and impartiality in utilising appraisal system is one of the key issues that has strengthened the employees' performance evaluation system. In the Nigerian public sector, a lot of staff have enjoyed promotion when they should be demoted because supervisors gave false ratings about their sub-ordinates. Mullins (1996) recounts that all-inclusive appraisal is exploited to determine wages, job tasks, responsibilities, promotions and training needs of employees. This is not the case in the Nigerian Public sector, where appraisal has no effect on employees' motivation or caution. Rather employees are promoted based on the number of years spent on the job. Performance appraisal system not only aids employees to identify his or her strengths and weaknesses but it also helps public sector managers to promptly make predictions and implement decisions instantly to unresolved changes.

2.3 Performance Appraisal Methods

McPheat (2009) recognises seven categories of PA system. Public sector managers have the opportunity to select the appropriate appraisal system for their respective units in the public organization. The seven appraisal systems recognised by Mcpheat include:

1. The 360 Degree Appraisal

This appraisal system is significant in that it provides specific public sector employees the opportunity to supply personal information through a questionnaire narrating their experiences. The feedback from colleagues through the questionnaire is reviewed by the public sector manager and considered during the appraisal.

2. The General Performance Appraisal

This appraisal technique covers existing correspondence between the supervisor (manager) and subordinates (employees) all through the year. Annually, the Board of Directors ascertains the extent to which goals and objectives set were actualized, provide feedbacks and create new goals.

3. The Administrative Performance Appraisal

This appraisal method lay emphasis on the technical skill of employees since they carry out specialised duties. They are evaluated on their specialised skills, quantity of work done, and many other duties they carry out.

4. The Managerial Performance Appraisal

This method of appraisal is employed in evaluating job and human resource skills of the public sector managers. Just like middle and lower cadre employees, the performance of managers of public organisations are also appraised. The feedback for this type of appraisal is obtained from team members without disclosing their identity.

5. The Employee Self-Appraisal

This appraisal procedure covers both job and human resource skills so that the public service officials could meet the needs of the society (clients). Both the superiors (managers) and the subordinates are mandated to carry out self-appraisal and this is followed by feedback from team members without disclosing their identity to ensure transparency, fairness and accountability.

6. Project Evaluation Review

This appraisal method is exploited to assess employee performance as it affects the project executed, and the assessment is performed out at the end of each project and not at the end of the year. This provides them with the necessary opportunities to make the needed amendments for the next project.

7. Sales Performance Appraisal

This appraisal technique is employed to evaluate achievements or attainments of sales performance. The salespersons are assessed based on their abilities to achieve sales targets, and are evaluated based on achieving their financial goals more than any other section of the organization, hence the need for consultations between a manager and salesperson so as to accomplish their goals or introduce changes that can assist them to attain their targets (McPheat, 2009).

2.4 Methods of Collecting Performance Appraisal Data

Muchinsky (2006) identified three major methods employed for obtaining PA data.

1) Objective production

This method relies on the electronic performance monitoring of data entry for workers, volumes of sales carried out and quantity of goods produced etc. The procedure employed for the evaluation of employees' performance depends on the job tasks of each employee. This procedure proffer clear-cut benchmarks, which is usually insufficient due to criterion contamination and criterion deficiency. Criterion contamination is a situation in which the criterion (response measure) is influenced by factors that are not related to the concept being measured. Criterion deficiency involves the aspect of the criteria that is left out i.e. that is not measured by the actual criteria. This implies that there is no correlation between the quality of products and quantity of production i.e. the quantity of production does not imply the quality of the products. Due to the deficiency of both types of criterion inadequacies, it has led to reduction in their validity (Muchinsky, 2006). In spite of the inadequate objective production data as regards job performance, such data is suitable for job performance.

2) Personnel

This method involves the documentation of withdrawal behaviours (i.e., absenteeism, accidents). Poor job performance in the Nigerian public sector can be attributed to employees indulging in absencing from duty without obtaining the required approval (Staw, 1986); however, this is subject to criterion deficiency. Muchinsky (2006) inferred that poor job performance is a product of excessive absenteeism and/or accidents, and that such personnel data is not an in-depth representation of an employee's performance.

3) Judgmental Evaluation

Judgmental evaluation is a combination of methods; hence it is considered methodology. Raters play significant roles in obtaining PAs, nevertheless, error will always be found in the data since the raters are human. Examples of errors found in ratings include central tendency errors, and errors as a result of halo effect. These errors occur from social cognition because the method of judging and evaluating employees in various contexts is connected with the manner of acquiring, processing and categorising information (Muchinsky, 2012).

An important piece of the judgmental evaluation is rater training. Rater training is the "process of educating raters in order to effectively undertake unbiased evaluation of performance, attained by curtailing the occurrences of halo, leniency, and central tendency errors (Muchinsky, 2012). Rater training also assist raters in developing a common viewpoint for assessment of each employee's performance (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 1998). Most scholars and public sector employees favour sound rater training. Nevertheless, such training is costly, time consuming, and only effective

for behavioural assessments (Sudarsan, 2009).

Another issue to consider is effects of rater motivation on judgmental evaluations. It is a frequent occurrence for raters to give higher ratings because the Nigerian public sector do not discipline raters for inaccurate appraisals. This has continually spurred public sector managers to give inaccurate rating to their subordinates in order to avert negative reprisals from subordinates. In the same vein, ratees' higher rating reflects favourably on the rater (Muchinsky, 2012). Muchinsky identified three major methods employed in judgmental performance appraisal.

- **Graphic Rating Scale:** this is the most frequently used method in PA, and it is used to assess subordinates on different factors on the extent of the trait they possess. The raters employ a 5- or 7-point scale; though there are as much as 20-point scales (Muchinsky, 2012).
- **Employee-Comparison Methods:** this scale is used to compare subordinates on pre-established criteria. This method eradicates preconceived central tendency and leniency errors, however, permits halo effect errors to take place. Muchinsky (2012) categorised employee-comparison methods into four, namely: rank-order, paired-comparison, forced-distribution and top-grading. The rank-order method is employed by raters to rank subordinates from "best" to "worst", but do not reveal how good or bad the subordinate is on a performance scale. The paired-comparison method stipulates that raters choose the two "best" subordinates out of a group on each scale then rank employees based on the frequency that a subordinate was chosen as one of the "best". The forced-distribution method is appropriate for large population of ratees. The raters appraise each subordinate on one or more proportion and places each subordinate in a 5 to 7 category normal distribution. The top-grading method can be applied to the forced distribution method (Smart, 2005). This method recognises 10% subordinates with the lowest performance, according to the forced distribution, and terminates them leaving the 90% higher performing subordinates (Muchinsky, 2012).
- **Behavioural Checklists and Scales:** behaviours are more explicit than attributes. The critical incidents method (or critical incident technique) concerns "specific behaviours typical of good or bad job performance" (Muchinsky, 2012). Supervisors record behaviours of what they consider suitable to be job performance, and they keep a record of good and bad behaviours. The Behaviourally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS) incorporate the critical incidents method with rating scale methods by rating performance on a scale but with the scale points being embedded in behavioural incidents (Muchinsky, 2012).

4) Peer and Self Assessments

While most judgmental PA research is assessed by supervisors in the public sector, peer assessments are carried out by an employee's colleagues. Self-assessments create opportunity for individuals to assess themselves (Muchinsky, 2012).

- Peer Assessments: In this method colleagues are saddled with the responsibility of evaluating and appraising performance of their colleague members (Muchinsky, 2012). There are three different types of peer assessments. *Peer nomination* entails that a member of the group recommends the “best” employee based on certain measures of performance. *Peer ratings* has each group member rate each other on a set of performance dimensions. *Peer ranking* expects each group member to rate all colleagues from “best” to “worst” on one or more measures of performance.
- Self-Assessments enables individuals to appraise their own behavior and job performance (Muchinsky, 2012). It is widely held for a graphic rating scale to be utilised for self-appraisal. Positive leniency tends to be a problem with self-assessments (Muchinsky, 2006).
- 360-Degree Feedback entails numerous appraisals of employees which often include assessments from superior(s), peers, and one’s self (Muchinsky, 2012).

2.5 Employee Reactions to Performance Appraisal

Several studies (Mumtaz, Buriro, Kalhoro, Ibrar, Buriro and Khoso, 2020; Nutakor, 2019; Aleassa 2014; Cook and Crossman, 2004) revealed that employees are dissatisfied with PA systems being implemented in the public sector. Studies identified subjectivity and rater bias as constraints affecting performance assessment in public sector organisations. Other studies (Balogun, 2017; Voußem, Kramer, and Schäffer, 2016; Harrington and Lee, 2014; and Rubin, 2011) revealed that public sector employees desire a transformation or a redesign in the PA system by making the system more objective, enhancing the feedback process, and increasing the frequency of review. In light of traditional PA operation defects, organisations are now increasingly introducing procedures that may enhance the system. These adjustments are particularly concerned with areas such as eradication of subjectivity and bias, training of appraisers, enhancement of feedback process and performance review discussion (Sudarsan, 2009). According to a meta-analysis of 27 field studies, employee involvement in his/her own appraisal process was positively correlated with employee reactions to the PA system. More specifically, employee participation in the appraisal process was greatly related to employee satisfaction with the PA system (Cawley, Keeping, & Levy, 1998). Concerning the dependability of employee reaction measures, scholars discovered employee reaction scales to be sound with few concerns through using a confirmatory factor analysis that is characteristic of employee reaction scales. Scholars advocate the study of employees’ reactions to PA is important because of two main reasons: employee reactions symbolises a basis of concern to practitioners of PAs and employee reactions have been linked through theory to integral parts of appraisal acceptance and success. Scholars translate these reasons into the perspective of the scientist-practitioner gap or the “lack of alignment between research and practice” (Keeping & Levy, 2000).

3. Method

Since the research was concerned with investigating the PA methods in operation in the federal public service, exploratory research was employed. The population comprised 16,853 top, middle and lower level staff in six selected Federal Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs). Purposive sampling procedure was employed in selecting 390 respondents derived using Taro Yamane sample formula. The respondents, consisting of raters and ratees, were drawn from the various departments and units of the selected MDAs in the Federal public sector. The six Ministries selected were Federal Ministries of Works and Housing, Agriculture, Education, Health, Defence, and Finance. The six federal departments selected were Nigeria Customs Service, Department of Petroleum Resources, Budget Office of the Federation, Federal Inland Revenue Service, Nigeria Immigration Service, and Debt Management Office. While the Six Federal Agencies selected were National Drug Law Enforcement Agency, National Emergency Management Agency, National Agency for Food and Drug Administration Control (NAFDAC), National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), Rural Electrification Agency, and Federal Environmental Protection Agency (FEPA).

The sample was drawn from the various administrative departments/units within the federal public sector. Questionnaire and interview schedules were the instruments utilized in obtaining data, and close ended questions constituted a larger part of the questionnaire that enabled respondents to select the better alternative that is appropriate for the definite requirement on a Likert scale of 1-5. This is to ensure that the primary data collected complement data obtained from secondary data such as official publications and periodicals. Data collected was analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and incorporated into in-depth interviews and literature findings through the use of content analysis.

4. Results

This section presents and discuss findings from items in the questionnaire that were administered to both senior and management staff of Federal Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs). Performance appraisal is essential in determining employee's effectiveness. This may be responsible for the various performance appraisal systems being employed by managers of the public sector to determine the extent of productivity level of employees. Table 1 shows the types of employees' PA system utilised in the Nigerian public sector.

4.1 Types of Employees' Performance Appraisal System used in the Nigerian Public Sector

Table 1 shows the result of chi-square analysis for types of performance measurement being used in the Nigerian public sector. The result revealed that annual review ($\chi^2 = 34.610$, $p < .05$) is positive and statistically significant, which implies that annual review is being utilised in Nigeria's public sector. For instance, in public Universities, annual review is employed in regrading employees to the next step of

the salary grade resulting in salary adjustment and increment. The Director of Human Resource Department in one of the federal agencies in an interview was of the view that this method is designed to enhance job understanding, facilitate effective job performance, and establish future goals for career advancement. However, it has failed due to fraud in the rating process by supervisors/managers of the public sector. A Deputy Director in one of the Ministries revealed that the common types of performance measurement utilised include annual review in order to identify employees that are due for promotion especially into the managerial cadre. The Director claimed this performance measure exist on paper but not in practice.

Also, the result showed that the general performance appraisal method ($\chi^2 = 34.805$, $p < .05$) is positive and statistically significant. It indicates that the general performance appraisal method is being implemented in the public sector. This result was affirmed by a Deputy Director of one of the selected federal ministries in an interview, who stated that this method is used to measure the output of staff and to evaluate its impact or outcome on the sectors achieved goals. In the same vein, the result revealed that balance score card ($\chi^2 = 6.317$, $p > .05$) is not statistically significant, which alludes that balance score card is not in use in the Nigerian public sector.

Furthermore, the result declared that benchmarking method is statistically not significant ($\chi^2 = 4.366$, $p > .05$), signifying that benchmarking is not executed in the country's public sector. Also, the result showed that inventory turnover method ($\chi^2 = 14.512$, $p < .05$) is positive and statistically significant. This insinuates that inventory turnover method is practiced in the public sector. Impact of this method is not noticeable in the performance of the federal ministries, departments and agencies. In like manner, the result showed that financial measures ($\chi^2 = 3.390$, $p > .05$) is statistically not significant, which connotes that financial measure is not in use in the public sector. Similarly, the result admitted that introductory measures ($\chi^2 = 3.976$, $p > .05$) is statistically not significant. This adduces that introductory measure is not employed in the public sector. Again, the result inferred that performance reviews ($\chi^2 = 23.683$, $p < .05$) is positive and statistically significant, which means that this method is currently in use in the public sector.

Furthermore, the result affirmed that four-block metric reviews ($\chi^2 = 9.049$, $p < .05$) is statistically significant. This infers that this method is practiced in the public sector but not effective. In the same way, the result showed that performance improvement plan ($\chi^2 = 16.073$, $p < .05$) is positive and statistically significant, which entails that this method is deployed in the public sector. In addition, the result enunciated that employee self-appraisal is positive ($\chi^2 = 18.220$, $p < .05$) and statistically significant, suggesting that employee self-appraisal is in operation in the public sector. The inventory turnover is deployed in the public sector because they are objective and publicly available from financial statements. Finally, the result established that 360-degree appraisal is positive ($\chi^2 = 21.112$, $p < .05$) and statistically significant, which suggests that 360-degree appraisal method is in operation in

the public sector. A Director of one of the selected federal agencies reported that this method allows peers and managers share feedback on employee's performance and team behavior, which aids employees to have a knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses. The feedback is then reviewed by the manager during the appraisal process.

Table 1. Chi square Analysis on Types of Performance Appraisal System Used in Nigerian Public Sector

S/N	Types of Performance Appraisal	χ^2	df	sig. (p)
1.	Annual Review	34.610	3	.000
2.	General Performance Appraisal	34.805	3	.000
3.	Balance Scorecard	6.317	3	.097
4.	Benchmarking	4.366	3	.225
5.	Evaluation Studies	12.561	3	.006
6.	Inventory Turnover	14.512	3	.002
7.	Financial Measures	3.390	3	.335
8.	Introductory Measures	3.976	3	.264
9.	Performance Reviews	23.683	3	.000
10.	4-Block Metric Reviews	9.049	3	.029
11.	Performance Improvement Plans	16.073	3	.001
12.	Employee Self Appraisal	18.220	3	.000
13.	360 degrees	21.112	3	.000

Source: Author's Field Report, 2021

4.2 Effectiveness of Employees' Performance Appraisal System in the Public Sector

Employee appraisal system is very essential to measure staff productivity, but more significant is its effectiveness. Table 2 shows the linear regression results indicating the effectiveness of employees' PA system deployed in the Nigerian public sector. The result shows that annual review is effective ($t=3.243$, $p<.05$) in the Nigerian public sector. This result validates the findings of Shawn Smith and Mazin (2011), who stated that the annual assessment form is a more comprehensive tool that has the capacity for evaluating traits and attributes of the ratee. Nevertheless, an Assistant Director in one of the Ministries observed that report of this appraisal method is shrouded in falsehood because the rater in the Nigerian public sector gives a false rating of the ratee. In many circumstances, an absentee and unpunctual subordinate is rated as being diligent and hardworking. This implies that the annual PA method is deployed but not effective in the public sector. Zenger (2017) recommended that for annual PA method to be effective, there is need for frequent dialogue with employees instead of annual

reviews; emphasis on future goals with explicit objectives, deadlines and involvement of employees instead of past performance; and avoid negative feedback instead, emphasising positive feedback which only improve interpersonal relationship with the official providing the feedback.

The result also reveals that general performance appraisal method is statistically not significant ($t=1.242$, $p>.05$) in the Nigerian public sector. This result was in consonance with the assertion of a Director in one of the ministries who stated that the practice of general PA in Nigeria's public sector is at variance with its principles and theory. This implies that general PA is not effective in the Nigerian public sector. The general PA is a continuing exchange of information between the manager and the employee throughout the year. And at the end of the year, the manager and the employee meet to ascertain the achievement of pre-set goals at the beginning of the year. Subsequently, the manager proffer feedback and establish new goals, and in turn prescribe training and development programmes that enhances employees' skill.

The result further shows that evaluation studies is statistically not significant ($t=1.481$, $p>.05$) in the Nigerian public sector. This result was corroborated by a head of unit in one of the federal agencies who observed that this method is not effective due to poor implementation. This method can only be effective when it is administered periodically or on an interim basis by external evaluators, either within or outside the public sector. Evaluation studies or program evaluation, according to General Accounting Office (GAO, 2003) appraises attainment of program objectives in the context of other aspects of program performance or in the context in which it occurs. The GAO recognized four main types, which uses measures of program performance, as well as other information, to acquire knowledge of the benefits of a program or how to improve it. GAO also identified process or implementation evaluation, which assesses the extent a programme is intended to operate. It evaluates the extent of conformity of program activities to statutory and regulatory requirements, program design, and professional standards or customer expectations.

In addition, result affirms that inventory turnover method is statistically significant ($t=1.974$, $p<.05$), which insinuates that this method is effective in the public sector. However, the reality on ground is that inventory turnover method is not efficiently utilised within the Nigerian public sector due to corruption tendencies that has overwhelmed the public sector. Inventory turnover is generally known to be an effective indicator of operational efficiency. Ballou (2000) admits that projections can be forecasted as to the possible benefit of aligning inventory management performance with the Nigerian public sector inventory control procedures. These projections can be broadened to show the effect of changing the way inventories are managed. The inventory turnover method is an efficient tool for auditing inventory management performance and evaluating the effect of management change in the Nigerian public sector.

Furthermore, the result discloses that performance reviews method is statistically significant ($t=2.119$, $p<.05$), which means that this method is effectively utilized in the Nigerian public sector. Nevertheless, the reality on ground shows that employees that have been queried for lateness and absenteeism are rated high by their supervisors and managers as being highly productive which implies that the deployment of this method is not effective. In contrast to what is occurring in the Nigerian public sector, Biswajeet (2009) averred that performance review assist management to obtain data on its human resources and utilise it to improve the receptivity of the organisation. Performance evaluation is carried out by human beings, who can be influenced by their emotions hence arbitrariness cannot be ruled out. The result reveals that 4-block metric reviews method is statistically not significant ($t=.692$, $p>.05$), which establishes that this method is not effective in Nigerian public sector. Furthermore, the result indicates that performance improvement plans method is statistically not significant ($t=.692$, $p>.05$), indicating that this method is not effective in Nigerian public sector. The performance improvement plan (PIP), also referred to as performance action plan, is a tool to provide employee with performance deficiencies the opportunity to succeed. It may be used to address failures to meet specific job goals or to ameliorate behavior-related concerns. The significance of this method is that the outcome is suppose to serve as rationale for employment decisions such as promotions, terminations and transfers. Nonetheless, the reality on ground is that the PIP is not considered in taking key decisions such as promotions, terminations and transfers. A Director in one of the Ministries reiterated this view that a staff of the ministry who is under discipline for a sackable offence was promoted because of his closeness to the Minister and the Permanent Secretary, since the staff runs both official and non-official duties for the duo.

Likewise, result shows that Employee Self-Appraisal (ESA) method is statistically significant ($t=3.084$, $p<.05$), implying that ESA is effective in Nigerian public sector. ESA tends to be more lenient, less variable, more biased and contrasted the rating of others. Employing self-evaluations in performance feedback is believed to lead to more constructive evaluation interviews, less defensive during the appraisal process and higher level of commitment to organisational goals (Nelson & Quick, 2009). ESA-rating tend to influence judgement of supervisors, which usually lead to supervisors altering their ratings in a positive direction, so as to give employees higher rating (Grobler *et al.*, 2011).

The result affirms that 360-degrees method ($t=3.102$, $p<.05$), is statistically significant, meaning that this method is deployed but not effective in the public sector. Swanepoel, Erasmus, and Schenk (2010) regarded the 360-degrees PA as one that receives appraisal feedback from all directions, namely the direct supervisor, colleagues and co-workers, subordinates and in special cases from clients. Hence, it is referred to as a multiple rater approach designed to evaluate employee work performance. Bateman and Snell (2013: 374) admitted that the ratee could be allowed to choose the raters, though it will require the approval of the manager. The merit of this appraisal method is that it brings to fore the strengths

and weaknesses of the ratee. However, in situations where the raters are colleagues the outcome is usually beclouded with sentiments and emotions that will not reflect the true attitudes and traits of the ratee. A Director in one of the parastatals revealed that employee PA is not relied upon in the promotion or reward of staff hence, it is not effective in achieving its objectives, and since managers and supervisors have not attach any importance to the issue of employee PA, those saddled with supplying the needed information, do not give true and accurate data concerning the performance of their subordinates.

Table 2. Linear Regression Analysis on Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal Systems Deployed in Nigeria's Public Sector

S/N	Types of Performance Appraisal	β	Std. error	t	sig. (p)
1.	Annual Review	.617	.190	3.243	.002
2.	General Performance Appraisal	.244	.196	1.242	.222
3.	Evaluation Studies	.284	.192	1.481	.147
4.	Inventory Turnover	.247	.125	1.974	.055
5.	Performance Reviews	.396	.187	2.119	.041
6.	4-Block Metric Reviews	.137	.199	.692	.493
7.	Performance Improvement Plans	.050	.201	.247	.806
8.	Employee Self Appraisal	.436	.173	3.084	.004
9.	360 degrees	.509	.186	3.102	.003

Source: Author's Field Report, 2021

4.3 Factors affecting Effectiveness of Employees' Performance Appraisal System in Nigeria's Public Sector

Effectiveness of employees' PA system could result in productivity of the employees vis-à-vis that of the organisation, however, it is hindered by variety of factors. Table 3 shows the mean values of the factors affecting the effectiveness of employees' PA system in the Nigerian Public Sector. Grobler *et al.* (2011) proposed factors affecting effectiveness of employees' PA system was adopted for this study on a 5-point Likert scale. The values of the measures of central tendency (mean) reveal that the respondents tend to show that appraisal distress (\bar{X} = 4.17) have a very high negative impact on the effectiveness of employees' PA in the Nigerian public sector. This result corroborated the assertion of Lawler (1994), who acknowledged lack of motivation or development from PA systems as the cause of appraisal distress. Lawler also argued that appraisal distress trigger disagreement between supervisors and subordinates leading to abnormal behaviours.

Also, lack of objectivity ($\bar{X} = 3.88$) have a high negative impact on PA, corroborating the findings of Grint (1993) who avers that the jettisoning of top down ratings by raters and their substitution with multiple-rater evaluation and this endeavour to deal with bias and objectivity by upward PA. The validity of upward appraisal means the discarding of subjective appraisal ratings. This approach is believed to deal with gender discrimination against women in appraisal ratings (Fletcher, 1999).

Furthermore, halo error ($\bar{X} = 3.78$) have a high negative impact on PA. This view was in agreement with the views of Grobler *et al.* (2011) who stated that halo error occurs when a rater allows a particular aspect of an employee's performance sway the assessment of other aspects of the performance resulting in a lower rating. Training of supervisors on PA can ensure that halo error is reduced. This implies that raters should be trained to know that all jobs need the utilisation of many skills and behaviours, and such training should lay emphasis on the fact that employees will perform excellently in some jobs and poorly in others, hence, training and coaching should focus on those areas where employees performed poorly in. In the same vein, leniency ($\bar{X} = 3.66$) have a high negative impact on PA. The result supported the findings of Grobler *et al.* (2011) who admitted that leniency occurs when inexperienced or poor raters may decide that the easiest way to appraise performance is simply to give everyone a high evaluation. Thus, leniency could be described as allocating unjustified high ratings to an employee, and it is inspired by an intent to prevent contention concerning the appraisal, which may lead to inability to identify deficiencies that would otherwise be corrected. Finally, leniency will hinder the public sector, as it is currently, to lay off employees whose performance is very poor.

Moreover, central tendency error ($\bar{X} = 3.92$) have a high negative impact on performance appraisal. This result validates the affirmation of Grobler *et al.* (2011) who noted that most raters, as in the Nigerian public sector, favour easiest way of rating subordinates as average. The anguish of central tendency occurs when raters cannot appraise ratees' performance without prejudice as a result of lack of familiarity with the work, a lack of supervisory ability or a fear that they will be criticised if they evaluate individuals too highly or too strictly. However, this error does exist and it influences the accuracy of evaluations. In like manner, recent behaviour bias ($\bar{X} = 3.54$) also have a high negative impact on PA. Also, this result was in harmony with the views of Grobler *et al.* (2011), who averred that employee PA is influenced by the employee most recent behaviour, thereby disregarding the employee past behaviour during the period under review. Hence, formal PAs generally cover a specified time, and an individual's performance over the entire period should be considered. Thus, maintaining records of performance throughout the appraisal period helps avoid recent behaviour bias.

Similarly, personal bias (stereotyping) ($\bar{X} = 3.63$) have a high negative impact on PA. This is the most frequent error that occurs during PA in the Nigerian public sector. Grobler *et al.* (2011) argued that personal bias is not related to job performance but may arise from personal traits such as age, sex, disability, and race or from organizationally related characteristics, such as seniority, membership of an

organisation's athletic team or friendship with top administrators. In the same vein, manipulating the evaluation ($\bar{X} = 3.74$) have a high negative impact on PA. Grobler *et al.* (2011) argue that since managers (raters) control every area of the appraisal process, this places them at vantage position to manipulate the system; as is the case in the Nigerian public sector. This occurs frequently in the public sector when superior/supervisor intend favouring a subordinate by allotting unmerited high-performance rating, whereas they award low rating to another subordinate employee who is productive because they want to protect their favoured employee.

Likewise, employee anxiety ($\bar{X} = 3.81$) have a high negative impact on performance appraisal. This result was in consonance with the findings of Clausen, Jones, and Rich (2008), who established that the evaluation process may give rise to anxiety for the appraised employee. This could also come in the guise of dissatisfaction, lack of interest, and employee resignation rate, which could affect the prospects for promotion, better work assignments, and increased compensation, because it depends on the results of evaluation. This could lead to both uneasiness and complete defiance.

Also, shifting standards ($\bar{X} = 3.76$) have a high negative impact on PA. This result affirms the findings of Grobler *et al.* (2011) who posited that PA should be based on unwavering and equitable standards, since it may mislead employees and the public sector may not be able to determine who is qualified for promotion. In like manner, overall ratings ($\bar{X} = 3.72$) have a high negative impact on PA. The result was in agreement with the findings of Grobler *et al.* (2011), who argued that many appraisal forms expect the rater to provide an overall rating of an employee's performance including evaluations of specific performance areas. In most cases, compensation decisions such enhancement of wages and bonuses are determined by the ratee's overall rating. Supervisors must rate employee as "outstanding above average", "doing an average job", "substandard but making progress" or "definitely unsatisfactory". It is arduous for the rater to combine all the separate performance measurements into one accurate overall rating.

Furthermore, horn error ($\bar{X} = 3.77$) have a high negative impact on PA. This error takes place when a rater conclude that mediocre performance lead to lower rating. Similarly, strictness ($\bar{X} = 3.85$) have a high negative impact on PA. The result corroborates the views of Grobler *et al.* (2011) who inferred that raters sometimes consistently allot low ratings even though some employees may have achieved an average or above-average level of performance. Raters are often culpable in their ratings because they feel that none of the ratees are living up to standards of excellence. Finally, politicization of rating ($\bar{X} = 3.91$) have a high negative impact on PA. This view was validated by a Director in an interview that just like in the larger society, staff PA has been politicized and overshadowed with nepotism. She explained further that the issue of promotion is based on politics and closeness to the management, hence, staff PA is not effective and merely exist on papers but not in practice.

Table 3. Factors Hindering the Effectiveness of Employees' Performance Appraisal System in OAU

S/N		Mean Score
1.	Appraiser distress	4.17
2.	Lack of objectivity	3.88
3.	Halo error	3.78
4.	Leniency	3.66
5.	Central tendency error	3.92
6.	Recent behavior bias	3.54
7.	Personal Bias (Stereotyping)	3.63
8.	Manipulating the Evaluation	3.74
9.	Employee Anxiety	3.81
10.	Shifting standards	3.76
11.	Overall ratings	3.72
12.	Horn error	3.77
13.	Strictness	3.85
14.	Politicisation of rating	3.91

Source: Author's Field Report, 2021

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The study identified annual review, general performance appraisal, inventory turnover, performance reviews, performance improvement plan, employee self-appraisal and 360-degree appraisal methods as the typical performance appraisal methods utilised in Nigerian public sector. The result revealed that these appraisal systems are being used in order to identify employees for promotion to the next grade thereby resulting in salary adjustment and increment. However, as a result of politicisation of these appraisal systems, they have failed to achieve their goal because the ratings are not the actual performance of the employees as reported by supervisors/managers of the public sector. The appraisal systems exist on paper but not in practice.

The study also determines the effectiveness of the appraisal systems being utilised in the Nigerian public sector. The study discovered that annual review is effectively deployed in the Nigerian public sector, nevertheless, in terms of outcome, it is not effective because it only assess past performance and do not emphasise future goals with explicit objectives and deadlines. The result also reveals that usage of inventory turnover method is effective in the public sector, however, it is not efficiently deployed within the Nigerian public sector due to corruption tendencies that has influence its utilisation. Likewise, performance reviews is being used in the Nigerian public sector, although its deployment is

not effective, in that it has not assist public sector organisations in obtaining data on its human resources.

In the same vein, Employee Self-Appraisal (ESA) is effective in the Nigerian public sector. Nonetheless, its liberal nature and being more biased affects its ability to bring about a genuine rating, and its effective utilisation in the Nigerian public sector remains elusive. The study adopted Grobler *et al.* (2011) factors affecting effectiveness of employees' PA system and the result affirmed that appraisal distress in most occasion causes conflict between raters and ratees resulting unethical conducts in the Nigerian public sector. In the same vein, lack of objectivity promote multiple-rater assessment, which prevents top down ratings by raters and this approach according to Fletcher (1999) fails to deal with gender discrimination against women in appraisal ratings. Also, halo error could lead to poor rating when a rater use a particular characteristic of a subordinate to determine the appraisal of other attributes of the employee performance. Furthermore, leniency as an attribute is found mostly in inexperienced raters who gives false ratings of employees, thus leading to the retention of employees that are suppose to be laid off. This may be responsible for the inefficient public sector in Nigeria.

In addition, central tendency error gives room for bias because the raters do not have adequate knowledge of the ratee's job tasks, hence raters most times rate employees average in order to prevent criticism. Similarly, recent behaviour bias appraise employee recent attitude to work thereby disregarding the employee past attitude to duty during the period under review, since the appraisal do not cover a specified time. In like manner, personal bias (stereotyping) such as age, sex, disability, membership of association, closeness to superior officials and race could influence the rating process for or against a subordinate. Likewise, evaluation manipulation occurs mainly among the managers or superior officers who by virtue of their placement in top position of authority, could manipulate the appraisal system to favour a subordinate that do not merit the scores awarded to them.

In like manner, employee anxiety could occur when a subordinate feels discontent or shows an attitude of apathy as a result of the appraisal process, which could hinder the employee's opportunity to be elevated or promoted and enjoy enhanced remuneration. Moreover, shifting standards is another factor that affects effectiveness of employees performance appraisal system in Nigerian public sector because it does not promote uniformity and equity in measuring employees performance. Also, overall rating affects effectiveness of employees performance appraisal system because it disregard scale rating for general or overall rating which may have lost sight of critical unit assessment or level appraisal such as excellent, very good, good, fair and poor.

Furthermore, horn error ($\bar{X} = 3.77$) have a high negative impact on PA. This error takes place when a rater conclude that mediocre performance lead to lower rating. Similarly, strictness ($\bar{X} = 3.85$) have a high negative impact on PA. The result corroborates the views of Grobler *et al.* (2011) who inferred that raters sometimes consistently allot low ratings even though some employees may have achieved an

average or above-average level of performance. Raters are often culpable in their ratings because they feel that none of the ratees are living up to standards of excellence. Finally, politicisation of rating ($\bar{X} = 3.91$) have a high negative impact on PA. This view was validated by a Director in an interview that just like in the larger society, staff PA has been politicised and overshadowed with nepotism. She explained further that the issue of promotion is based on politics and closeness to the management, hence, staff PA is not effective and merely exist on papers but not in practice.

The paper identified types of PA systems in use in Nigerian public sector and investigated effectiveness of the PA systems in the public sector. It then examined factors affecting effectiveness of PA systems in the Nigerian public sector. The study found that annual review, general PA, evaluation studies, inventory turnover, performance reviews, 4-block metric reviews, performance improvement plans, employee improvement plan, employee self-appraisal and 360 degrees are the appraisal systems in use in the Nigerian public sector. However, the study showed that annual review, inventory turnover, performance reviews, employee self-appraisal and 360 degrees were effective on paper but ineffective in practice.

Recommendations

In the light of the above findings and conclusions on the foregoing assessment of the PA systems in the Nigerian Public Sector, the following recommendations are important in improving the performance appraisal systems in the sector.

- 1) There is the need to put in place a policy that will recognize the existence of employee PA system, define the procedure through which the appraisal system should be carried out, remove or limit the effect of such factors so as to have a good and effective PA system and to stipulate the period when the appraisal will cover either yearly or quarterly.
- 2) Performance appraisal should not only be conducted to take promotion decisions, rather it should be able to guide the institution to identify training needs.
- 3) Employees should have adequate knowledge regarding the standards on which they are measured.
- 4) To increase the credibility of PA system there should be participation and ownership by the employees. In addition, adequate training, procedural justice, goal-setting and performance feedback are important factors in determining the success of appraisal system in the sector.
- 5) Managers of the public sector should carry out PA regularly and frequently in order to identify area of needs in improving the sector and employees' productivity.
- 6) The managers and supervisors should be sent on training in PA in order to be equipped in modern day performance measurement of the sector.

7) The results of the performance appraisal should be utilised for promotion or appointment into higher positions in order to promote efficiency and effectiveness in the sector.

References

- Armstrong, M. (2001). *Human Resource Management* (8th ed.). Practice, London: Kogan Page Publishers.
- Armstrong, M. (2004). *Handbook of human resource management practice* (9th ed.). London: Kogan Page.
- Bacal, R. (2003). *The Manager's Guide to Performance Reviews*. McGraw-Hill.
- Ballou, R. H. (2000). Evaluating inventory management performance using a turnover curve. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 30(1), 72-81.
- Bateman, & Snell. (2013). *Management: Leading and Collaborating in a Competitive World* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill International Edition.
- Biswajeet, P. (2009). Performance appraisal, employee development and organizational justice: Exploring the linkages. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(7), 1176-1194.
- Cawley, B. D., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (1998). Participation in the performance appraisal process and employee reactions: A meta-analytic review of field investigations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 615-633.
- Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development [CIPD]. (2017). *Performance appraisal: understand the basics of performance appraisals and how to ensure the process adds value to the organisation*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Clark, C., & Corbett, D. (1999). *Reforming the Public Sector Problems and Solutions*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Clausen, T. S., Jones, K. T., & Rich, J. S. (2008). Appraising Employee Performance Evaluation Systems. *CPA Journal*, 78, 64-67.
- Davis, R. (1995). *Choosing performance management*. New Delhi: Cupa Publication.
- Drucker, P. (2007). *People and Performance: The Best of Peter Drucker on Management*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Dyaji, G. M., Ibietan, J., & Abasilim, U. D. (2020). Performance Appraisal and Public Sector Productivity In Nigeria: Lessons From A Military Service Unit. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Reviews*, 10(1), 171-182.
- Faizal, M. (2005). *Institutionalisation of performance Appraisal system: A case of the Maldivian Public Service*. Master of Philosophy in Public Administration, Department of Administration and Organisation Theory, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.

- Fletcher, C. (1999). The implications of research on gender differences in self-assessment and 360 degree appraisal. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 9(1), 39-46.
- Fletcher, C. (2004). *Appraisal and feedback: Making performance review work* (3rd ed.). London: C.I.P.D.
- General Accounting Office [GAO]. (2003). Results-Oriented Cultures: Modern Performance Management Systems Are Needed to Effectively Support Pay for Performance. *General Accounting Office Reports & Testimony*. GAO-03-612T. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com.-accessedon15/6/2021>
- Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Balkin, D. B., & Cardy, R. L. (1998). *Managing human resources* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Grint, K. (1993). What's wrong with performance appraisals? A critique and a suggestion. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 3(3), 61-77.
- Grobler, A. Warnich, S., Carrel, R., Elbert, F., & Hatfiel, D. (2011). Effects of Strategic Performance Appraisal, Career Planning and Employee Participation on Organizational Commitment: An Empirical Study. *International Business Research*, 5(4), 124-133.
- Heskett, J. (2006). *What's to Be Done About Performance Reviews*. Harvard Business School-Working Knowledge for Business Leaders.
- Ho, A. T.-K., & Ni, A. Y. (2005). Have cities shifted to outcome-oriented performance reporting? A content analysis of city budgets. *Public Budgeting and Finance Summer*, 61-83.
- Hoque, Z., & Moll, J. (2001). Public sector reform: Implications for accounting, accountability and performance of state-owned entities—An Australian perspective. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 14(4), 304-326.
- Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (2000). Performance appraisal reactions: Measurement, modeling, and method bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 708-723.
- Lambert, R. G., McCarthy, C., O'Donnell, M., & Wang, C. (2009). Measuring elementary teacher stress and coping in the classroom: Validity evidence for the classroom appraisal of resources and demands. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(10), 973-988.
- Landy, F., Zedeck, S., & Cleveland, J. (1983). *Performance measurement and theory*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Lawler, E. E., (1994) Performance Management: The Next Generation. *Compensation and Benefits Review*, 26(3), 16-19.
- Longenecker, C. A. (1999). Creative Effective Performance Appraisals. *Ind. Manag*, 18-23.
- Lopez, F. M. (1968). *Evaluating employee performance*. Chicago, Illinois: Public Personnel Association.

- Mayne, J., & Zapico-Goni, E. (Eds.). (1997). *Performance monitoring for public sector reform: Future directions from international experience*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- McPheat, S. (2009). *Types of Performance Appraisals*. Retrieved from <http://www.m-t-d.co.uk/blog/types-of-performance-appraisals.htm>
- Miller, J. S. (2003). High tech and high performance: Managing appraisal in the information age. *Journal of Labor Research*, 24, 409-424.
- Moura, P. V. (2012). *A avaliação do desempenho na administração pública*. Coimbra: Coimbra Editora.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (2006). *Psychology applied to work* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (2012). *Psychology Applied to Work* (10th ed.). Summerfield, NC: Hypergraphic Press.
- Mullins, L. J. (1996). *Management and organizational behaviour*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. (2009). *Organizational Behaviour: Science, the Real World and You* (6th ed.). Mason, OH: Southwestern/Cengage.
- O'Faircheallaigh, C, Wanna, J., & Weller, P. (1999). *Public Sector Management in Australia: New Challenges, New Directions* (2nd ed.). Sydney: MacMillan Education Australia.
- Onah, R. (2008). *Trends and Challenges of Ethnic Nationalism in Nigeria: Lessons from the United States of America*. Retrieved from <http://www.unn.edu.ng/home/index.php/.../View-category>
- Parker, L., & Guthrie, J. (1993). The Australian public sector in the 1990s: New accountability regimes in motion. *Journal of International Accounting Auditing and Taxation*, 2(1), 59-81.
- Robins, S. P., & Couter, M. (1999). *Management* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Sakpere, O. R. (2014). Wealth Accumulation by Political Office Holders and its Impact on Poverty Incidence in Nigeria. *African Journal of Institutions and Development (AJID)*, IX(1&2),150-164.
- Schuler, R., & Jackson, S. (2006). *Human Resource Management: International Perspectives*. Canada: Thomson.
- Shawn, S. J. D., & Mazin, R. (2011). *The Human Resource Answer Book: An Indispensable Guide for Managers and Human Resources Professionals* (2nd ed.). New York: AMACOM.
- Smart, B. D. (2005). *Topgrading: How leading companies win by hiring, coaching, and keeping the best players*. New York, New York: Penguin Group.
- Staw, B. M. (1986). Organizational psychology and the pursuit of the happy/productive worker. *California Management Review*, 28(4), 40-53.
- Sudarsan, A. (2009). Performance appraisal systems: A survey of organizational views. *The Icfai University Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 3(1), 54-69.
- Swanepoel, J. Erasmus, J., & Schenk, H. (2010). *South African Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice* (4th ed.). London: Kogan Page.

- Thompson, J., Cook, M., Cottrell, D., Lewis, R., & Miller, B. (1998). Developing an Institutional Framework for Rewarding Excellence in Teaching: A Case Study. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 6(2). Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>.-accessedon117/7/2021
- Wilson, J. P. (2005). *Human Resource Development* (2nd ed.). London: Kogan Page.
- Zenger, J. (2017). The 6 Vital Elements of Effective Performance Management Systems. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jackzenger/2017/02/16/the-6-vital-elements-of-effective-performance-management-systems/?sh=17eca5da618e>