



**STAFF EVALUATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL  
PERFORMANCE IN LIMITED LIABILITY  
COMPANY: THE NEXUS**

**BASHARI HADIZA; & BELLO DOGOJI ADAMU**

*Department of Business Administration, the Federal Polytechnic, Bauchi*

**Abstract**

*This study examined the relationship between annual staff evaluation and organizational performance, enhance productivity in an organization and determine training needs of workers, also helps an organization to place employees in tasks they are best suited for in order to improve productivity, when productivity is improved it leads to increased earnings in the organization. The study adopted a descriptive design. A twenty-item unstructured questionnaire was used to assess 450 randomly selected staffs on effect of staff evaluation on organizational performance in Ramadan Press Ltd, Bauchi, Nigeria. Three research questions and two hypotheses were used as guides to the study. Data obtained were analyzed using descriptive statistics Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The major findings revealed that there is a significant and positive relationship between staff Evaluation and Organizational Performance, and that staff evaluation is useful in improving the productivity as well as identifying training need of employees in an organization. Because of its importance management of the organization should educate the employees on the purpose of Staff evaluation exercise so that they are clearly aware that it is not a weapon of punishment but an instrument designed to assist them to grow and improve, and management should organize course for managers on how to carry out a successful staff evaluation of their subordinates.*

**Key words:** *Staff Evaluation, productivity, training, Organizational Performance.*

**INTRODUCTION**

The principal purpose of acquiring human resources in any organization is to aid in the actualization of the organizational objectives. However, productivity targets vary from reality or actual performance because of ranges of variables. Environment: human technology, organizational and so on. The task of management is on these variables which have constituted themselves as obstacles to productivity in

opportunity for productivity. Hence herald a tedious task of personnel managers in any organization.

Staff evaluation (performance Appraisal) is done on an employee's job performance over a specific period of time. It is the equivalent of a report card on an employee and how their managers assess their performance over the prior year. Anyone who has worked in more than one department or in more than one company will attest to the fact that not all staff evaluation processes are the same. The varying systems and processes are application in many organizations. Unfortunately, some are done so poorly that they are not only designed to fail, but also to create a negative experience for both the manager as well as the employee.

Employees are the most valuable assets in an organization and as such, the most dynamic of all the organization's resources. Human resources of an organization should be given much or the desired attention from management. If the stated goals and objectives of an organization is to be achieved as stated or enshrined in the vision and mission statement of the corporate plan, the need for performance appraisal of the human resources is very necessary to achieve the stated objectives.

Thus, motivation, leadership, communication, work restructuring, payment system (remuneration), and training and development may all be included in the issues which management needs to give desirable attention.

Employees should be evaluated and assessed on their respective job function in line with the organization's performance measurement indices. Such employee should be proper training and promoted to handle higher challenges or tasks in the organization. Performance appraisal is one of the essential tools employed by modern organizations to achieve their broad organization goals and objectives and for career planning opportunities, mobility, new tools of vocational specification and changes in status.

Many evaluations provide quantitative measurements essential for a production-oriented work environment. Other employee evaluations provide employers with metrics regarding the quality of employees' work. The importance of an employee evaluation is that it's instrumental in determining whether an employee's skill set is appropriately matched to the employee's job.

Organization must continually assess their employees' strengths and weaknesses. By doing so, employers are better able to match employee qualification to job assignments. Employee evaluations provide an assessment of the strengths and weakness for individual employees as well as the collective talents of employees by department or team. For example, an employee evaluation can reveal whether your employees have strong proficiency in computer software application for finance use, yet weaknesses in application used for presenting finance-related information in

multimedia format. The importance of employee valuations to assess worker's skills is particularly significant in work force planning processes.

Staff evaluation (performance appraisal) has also been looked at as the method by which performance and productivity of each worker is measured in order to determine his or her contribution to the effort of the organization towards the achievement of the set goals and objectives.

The method used in the measurement and evaluation of a worker's performance differ from one organization to another. But the ultimate purpose is to estimate the job performance of each employee towards the achievement of organizational objectives. Performance appraisal is also carried out for the purpose of promotion and transfer to new job task and positions within an organization (Eldman, 2009).

Staff Evaluation serves as a tool for enhancing productivity in modern organizations, through the process of performance appraisal, the productivity of organizational members is measured. It is one of the most delicate issues in human resources management because an employee's overall success in an organization depends largely on the outcome of his evaluations.

However, it is pertinent to state here that some bosses take advantage of this to under-estimate or under-assess the performance of employees who are not in their good book. Thus, a proven performance appraisal system links the organization and the employees together and makes the workforce to understand what is expected of them in a job, and where they fit in appropriately in the organization (Donli, 2008).

In contemporary business environment with keen competition among firms and economic down turn, many firms use performance appraisal to scale down the size of the workforce in order to retain only those one which are more productive. Downsizing the workforce helps an organization to reduce the total cost of labour and to shore up the profit figures of the enterprise.

In other words, if performance appraisal is properly utilized, it will go a long way in assisting an organization in achieving its objectives. Modern organizations are taking more and more interest in determining the quality and level of performance of their employees. Assessing the present productivity of the workforce helps an organization to prepare the ground for future training and development of the workforce (Dipboye, 2001).

### **STATEMENT OF RESEARCH PROBLEM**

Recent years have seen an increase in their use among organizations motivated by the desire to drive employees' behaviors and attitudes and ultimately the team's performance. Establishment of goals and objectives at the beginning of financial years for organizations provide employees with clear performance targets and

enables the managers to monitor performance during the cycle. Performance appraisals help reinforce good performance, alert managers to the need for training and development in certain areas or the need to offer assistance to a poorly performing personnel and establish systems or reward and promotions all geared towards improving performance.

In organization most of the staff evaluation exercise/program is not well designed and focused. Management of organization tends to view it as a punitive measure. This makes it lose its objective sand focus, performance appraisal no longer seek to actualize its objective of correcting deviations, hence increasing productivity and jettison al hindrance that tends to hinder productivity. But it is being used as and jettisons all hindrance that tends to hinder productivity. But it is being used as a tool for subordination oppression, victimization and exploitation. Despite the veritable return at performance appraisal to many organizations, the societal value system has subdued it objectivity and its attendant's outcomes, this make most of our performance more subjective than objective.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The main aim of this study is to examine effect of Staff Evaluation on organizational performance.

The specific objectives of the study are:

1. To determine how Staff Evaluation (performance appraisal) influence organizational performance.
2. To ascertain the impact of Staff Evaluation Technique on organizational performance.
3. To examine the usefulness of staff evaluation in an organization.

### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Based on the objectives of the study, the following research questions are raised to guide the study in the collection and interpretation of data.

1. To what extent does staff evaluation affect organizational performance?
2. Does staff evaluation increase organizational performance?
3. What is the usefulness of staff evaluation in an organization?

### **RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS**

The research hypothesis below was stated and tested for the study.

Ho1: Staff evaluation has significant effect on organizational performance.

Ho2: Staff evaluation does not increase organizational performance.

## **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

Staff Evaluation has also been looked at as the method by which the performance and productivity of each worker is measured in order to determine his or her contribution to the effort of the organization towards the achievement of the set goals and objectives. The method used in evaluation of a worker's performance differs from one organization to another. But the ultimate purpose is to estimate the job performance of each employee towards the achievement of organizational objectives. Performance appraisal is also carried out for the purpose of promotion and transfer to new job tasks and positions within an organization.

Staff Evaluation (Performance appraisal) plays a central role in managing human resources in organizations. The term staff evaluation (or performance evaluation) refers to the methods and processes used by organizations to assess the level of performance of their employees. This process usually includes measuring employee's performance and providing them with feedback regarding the level and quality of their performance (DeNisi and Pritchard, 2006).

The main goal of the Staff Evaluation organizations is to improve employee performance (DeNisi and Pritchard, 2006). This goal could be achieved through three possible mechanisms: (1) The information provided by the Staff Evaluation be used for administrative decisions linking the evaluated performance to organizational rewards or punishments such as a pay rise, promotion, or discharge (Raynes, Gerhart, & Staff Parks, 2005);

(2). The Staff Evaluation process involves providing performance feedback (i.e. Information regarding the level of performance) to them employees who were evaluated, allowing them to adjust their performance strategies to match the desired performance (Locke and Latham, 2002).

(3). The Staff Evaluation is a process that raises employee awareness to the fact that they are being measured. As has been shown since the Hawthorne studies (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939) and is expressed in the aphorism "what gets measured gets one," the mere fact of knowing that one is being observed or measured increases performance and foster cooperative behaviour (Keller and Pfattheicher, 2011).

While the first and second mechanisms of Staff Evaluation have been widely explored, the third has received little attention in the Staff Evaluation literature.

## **CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE STAFF EVALUATION**

Assuming that the main purpose of the Staff Evaluation process is to increase performance, an effective staff evaluation would be one that achieves this purpose. However, it is not as obvious as it seems to establish the criteria for effective staff

evaluation that lead to performance improvement: does effective staff evaluation mean that the scales in use are accurate and free of rater biases? Or does it mean that the workers accept the staff evaluation results and are willing to change their manners accordingly? While early research focused primarily on the accuracy of ratings as the only criterion for staff evaluation effectiveness, recent studies have suggested focusing on motivational aspect such as rates' reactions to the staff evaluation (e.g., satisfactions, feedback acceptance). In order for workers to improve their performance following an appraisal, they must accept the appraisal rating and be willing to change their performance accordingly. Ensuring worker's reactions such as satisfaction, commitment, acceptance of the appraisal, and trust in management could help organizations achieve the primary staff evaluation purpose of improving performance (Keeping and Levy, 2000).

In order to yield positive reactions among rates, the staff evaluation process should be perceived as reliable, accurate, and free of political interests on the one hand, and allow the rate to express his or her voice on the other. The shift from measuring the accuracy of the appraisals to measuring the ratees' reactions and motivation reflects a significant change in the research of staff evaluation (Levy and Williams, 2004).

### **LEADERSHIP EFFECT ON STAFF EVALUATION**

Another contextual factor influencing the effectiveness of staff evaluation is the manager's leadership behaviour (Elicker et al., 2006). More specifically, the exchange relationship between the managers (who perform the evaluation) and their employees (those being evaluated) strongly affects the reactions of the employees to the Staff Evaluation process. The Staff Evaluation session is a 'contact point' (Holbrook, 2002) that is influenced by the existing exchange relationship (Elicker et al., 2006) and by leadership credibility (Gabris and Ihrke, 2001).

The literature on leader-member exchange (LMX) has contributed to our understanding of supervisor-subordinate relationships (Graen et al., 2006) and their impact on various organizational outcomes (Kark and Van Dijk, 2008). Specifically, the LMX model identifies the supervisor subordinate relationship as a dyadic social exchange process that is unique to each supervisor subordinate pair (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). When LMX is high (in-group), the worker receives more attention and support from his or her leader, their relationship is close and warm, and they trust each other. As a result, the worker demonstrates a higher level of performance and has a positive attitude compare with a worker with low LMX (out-group). Given the initial warm and supportive relationship between managers and their in-group workers, it is obvious that during Staff Evaluation sessions, the workers with high LMX will be more confident in their ability to communication with their managers

and, therefore, will achieve more positive outcomes than the out-group workers. Elicker and colleagues (Elicker et al., 2006) have found that the opportunity for an employee's voice and his or her perception of justice are important mechanisms for the effect of LMX on his or her reaction to Staff Evaluation. Specifically, they found that the quality of the exchange relationship between leaders and workers affects the opportunity of the workers to voice opinions during Staff Evaluation session, and as a result, increases the perception of justice, and this perception, in turn, influences worker's attitudes toward the Staff Evaluation process (i.e., motivation, satisfaction, perceived accuracy, and perceived utility). Besides LMX, other leadership behaviors are also found to influence the effectiveness of the staff evaluation process. Specifically, transformational leadership has been related to satisfaction with the Staff Evaluation Effectiveness process, whereas transactional leadership has been related to lower Criteria for Staff Evaluation Effectiveness (Walman et al., 1987). Both leadership and procedural justice are important contextual factors influencing the Staff Evaluation success; therefore, attentions should be given to these issues while conducting Staff Evaluations in an organization.

#### **Techniques of Staff Evaluation**

Formal Staff Evaluation (performance appraisal) programme have often yielded unsatisfactory results. This may be partly due to the manner which and partly as a result for failure to close a particular approach or method that most adequately suit the objectives. There are many techniques of Staff Evaluation some of these are simple while others are more complex thereby, requiring well trained appraisers who can effectively use them. The most commonly used appraisal techniques includes:

- (a) Field review
- (b) Essay appraisal
- (c) Critical incident appraisal
- (d) Ranking method
- (e) Assessment
- (f) Work standards approach
- (g) Forced – choice rating
- (h) Graphic rating scale
- (i) Check list method

#### **Mode of Staff Evaluation**

- Subordinate participates in the setting of performance target increase the commitment to and success in establish them
- Constructive attitudes by supervisor and outcome not predetermined

- Participation in discussion and decision of the subordinate should be of high level
- Material approach to solving problem
- Opportunity for self-evaluation encourage so that managers can be spared to develop him.
- Appraisal must be a regulate activity of the organization (e.g. end of a finished product car furniture) refer to suit the needs of the individuals or work groups.

### **Management by Objective (MBO)**

To accomplish anything, know whether or not you have done so. Compare achievement, with objectives. MBO is an effort to be fair and reasonable to predict performance and judges it more carefully, and presumable to provide individuals with an opportunity to be self-motivating by setting their own objectives Konntz and O'Donald noted that one of the most important and fascinated development in the management scene has been the establishment of programme of management by goals quantitatively or qualitatively objectives are set for manager which they are required achieve. Peter Drucker, a proponent of management by objectives is perhaps that it makes it possible for a manager to control his own performance. He further asserts that self-control means stronger motivation to control his own performance. He further asserts that self-control means stronger motivation implying the describe to always achieve or do the best than just do, fat enough to by. He believes that the importance of MBO is higher performance goals and also broader vision. Dogals McGregor, on his part said that one of the cause of failures of appraisal system stems from the facts that supervisors dislike plying God that is making judgment about another man's worth. He recommended instead than an individuals should see this own goals, checking them out with his superior and should use the appraisal session as a counseling device. Thus, the subordinate achieve his own goals instead at dehumanized inspector of products.

A critic of the MBO programme Hary Levison, while not agreeing with McGregor that the failure of appraisal stream from playing God or feeling in human said that manager experience their unconsciously is felt to be hurting or destroying the other person. Arguing further, he said that method simply serves to increase pressure on the individual. However, Levinson Harry in all critics against MBO does not reject the process itself but does argue that the technique can be improved by examination of underlying assumption and by considering the individual personal goals first. In spite of criticism about MBO, the most effective objective coaching counseling and motivational purpose call for the use of MBO approach if it involves real

participation, appears to be most likely to an inner commitment to improved performance. Also, in interview, MBO proves to be one of the most effective techniques. Other advantages MBO includes

- a. Through MBO, assessment becomes an integral part of the organizational planning and continuous system.
- b. The commitment is a powerful motivational force
- c. The emphasis is on work achievement and not on the main personal characteristics
- d. The cycle is highly participative
- e. It goes further towards the ideals of self-appraisal and self-direction.

However, MBO is still not without disadvantages. Some of its advantages include:

- a. With MBO, the total process, especially the counseling, is very time consuming.
- b. Special circumstances (e.g. change in economic environment) too often make the objective unrealistic
- c. It lacks an emphasis on the short term selection activity
- d. Research shows that many individuals are not self-directive they want to be told what to do

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This research was grounded on feedback theory. The feedback theory postulate that as responsible members of groups, people intend to behave in ways that help the group to move toward accomplishing its task, while at the same time maintaining its membership, that is, keeping any member from being lost overboard. Actually, even one's best-intended behaviour may hinder rather than help and sometimes it is even destructive. As a group develops, some of the members find themselves wanting to get the reactions of other members of the group to their behaviour during the sessions. Others, to a greater or lesser degree, have fears about this. When people tell how another's behaviour is affecting them, what they are communicating is feedback. The technical term comes originally from the field of automation. (For example, the thermostat gives feedback to a furnace on how well the furnace is heating the thermostat.) It's a term that applies equally well to what goes on in groups.

The theory holds that Feedback may emerge in a number of ways. Conscious: nodding assent; or unconscious: falling asleep Spontaneous: "Thanks a lot"; or solicited: "Yes, it did help" Verbal: "no"; or nonverbal: leaving the room Formal: evaluation form; or informal: hand-clapping. Feedback can have the following helpful effects: Reinforces, when feedback confirms behaviour by encouraging its repetition. "You really helped then when you clarified that." Corrects, when

Feedback help bring behaviour in line with intention. “It would have helped me more if you had stood up to talk.” Identifies when Feedback help identify persons and their relationship. “Joe, I thought we were enemies, but we’re not, are we?”

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study is out to establish the relationship between Staff Evaluation organization performances. The study adopted descriptive survey. The sample of 450 staffs was selected randomly from both senior and junior staff of Ramadan Press Ltd out of a population of 923 staffs. The choice Ramadan press Ltd stemmed from the fact that it is the first established private printing press in Bauchi State. Staff evaluation is homogenous among most private organization, which Ramadan press Ltd is part of. It is therefore assumed that the results obtain from this organization will to some extent be generalized.

The instrument used for data collection was a self-designed questionnaire title:

**Staff Evaluation and Organizational Performance in Limited Liability Company: the Nexus** The questionnaire comprises two sections. Section A solicits for responses on name of institution and personal data of the respondent while section B contains items that elicit information from staff about staff evaluation and organizational and strongly disagree 1) .

## DATA ANALYSIS

Data collected were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The content validity of the instrument was conducted by some experts in research methodology and evaluation. Inputs from instrument we used to modify some of the items. While the test-retest (pilot study) was conducted using some staffs outside the respondents for the study. The reliability of the instrument was computed and a reliability coefficient of 0.65 and 0.67 were obtained. These Values portray moderately high level of reliability and were accepted for the study.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Research Question 1:** To what extent does staff evaluation affect organizational performance?

**Table 1:** staff evaluation on organizational performance.

Statement items	SA	A	D	SD
The conditions for staff evaluation favorable to ensure improved organizational performance	258	124	57	11
Do staff evaluation assist in enhancing performance of	252	171	12	15

worker is your organization				
Do staff evaluation encourage staff acquire skills and creativity to improve their performance	256	159	19	16
Staff evaluation assists staff to improve their job performance	258	163	16	13
Total	1024	617	104	55
Aggregate Present	57%	34%	6%	3%

Key: SA = (Strongly Agree), A = (Agree), D = (Disagree) and SD = (Strongly disagree) N = 450

Table 1, show that 91% of the respondents affirmed staff evaluation has effect on performance of organization, while 9% of the responses expressed a contrary opinion to be submission. This result therefore infers that staff evaluation has effect on organization performance

**Research Question 2:** Does staff evaluation increase organization performance?

**Table 2:** How staff evaluation increase organizational performance

Statement items	SA	A	D	SD
Does staff evaluation lead to increase in revenue of your organization	145	124	128	53
Does staff evaluation increase customer satisfaction in your organization	140	112	133	65
Does staff evaluation increase operational efficiency and effectiveness	256	134	38	18
Does staff evaluation has increase organizational growth	158	163	116	13
Total	699	533	415	149
Aggregate Present	40%	30%	23%	8%

Key: SA = (Strongly Agree), A = (Agree), D = (Disagree) and SD = (Strongly disagree) N = 450

Table 2: show that 70% of the respondents asserted staff evaluation performance or organization, while 30% of the responses expressed a contrary opinion to the submission. This result therefore deduces that staff evaluation increases organizational performance.

**Research Question 3:** What is the usefulness of staff evaluation in an organization?

**Table 3:** Usefulness of staff evaluation in an organization

Statement items	SA	A	D	SD
Is staff evaluation useful in your organization	258	164	17	10

Staff evaluation is useful identify training need of employees	252	171	12	15
Staff evaluation is useful for transfer of employees to new job tasks and position within an organization	256	159	19	16
Staff evaluation assists staff to improve their job performance	258	163	16	13
Total	1024	617	104	55
Aggregate Present	57%	34%	6%	3%

Key: SA = (Strongly Agree), A = (Agree), D = (Disagree) and SD = (Strongly disagree) N = 450

Table 3:, show that 94% of the respondent asserted staff evaluation is useful to organizations, while 6% of the responses had divergent opinion to the submission. This result therefore presumes that staff evaluation is useful to organizations

### RESULT OF HYPOTHESIS TESTED

Ho1: Staff evaluation has significant effect on organizational performance

**Table 4:** effect evaluation on organizational performance

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Df=(n-2)	P-value	r-calculated
Staff evaluation	450	30.55	6.357	448	0.05	0614
Organizational Performance		25.44	6.673			

\*\*\*a = 5% significance level

Table 4 shows that the calculated r-value of 0.0614 is greater than the critical r-value of 0.1946 given 148 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance. This result supports the rejection of null hypothesis in acceptance of its alternative that a significant relationship exists between staff evaluation and organization performance.

**Table 5:** Staff evaluation increases organizational performance

Ho2: Staff evaluation does not increase organizational performance

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Df=(n-2)	P-value	r-calculated
Staff evaluation	450	30.55	4.357	448	0.05	0715
Organizational Performance		25.44	4.673			

\*\*\*a = 5% significance level

Table 5 shows that the calculated r-value of 0.715 is greater than the critical r-value of 0.1946 given 148 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance. This result

supports the rejection of null hypothesis in acceptance of its alternative that a significant relationship exists between staff evaluation and organization performance.

## **DISCUSSION**

Evaluation of staff productivity of a worker is used to determine an employee's suitability for promotion, training and placement into higher position of authority. This present study investigated effect of staff evaluation on organizational performance. Three research question and two hypotheses were discussed

Table 1 show that 91% of the despondences affirmed that staff evaluation has effect on performance of the organization while 9% expresses a contrary opinion. These findings corroborate those of (Eldman, 2009, and Apple Baum, 2011).

Table 2 reveals that 70% of the employees asserted that staff evaluation had increase the performance of their organization. This result supports the research of conducted by Lathan et al, (2008), and Kay, et al, (2007).

Table 3 reveals that 94% respondents affirmed that staff evaluation is useful to organizations. This result supports Locher, et al, (1987), Akinbowale, et al. (2013), Apple Baum (2011) submissions that staff evaluation is essential to organizational performance

The result on Table 4 indicates that there is a significant relationship exists between staff evaluation and organizational performance.

## **CONCLUSION**

Organizational objectives are set to achieve organizational goals are clearly understood and such objectives set are aligned to organizational goals and involves employee participation in the process of setting objectives. To ensure there is a smooth operation in the firm, accurate and specific feedback is received from the performance manager on past performance and work is fairly distributed among team members and evidence of performance is well documented and available for reference if needed. Objective based appraisal greatly affects performance although employee getting involved in the process of setting objectives does not impact on organization performance. The study revealed a significant between staff evaluation and organizational performance. The study reveals that staff evaluation exercise increases the performance of organization. The study showed staff evaluation practices are useful to most organization. It is concluded that staff evaluation enhance the level of performance of an organization

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is based on the above findings of this study that the following recommendations are proffered. The management should organize courses for managers on how to carry out a successful staff evaluation of subordinates

It is recommended that management of the organization should reduce the pressure on the employees on the purpose of Staff evaluation exercise so that they are clearly aware that it is not a weapon of punishment but an instrument designed to assist them to grow. Therefore organizations should therefore adapt a more personal approach in linking performance appraisal results to rewards and incentives. This could contribute significantly towards boosting of employee motivation as a result improves the level of organizational performance.

It is also recommended that multiple of staff evaluation should be introduced to encourage objectivity and eliminate bias in the exercise

## REFERENCE

- Abang A, May-Chiun L, Maw King L (2009) Human Resource Practices and Organizational Performance. Incentives as Moderator. *Journal of Academic Research in Economics* 1: 219-234.
- Appelbaum, H., Roy, and Gilliland, T. (2011) Globalization of performance appraisals: theory and applications', *Management Decision*, 49(4), pp.570 – 585.
- Armstrong, M. (2009) *Armstrong's Handbook of Performance Management: An Evidence-Based Guide to Delivering High Performance*. London: Kogan Page Publishers.
- Davis K (1981): *Modern Business Administration*, John Willey and Sons pp. 80
- Dipboye R.L. de Pontbriand, R. (2001) "Correlates of employees reaction to performance appraisals and system",. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1981, No. 66Pp. 248 – 251
- Donli, J.G. (2008), "Personnel Selection, Placement and induction" Being the text of lecturers delivered at the industrial Relations and Personnel Management Course held at Financial Institution Training Center, Yaba, on 14/9/1989).
- Eldman Daniel C. Arnold, H.J (2009). *Managing Individual and Group Behaviour in organization*. McGraw Hill Book Company, Japan, Japan, 1983, Pp. 392
- Elicker, M..N,E.D Pulakos, *Performance Management: A new Approach for driving Business result*. Hong-Kong: Wiley – Blackwell, 2009.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). A review of three decades of doctoral studies using the principal instructional management rating scale: A lens on methodological progress in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(2), 271-306.
- Harold Mayfield (1960): *Defense of performance appraisal*, March – April No 60206 pp.26
- Keller, E.M. H, P fatheicher. J.R.P. (2011). "Effects of threat in performance appraisal Interview " *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1965, No. 49, Pp. 311-317
- Kirchmer, M. (2017). *High Performance through Business Process Management: Strategy Execution in a Digital World*. Springer.(MBO)
- Kuvaas, B. (2006). Performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: mediating and moderating roles of work motivation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(3), 504-522.
- Loyal C.C. Williams F. (2004): *Personnel administration concept and situation* Palo: Alto Consulting psychologies Press
- Rasheed, A., Khan, S. U. R., Rasheed, M. F., & Munir, Y. (2015). The impact of feedback orientation and the effect of satisfaction with feedback on in• Jrole job performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 26(1), 31-51.
- Rock, David B. J. (2015). *Why More and More Companies Are Ditching Performance Ratings*. *Harvard Business Reviews*, 20-22.
- Roetheliberger. W, Dickson M.S (1939): *Personnel Administration*, McGraw Hill Ltd., 8<sup>th</sup> Edition pp 290.
- Waldman et al (1987): *New Context of Performance Appraisal*, London PD Publication LTD 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, pp.76-90.