
INFLUENCE OF EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL ON EMPLOYEES' JOB SATISFACTION IN DANGOTE FLOUR MILLS PLC

¹Omolabi, Issa *PhD.*

¹Department of Business Administration,
Faculty of Management Sciences,
University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Abstract

The periodic examination of employees' contribution to an organisation vis-à-vis the reward paid to them has remained a daunting task for Human Resource Managers (HRMs) over the years. Yet, the HRMs must also ensure that employees are satisfied with their job while doing the former. It is from these puzzling duties of HRM that this paper derived its inspiration of investigating the influence of employees' performance appraisal on employees' job satisfaction in Dangote Flour Mills, Plc, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria. This was done using a structured questionnaire format to collect information from the company with two hundred and thirty-two (232) (comprising both managerial and non-managerial) staff. Similarly, a simple random sampling technique was adopted while the sample size was calculated using the Raosoft Online Sample Size calculator. Data gathered was analysed with a Pearson correlation analysis. The paper found that a positive and significant relationship exists between the duo. Sequel to this, the author thus recommended that a good appraisal policy be maintained to increase employee job satisfaction. In addition, the appraisal should either end with a training programme or a related policy geared at facilitating employees' career improvement.

Keywords: Performance Appraisal, Job Satisfaction, Dangote, Employees' Performance Appraisal, Employees' job Satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

Nonchalantly, organisations set targets that Human Resource Managers (HRMs) strive to achieve regardless of whose feet they will step on. Among the owners of the offended feet is the employees whose interest is to maximise their job satisfaction which may not necessarily come from the job rewards. This complex relationship required a critical analysis of the interest of each participant in the mix. To the organisation for instance, profit maximization is key, to the HRMs, effectiveness and efficiency tops while for the employees, job satisfaction and career development is not an option. In navigating through these waters, HRMs strategically balance the equation by justifying investors' investment with the application of an effective performance appraisal technique while making sure that employees are kept happy.

It deriving from the above that aligning employees' performance appraisal, reward system and employees' job satisfaction in an organization has been a serious challenge for human resource managers especially in the developing countries of the world. In Nigeria for instance, the management of most of these organizations continue to pay less attention to the appraisal of their employees' performance and job satisfaction, yet trying to achieve the organizational goals at all cost. Similarly, employees on the other hand are not satisfied with the reward system of the organization and this has detrimental effect on their job satisfaction as well as their overall performance in the organization.

Performance appraisal is credited with encouraging employee loyalty, fostering teamwork, impacting other Human Resource functions positively and also positively involved in employee motivation. Owing to the role these factors play in attaining organizational goals, many organizations invest in Performance appraisals. However, researchers also cite loopholes in the appraisal system and also warn of the dangers it poses to management and their subordinates. They also assert a seeming unanimous (employees and their supervisors alike) dissatisfaction with Performance appraisal.

Emanating from the above therefore is a new challenge for organizational managers to monitor employees' job satisfaction in a bid to ascertain its nexus with employees' performance appraisal hence, this study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Performance Appraisal

Performance Appraisal (PA) plays a central role in managing human resources in organizations. The term performance appraisal (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 employees 'performance and providing them with feedback regarding the level and quality of their performance (DeNisi and Pritchard, 2006). Performance appraisal serves a number of purposes for organizations. According to Robbins (2005), performance appraisal is used by management for general human resource decisions. It provides input into important decisions such as promotions, transfers, terminations, rewards, etc. Through an effective performance appraisal system, employee skills and competencies, as well as needs and inadequacies, can be identified and such can be used as basis in designing training and development programs. It can also be used as a criterion against which selection and development programs are validated. It also fulfils the purpose of providing feedback to employees on how the organization views their performance. Further, performance appraisal is used as the basis for reward allocations.

Decisions as to who gets merit pay increases and other rewards are frequently determined by performance appraisal. This goal could be achieved through three possible

mechanisms: the information provided by the PA can be used for administrative decisions linking the evaluated performance to organizational rewards or punishments such as a pay raise, promotion, or discharge (Landy and Farr, 1980; Raynes, Gerhart, & Parks, 2005); the PA process involves providing performance feedback (i.e., information regarding the level of performance) to the employees who were evaluated, allowing them to adjust their performance strategies to match the desired performance (Erez, 1977; Kluger and DeNisi, 1996; Locke and Latham, 2002). PA 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 done,” the mere fact of knowing that one is being observed or measured increases performance and fosters cooperative behaviour (Bateson, 2006).

Techniques of Performance Appraisal

There are two techniques used in performance appraisal: Objective measures which are directly quantifiable and Subjective measures which are not directly quantifiable. Performance Appraisal can be broadly classified into two categories: Traditional Methods and Modern Methods.

a. Traditional Methods

The Traditional Methods are relatively older methods of performance appraisals. This method is based on studying the personal qualities of the employees. It may include knowledge, initiative, loyalty, leadership and judgment. The traditional method includes;

Ranking Method (Dessler, 2011): ranking method is ranking employees from best to worst on a particular trait, choosing highest, then lowest, until all employees are ranked.

Graphic Rating Scales: In 1922, Paterson working with the employees of the Scott Company developed a graphic scale to provide the reliability, consistency over time, usefulness and practicality. Bradshaw in 1931 discussed improvements to the graphic rating scale that included “behaviourism” to anchor the scales and help better illustrate the trait. In 1972, Flynn told that the five to nine scale points result in the highest quality of ratings. Graphic Rating Scale is a scale that lists a number of traits and a range of performance for each (Dessler, 2011). The employee is then rated by identifying the score that best describes his or her level of performance for each trait.

Another traditional method is the Critical Incident Method, the technique was formally codified by the works of Fitts and Jones in 1947 for classifying pilot error experiences in reading and interpreting aircraft instruments. Fitts and Jones used the term “errors” rather than “critical incidents”. As opposed to Fitts and Jones way of collecting data, data gathering during task performance is now considered a defining criterion for critical incident methods. The work of John Flanagan in 1954 became the landmark critical incident technique, after his title

entitled “The Critical Incident Technique” appeared in the psychological bulletin. Flanagan (1954) defined the critical incident technique as a set of procedures designed to describe human behaviour by collecting description of events having special significance and meeting systematically defined criteria. Flanagan originally used trained observers to collect critical incident identification. Identification of the critical incidents during task performance can be an individual process or a mutual process between user and evaluator. Critical Incident (Dessler & Gary (2011), method is keeping a record of uncommonly good or undesirable examples of an employees work related behaviour and reviewing it with the employee at predetermined times.

Narrative Essays is another traditional method technique; Here Evaluator writes an explanation about employee’s strength and weakness points, previous performance, positional and suggestion for his (her) improvement at the end of evaluation time. This technique mainly attempts to focus on behaviour.

b. Modern Method

The Modern Methods were devised to improve the traditional methods. It attempted to improve the shortcomings of the old methods such as biasness, subjectivity, Management by Objectives. In 1954, Peter F. Drucker introduced “*Management By Objective*” in his book. “The Practice of Management”. It comprises of three building blocks: object formulation, execution process and performance feedback. In 2000, Weihrich suggested a new model: the system approach to MBO (SAMBO). SAMBO comprises seven elements: strategic planning and hierarchy of objects, setting objectives, planning for action, implementation of MBO, control and appraisal, subsystems, and organizational and management development. The modern method/techniques include;

Behaviourally Anchored Rating Scale (BARS); BARS were introduced by Smith and Kendall in 1963 with the attention of researchers concerned with the issue of reliability and validity of performance ratings. Behavioural anchor scales are more informative than simple numbers. Behaviourally anchored performance dimensions can be operationally and conceptually can be distinguished from one another. Rater will act as observer not the judge. BARS help rater focus on specific desirable and undesirable incidents of work behaviour which can serve as examples in discussing a rating. BARS use behavioural statements or concrete examples to illustrate multiple levels of performance for each element of performance.

Humans Resource Accounting (HRA): The concept of human resource accounting began in the 1960 by Rensis Likert. Prof. Flamholtz defines human resource accounting for people as an organizational resource. The main theory underlying the HRA is that the people are valuable resources of an organization or enterprise, information on investment and value of human resource is useful for decision making in the organization. This paper aims at analysing the

application of human resource accounting in heavy industries covering the period from 2001-2010. In 1965, both Cronbach, Glaser, Naylor & Shine developed models for estimating the financial utility of personnel selection and used the concept of "utility analysis". In 1966, Grojer and Johnson embrace both HRA and Utility Analysis (UA) and suggested the concept of human resource costing and accounting (HRCA). Another method of human resource accounting is human resource value accounting (HRVA).

Assessment Centres; The assessment centre method, in its modern form, came into existence as a result of AT & T Management Progress Study by Bray, Campbell & Grant in 1974. Common job simulations used in assessment centres are in basket exercises, group discussions, simulations of interviews with "subordinates" or "clients", fact finding exercises, analysis/decision making problems, oral presentation exercises, written communication exercises.

360 Degree is another modern method technique; it is a popular performance appraisal technique that involves evaluation input from multiple levels within the firm as well as external sources. 360 Degree feedback relies on the input of an employee's superior, colleagues, subordinates, sometimes customers, suppliers and/or spouses. It provides people with information about the effect of their action on others in the workplace. It provides a notion of behavioural change might be elicited through a process of enhanced self-awareness.

720 Degree also provides a means of measurement technique under the modern method, Rick Gal breath became dissatisfied with 360 degree reviews, he started using the 720 degree and defined it as a more intense, personalized and above all greater review of the upper level managers that brings in the perspective of their customers or investors, as well as subordinates. 720-degree review focuses on what matter most, which is the customer or investor perception of their work. 720-degree approach gives people a very different view of themselves as leaders and growing individuals. 360-degree appraisal method is practiced twice. When the 360- Degree appraisal is done, then the performance of the employee is evaluated and having a good feedback mechanism, the boss sits down with the employee again a second time and gives him feedback and tips on achieving the set targets

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction generally reflects how an employee feels about his or her job. It includes how an employee feels about the conditions within which he works and thus influences his attitudes towards his work. It is also concerned with rewards as employees' feelings towards their organization may be influenced by rewards (Kim, 2005). Schwegker (2001) defines job satisfaction is as the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating one's job values. Job dissatisfaction, on the other hand, is the

undesirable emotional state an employee encounters if he realizes that his job prevents him from attaining his values.

Satisfaction is categorized as intrinsic, extrinsic or total. According to Wegge et al. (2007), job satisfaction helps organizations in identifying work behaviours including organizational citizenship and absenteeism. In like manner, (Saari, 2004) asserts that organizations can identify or track employee turnover with job satisfaction. It is also indicative of job performance (Chen, 2006). As a result, an organization's efforts in increasing its employees' job satisfaction can mitigate undesirable work attitudes like absenteeism (Cohen et al., 2007). Organizations, however, are cautioned that job satisfaction may have a negative correlation to productivity on the job as reported by Judge et al (2001) in a meta-analysis which revealed low correlations between job satisfaction and performance. Some factors which influence job satisfaction include how complex an employee's task is. Usually, employees who have high-complexity tasks have higher job satisfaction than those who have low to moderate complexity tasks (Cohen et al., 2007).

In summary, organizations cannot easily ascertain if job satisfaction will lead to increased productivity owing to the assertion that an employees' performance may be influenced by his personality (Bowling, 2007), this should thus be considered by organizations in deciding on increasing the job satisfaction of its employees.

Theoretical Framework

Expectancy Theory

Expectancy theory is more concerned with the cognitive antecedents that go into motivation and the way they relate to each other. That is, expectancy theory is a cognitive process theory of motivation that is based on the idea that people believe there are relationships between the effort they put forth at work, the performance they achieve from that effort, and the rewards they receive from their effort and performance. In other words, people will be motivated if they believe that strong effort will lead to good performance and good performance will lead to desired rewards. Victor Vroom (1964) was the first to develop an expectancy theory with direct application to work settings, which was later expanded and refined by Porter and Lawler (1968) and others (Pinder, 1987).

Expectancy theory is based on four assumptions (Vroom, 1964). One assumption is that people join organizations with expectations about their needs, motivations, and past experiences. These influence how individuals react to the organization. A second assumption is that an individual's behaviour is a result of conscious choice. That is, people are free to choose those behaviours suggested by their own expectancy calculations. A third assumption is that people want different things from the organization (e.g., good salary, job security, advancement, and challenge). A fourth assumption is that people will choose among

alternatives so as to optimize outcomes for them personally. The expectancy theory based on these assumptions has three key elements: expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. A person is motivated to the degree that he or she believes that (a) effort will lead to acceptable performance (expectancy), (b) performance will be rewarded (instrumentality), and (c) the value of the rewards is highly positive (valence).

Expectancy theory has some important implications for motivating employees. The model provides guidelines for enhancing employee motivation by altering the individual's effort-to-performance expectancy, performance-to-reward expectancy, and reward valences (Greenberg, 2011; Hellriegel & Slocum, 2011; McShane & Von Glinow, 2011; Nadler & Lawler, 1984). Several practical implications of expectancy theory are described below.

Effort-to-Performance Expectancy

Leaders should try to increase the belief that employees are capable of performing the job successfully. Ways of doing this include: select people with the required skills and knowledge; provide the required training and clarify job requirements; provide sufficient time and resources; assign progressively more difficult tasks based on training; follow employees' suggestions about ways to change their jobs; intervene and attempt to alleviate problems that may hinder effective performance; provide examples of employees who have mastered the task; and provide coaching to employees who lack self-confidence. In essence, leaders need to make the desired performance attainable.

Performance-to-Reward Expectancy

Leaders should try to increase the belief that good performance will result in valued rewards. Ways of doing so include: measure job performance accurately; describe clearly the rewards that will result from successful performance; describe how the employee's rewards were based on past performance; provide examples of other employees whose good performance has resulted in higher rewards. In essence, leaders should link directly the specific performance they desire to the rewards desired by employees. It is important for employees to see clearly the reward process at work. Concrete acts must accompany statements of intent.

Valences of Rewards

Leaders should try to increase the expected value of rewards resulting from desired performance. Ways of doing this include: distribute rewards that employees value, and individualize rewards. With a demographically diverse workforce, it is misleading to believe that all employees desire the same rewards. Some employees may value a promotion or a pay raise, whereas others may prefer additional vacation days, improved insurance benefits, day care, or elder-care facilities. Many companies have introduced cafeteria-style benefit plans— incentive systems that allow employees to select their fringe benefits from a menu of available alternatives.

Another issue that may surface with expectancy theory is the need for leaders to minimize the presence of countervailing rewards—performance rewards that have negative valences. For example, group norms (see, e.g. the classic Hawthorne Studies, Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939) may cause some employees to perform their jobs at minimum levels even though formal rewards and the job itself would otherwise motivate them to perform at higher levels.

Empirical Review

Satisfaction toward the appraisal was the most measured response, according to Dusterhoff, Cunningham & MacGregor (2014). These authors distinguish two forms of satisfaction: one linked to the appraisal session and one linked to the appraisal system and its perceived use. The PA is seen as a key part of a strategic management approach, offering a tool that links employee skills and behaviours to the organization's strategic goals. To play this strategic role however, employees must perceive the program positively and be satisfied with its overall use (Dusterhoff, Cunningham & MacGregor, 2014). Brown, Hyatt & Benson (2010) note that the dissatisfaction and disagreement with the PA program are linked to increasing work dissatisfaction, organizational commitment and the intention to resign. This allows us to assume that there is a link between the perception of the PA system and job satisfaction.

In further investigation of the link between employees' performance appraisal and job satisfaction, Brown (2010) surveyed 6,957 employees of a large Australian public sector organization regarding their opinions and perceptions of the performance appraisal quality. The outcome of this study revealed that there was a direct relationship between performance appraisal satisfaction and employees' outcomes, which is mostly job satisfaction among employees (Brown, 2010). However, the comprehensive study of the performance appraisal quality in a field setting is limited (Addison, 2007).

Besides, there is also a study that investigates the reaction of employees to various aspects of the appraisal process. This study conducted by researcher determines that there is a relationship between performance appraisal with employee outcomes, especially in identifying the effects of performance appraisal quality towards the job satisfaction among employees in multinational companies in Malaysia (Poon, 2004). The outcome of this study shows that there is positive relationship between performance appraisals towards job satisfaction among employees in multinational companies, Malaysia. How (2011) also stated that, there is positive relationship between performance appraisals towards job satisfaction among employees in national-wide companies in Malaysia.

According to Bhatti and Qureshi (2007) the researchers found that there is a positive relationship between performance appraisals with job satisfaction where there is an increase in employee productivity. This finding adds to advantages of the job satisfaction of employees by adding that at the same time it has a positive effect on three factors such as productivity, commitment, and engagement in work activities. It means that the more employees will be

satisfied from their work more they will be contributing towards achieving organizational goals in effective and efficient manner.

Fletcher (2001) defines performance appraisal more broadly as “activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, enhance performance and distribute rewards”. In simple term, performance appraisal can be simplifies as an effective assessing process where it evaluate based on employee performance meanwhile it also a process where the supervisor can develop their skills and improve the organizational performance simultaneously (Mondy & Mondy, 2014).

METHODOLOGY

This study aims at investigating the influence of employees’ performance appraisal on employees’ job satisfaction in Dangote Flour Mills Plc in Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria. Using a structured questionnaire format to collect information from the company with two hundred and thirty-two (232) (comprising both managerial and non-managerial) staff. Similarly, a simple random sampling technique was adopted while the sample size was calculated using the Raosoft Online Sample Size calculator as presented below:

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| What margin of error can you accept? 5% is a common choice | <input type="text" value="5"/> % | The margin of error is the amount of error that you can tolerate. If 90% of respondents answer yes, while 10% answer no, you may be able to tolerate a larger amount of error than if the respondents are split 50-50 or 45-55. Lower margin of error requires a larger sample size. |
| What confidence level do you need? Typical choices are 90%, 95%, or 99% | <input type="text" value="95"/> % | The confidence level is the amount of uncertainty you can tolerate. Suppose that you have 20 yes-no questions in your survey. With a confidence level of 95%, you would expect that for one of the questions (1 in 20), the percentage of people who answer yes would be more than the margin of error away from the true answer. The true answer is the percentage you would get if you exhaustively interviewed everyone. Higher confidence level requires a larger sample size. |
| What is the population size? If you don't know, use 20000 | <input type="text" value="232"/> | How many people are there to choose your random sample from? The sample size doesn't change much for populations larger than 20,000. |
| What is the response distribution? Leave this as 50% | <input type="text" value="50"/> % | For each question, what do you expect the results will be? If the sample is skewed highly one way or the other, the population probably is, too. If you don't know, use 50%, which gives the largest sample size. See below under More information if this is confusing. |
| Your recommended sample size is | 145 | This is the minimum recommended size of your survey. If you create a sample of this many people and get responses from everyone, you're more likely to get a correct answer than you would from a large sample where only a small percentage of |

the sample responds to your survey.

Online surveys with Vovici have completion rates of 66%!

| Alternate scenarios | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|--|
| With a sample size of | 100 | 200 | 300 | With a confidence level of | 90 | 95 | 99 | |
| Your margin of error would be | 7.41% | 2.58% | 0.00% | Your sample size would need to be | 126 | 145 | 173 | |

Source: <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>

The sample size for this study is one hundred and forty-five (145).

Basic descriptive statistical tools like frequency count and percentages was adopted for analysis of the data, after which the test of the proposed hypotheses was conducted using Pearson correlation analysis. However, to ease the overall process to be undertaken in the analysis of the data, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was employed for executing the various analyses and statistical tests. The regression models for analyses of data are presented below:

In line with the basic research procedure, a hypothesis was formulated as follows:

Hypothesis

Ho: There is no significant relationship between employees’ performance appraisal and employees’ job satisfaction.

The method to use here is Pearson correlation analysis

$$Y = \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

$$JS = f(OMM + SMM)$$

Where:

Y = Job Satisfaction (JS) – Dependent Variable

X₁ = Objective Measurement Metrics (OMM) – Independent Variable

X₂ = Subjective Measurement Metrics (SMM) – Independent Variable

= Error Terms

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

The study investigated the nexus between human resource training and organizational growth. The response rate was 100%.

Table 1.1: Socio-Demographic Details

| Age | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------------|
| 21-25 years | 13 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 26-30 years | 43 | 29.7 | 38.6 |
| 31-35 years | 21 | 14.5 | 53.1 |
| 36-40 years | 41 | 28.3 | 81.4 |
| 41 and above | 27 | 18.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 145 | 100.0 | |
| Gender | | | |
| Female | 24 | 16.6 | 16.6 |
| Male | 121 | 83.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 145 | 100.0 | |
| Marital Status | | | |
| Married | 112 | 77.2 | 77.2 |
| Single | 33 | 22.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 145 | 100.0 | |
| Educational Degree | | | |
| O' Level | 83 | 57.2 | 57.2 |
| OND/NCE | 41 | 28.3 | 85.5 |
| B.Sc./HND | 21 | 14.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 145 | 100.0 | |
| Working Experience | | | |
| 0-5 years | 49 | 33.8 | 33.8 |
| 6-10 years | 67 | 46.2 | 80.0 |
| 11-15 years | 17 | 11.7 | 91.7 |
| 16 years and above | 12 | 8.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 145 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey, 2021

Table 1.1 shows the demographic details of the respondents which was sectioned as follow;

On the age of the respondents, 9.0% were between the ages of 21-25, 29.7% were of 26-30, 14.5% of 31-35, 28.3% of 36-40 while 18.6% of the respondent fell between 41 years and above. The indicated that the bulk of the workforce is within the productive age that is likely to engender effective performance in the company. As regards gender, 83.4% of the respondents were male while 16.6% of the respondents were female. This equally established that majority of the respondents were males who are likely to occupy the units that engages in the critical production activities of the company.

In relation to the marital status of the respondents, 77.2% of the respondents were married while 22.8% were single. This implies that there were more mature minds in the workforce of the organization. As regards the educational status of the respondents, 57.2% of the respondents had O' level certificate, 28.3% had OND/NCE certificates, while 14.5% had certificate in B.Sc./HND certificates. This implies that the sampled firm (Dangote Flour Mill, Ilorin Kwara State) has a critical mass of highly skilled labours that have the requisite skills, knowledge and expertise that is needed to compete favourably and excel in the sector. As for

the working experience, 33.8% of the respondent had 0-5 years working experience, 46.2% had 6-10years, 11.7% had 11-15 years working experience while 8.3% of the respondents had 16 years and above working experience.

Test of Hypotheses

Ho: There is no significant relationship between employees’ performance appraisal and employees’ job satisfaction.

Table 1.2a

| Model Summary | | | | |
|---------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .683a | .466 | .463 | .858 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), employee’s performance appraisal.

The table above presents the model summary where the correlation coefficient r is .683 (i.e. $r = 0.683$) which indicates that there exists a very strong positive linear relationship between employees’ job satisfaction (dependent variable i.e. the variable being predicted) and performance appraisal (independent variable). It is also crystal clear from the table that the r^2 which is the coefficient of determination is 0.466 approximately 47%. This implies that 47% of employees’ job satisfaction can be explained by performance appraisal.

Table 1.2b

| ANOVAa | | | | | | |
|--------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 57.172 | 2 | 28.586 | 38.812 | .000b |
| | Residual | 102.377 | 139 | .737 | | |
| | Total | 159.549 | 141 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Employees job satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), performance appraisal

Table 1.2b presents ANOVA table. The F-statistic as shown from the table below is significant since the ANOVA significance of .000 is less than the alpha level of .05, thus the model is fit. As a result of this the null hypothesis (performance appraisal has no significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction) was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted (performance appraisal has significant effect on employees’ job satisfaction).

| Coefficients | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.218 | .363 | | 6.108 | .000 |
| | objectives measurement metric | .046 | .093 | .037 | .494 | .000 |
| | Subjective measurement metric | .526 | .064 | .613 | 8.208 | .000 |
| Dependent Variable: employees job satisfaction | | | | | | |

The table above indicates that objectives measurement metric, subjective measurement metric has significant impact on employee's job satisfaction since p-value of 0.000, 0.000 was derived respectively. This implies that performance appraisal has significant effect on employee's job satisfaction.

DISCUSSION

The intent of this study is to investigate how performance appraisal affects employees' job satisfaction. From the findings, it showed that the adopted appraisal process in the company under focus is effective, other factors, such as; experience, academic qualification and aptitude tests makes the process more transparent and effective, there was an indication that the process had a positive effect on the employee ability to perform assignments given and thus impacts employees' job satisfaction positively. The findings of the study coincide with that of Poon (2004), Brown (2010), How (2011) and Bhatti and Qureshi (2007).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Having investigated the influence of employees' performance appraisal on employees' job satisfaction, the paper concluded that a positive significant relationship exists between the duo. Sequel to this, the thus recommended that a good appraisal policy be maintained to increase employee job satisfaction. In addition, the appraisal should either end with a training programmes or a related policy geared at facilitating employees career improvement.

References

- Addison, J. T. (2007). The Determinants of Performance Appraisal Systems: A Note (Do Brown and Heywood's Results for Australia Hold Up for Britain?). *Discussion Paper No.306*.
- Bhatti, K. K. and Qureshi, T. M. (2007). Impact of Employee Participation on Job Satisfaction, Employee Commitment and Employee Productivity. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3(2): 54-68.
- Bowling, N. A. (2007). Is the Job Satisfaction-Job Performance Relationship Spurious: A Meta-Analytic Examination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71, 167-185.

- Brown, M. (2010). Consequences of the Performance Appraisal Experience. *Research Paper*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. 39 (3), 375-396.
- Brown, M., Hyatt, D. & Benson, J. (2010), "Consequences of the Performance Appraisal Experience", *Personnel Review*, 39 (3), 375 – 396.
- Chen, S. H., Yang, C. C., Shiao, J. Y., & Wang, H. H. (2006). The Development of an Employee Satisfaction Model for Higher Education. *The TQM Magazine*, 18(5), 484-500.
- Cohen, A., & Golan, R. (2007). Predicting Absenteeism and Turnover Intentions by Past Absenteeism and Work Attitudes. *Career Development International*, 12(5), 416-432.
- DeNisi, A., & Pritchard, R. (2006). Performance appraisal, Performance management and improving individual performance: A motivational framework. *Management and organization Review*, 2(2), 253- 277.
- DeNisi, Angelo & Pritchard, Robert. (2006). Performance Appraisal, Performance Management and Improving Individual Performance: A Motivational Framework. *Management and Organization Review*. 2.10.1111/j.1740-8784.2006.00042.x.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228253257_Performance_Appraisal_Performance_Management_and_Improving_Individual_Performance_A_Motivational_Framework
- Dessler, Gary & Al Ariss, Akram. (2012). Human Resource Management.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257929914_Human_Resource_Management
- Dusterhoff, C., Cunningham, J.B. & MacGregor, J.N. (2014). The Effects of Performance Rating, Leader–Member Exchange, Perceived Utility, and Organizational Justice on Performance Appraisal Satisfaction: Applying a Moral Judgment Perspective, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119,265–273.
- Erez, M. (1977). Feedback: A necessary condition for the goal setting-performance relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 624-627.
- Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51(4), 327–358.<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0061470>
- Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance Appraisal and Management: The Developing Research Agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, pp 473–487.
- Greenberg, J. (2011). Behavior in Organization, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Hellriegel, D. & Slocum J.W. (2011). Organizational Behavior. OH; South- Western Cengage Learning.
- How, Tan Kwang. (2011). *Human Resource Management in Malaysia, Theory & Practice*. Syahalam, Malaysia: McGraw-Hill (Malaysia).
- Involvement as Interactive Predictors of Absenteeism in a Public Organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80, 77-89.

- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The Job Satisfaction-job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407.
- Kim, W. G., Leong, J. K., & Lee, Y. (2005). Effect of service orientation on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention of leaving in a casual dining chain restaurant. *Hospitality Management*, 24, 171-193.
- Kluger, Avraham & DeNisi, Angelo. (1996). The Effects of Feedback Interventions on Performance: A Historical Review, a Meta-Analysis, and a Preliminary Feedback Intervention Theory. *Psychological Bulletin*. 119,254-284. 10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254.
- Landy, F.J. and Farr, J.L. (1980). *Psychological Bulletin*, 87(1) (1980): 72–107
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705–717. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705>
- Mc Shane, S.L. & Von Glinow, M.A. (2011). *Organizational Behavior*, New York, NY
- Mondy, R. Wayne, Mondy, Judy Bandy. (2014). *Human Resource Management*. 13th Edition. Edinburg Gate, Harlow Essex, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Nadler, L. (1984). *The Handbook of Human Resource Development*, 3 (3) 307-311
- Poon, J. M. (2004). Effects of Performance Appraisal Politics on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention. *Emerald*, Vol. 33 No. 3, 2004, 13.
- Porter, L.M. and Lawler, E.E. (1968). *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*; Dorsey, Homewood
- Robbins, S.P. (2005). *Essentials of Organizational Behaviour*. 8th Edition, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.
- Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the worker*. Harvard Univ. Press.
- Rynes, S.L., Gerhart, B., Parks, L., (2005). Personal Psychology: Performance Evaluation and Pay for Performance. *Annual Review of Psychology* 56, 571–600.
- Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 395-407.
- Schwepker C. H. (2001). Ethical Climate's Relationship to: Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Turnover Intention in the Sales Force. *Journal of Business Research*.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New yoke, Wiley print
- Wegge, J., Schmidt, K., Parkes, C., & Van Dick, K. (2007). 'Taking a sickie': Job Satisfaction and Job.