

Nexus Of Performance Appraisal And Manager/Subordinate Relationship In Employee Motivation In Financial Institutions In Kumasi, Ashanti Region Of Ghana

Vincent de Paul Kanwetuu

Kofi Osei Akuoko

Bernard Obeng

Department of Sociology and Social Work,
Faculty of Social Sciences,
Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology,
Kumasi, Ghana

Abstract: The role of performance appraisal in employee motivation has been disputed by academics and researchers following complaints by employees that the process leads much to be desired. In Ghana, research reports indicate that the appraisal process of some organisations is fraud with inaccuracies, bias considerations and favouritism on the part of managers. Thus, subordinate employees dread the whole process of appraisal calling into question the professionalism and social wisdom of appraisers. Consequently, a survey questionnaire was distributed among employees of some selected financial institutions to examine the role manager-subordinate employee relationship can play in making the appraisal process more motivating to employees. The results of the study indicated that there is significant positive correlation between manager-subordinate relationship and employee motivation in the areas of good interpersonal communication, managerial tolerance to failure and managerial recognition of employee success. Furthermore, employee participation in setting job objectives and performance review correlate positively with employee motivation whereas self-evaluation of performance correlated negatively with employee motivation. The study, therefore, recommended that management should approach performance appraisal issues with good interpersonal communication and develop the capacity to diagnose and treat poor performance with tolerance. Also, poor performers should be taken through training to improve future performance.

Keywords: Performance appraisal, Manager-subordinate relationship, Employee motivation, Financial institutions, Organizations, Interpersonal communication.

I. INTRODUCTION

There has been a long standing debate regarding the usefulness of performance appraisal in employee motivation. Whereas some academics and human resource practitioners view Performance Appraisal System (PAS) as a motivational tool, others see it as source of employee de-motivation. This brings into dispute the role of performance appraisal in employee motivation. For instance, research reports indicate that PAS has done little to improve its usefulness as a managerial decision-making tool (Banks & Murphy, 1985). Corroborating this argument, Folger, Konovsky & Cropanzano (1992), conclude that many appraisal systems

have failed to realize their full potential in contributing to organizational effectiveness. Coens and Jenkins (2000) further argue that inaccuracies in the appraisal process can demotivate employees forcing them to read newspapers for employment opportunities elsewhere.

Contrasting the above are those who view PAS as effective tool for employee motivation. For instance, Lawler (1971) viewed performance appraisals as more effective when companies tie them to reward decisions and to terminate poor performers. This is not surprising in light of motivation theories such as reinforcement theory, which indicates that behaviour that is rewarded is repeated. Tying appraisal results to rewards may lead to the perception that performance is

rewarded. He identified at least three characteristics of appraisals that increase the perception that they are fair and thus effective in motivating employees. These characteristics include adequate notice, fair hearing, and judgment based on evidence.

With regard to the above debate, one questions how much managerial social wisdom is applied in the appraisal process. Simply put, what is the nature of manager-subordinate relationship? These questions served as the bases for which the authors sought to examine the role of manager-subordinate relationship in yielding effective employee motivation in the appraisal process.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Most managers lack adequate human relation skills or they tend to over emphasize organisational objectives thereby neglecting relational justice. In so doing, they tend to ignore the most significant elements of their businesses - the people (Manu, 2004). Consequently, some employees dread performance appraisals viewing it as managerial license to punish non-performing employees. For instance, a recent study in Barclays Bank, Ghana reported that employees described the appraisal system as discriminatory, punitive and a judgemental process, where cronyism and biased considerations dominated objectivity (Horsoo, 2010). Nkrumah (1991) quoted in Ohemeng (2009) indicates that the appraisal system in Ghanaian public organizations was fraught with problems and abuses that made its credibility questionable. If the appraisal system is viewed by employees as judgemental, punitive and discriminatory, then it cannot be used to evaluate employee motivation without other managerial interventions.

Thus, a major cause of the general poor attitude of Ghanaian employees towards work is ineffective performance appraisal systems. Owusu-Buor (1986) as cited in Akuoko (2011) indicates that the recurring concerns among managers of several organizations in Ghana have been poor worker attitude and behaviour leading to low productivity and high labour turnover. This leads to the inability of supervisors to achieve organizational objectives although many organizations remunerate their workers and train them particularly on-the-job and in-service training.

The paper, therefore, explores the human relations aspect in an appraisal system to explain the extent to which manager-subordinate interaction could complement performance appraisal in yielding desired employee motivation especially in financial institutions where there is keen competition in customer attraction (Osei-Wusu, 2013).

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The general objective of the study was to find the impact of manager-subordinate relationship on employee motivation using performance appraisal as basis for interaction. Specifically, the study sought to find out the level of employee participation in the appraisal process, the effect of manager-

subordinate relationship on employee motivation, and the effect of appraisal outcome on employee motivation.

IV. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The findings of the study would be useful to managers and supervisors of institutions and organisations where performance appraisal is an organisational routine. This is because managers or appraisers would appreciate their involvement in the success of the process. Specifically, the study would equip managerial and supervisory staff with the knowledge of behavioural characteristics which brings about increased morale among employees towards job execution. Secondly, the literature on the link between manager/subordinate relationship and employee motivation in Ghana is rare. This compels many Ghanaian based researchers to quote from foreign literature to buttress findings of studies on local organizations. The findings of the study would, therefore, serve as additional source of reference for future studies.

V. LITERATURE REVIEW

As a distinct management procedure, performance appraisal dates from the time of World War II. In a broader sense, however, it is one of the oldest professions with origins in Frederick Winslow Taylor's 1911 Time and Motion work, which used the scientific method to assess and improve worker productivity. In 1960, the Theory X and Y was introduced by Douglas McGregor (1906-1964) to categorize employees. With X employees, performance appraisals were income justification exercises. With Y employees, they were cooperative exercises in aligning personal and professional goals with organizational objectives.

In companies, performance appraisals began as simple methods for deciding whether or not the salary of an employee was justified. Later on, empirical studies showed that pay rates were not the only element that had an impact on employee performance. It was found that other issues, such as morale and self-esteem, could also have major influence. That resulted in progressive rejection of emphasis of performance appraisal on reward outcomes and in the 1950s in the United States, its potential as a tool for motivation and development of employees was recognized (Bruce, Anne, Pepitone and James, 1999). The general model of performance appraisal, as it is known today, began from that time.

The theoretical bases of PAS are equity and expectancy theories (Kellough & Nigro, 2002; Perry, 2003; Risher, 2002; Vroom, 1964); and goal theory (Armstrong, 2006). Adams (1965) formulated the equity approach as an appropriate way to effective supervision. Equity simply means fairness. In other words, equity exists when the input-outcome ratio of a worker is compared and found to be equal to the input-outcome ratio of a referent.

Equity theory assumes that one important cognitive process involves people looking around and observing what efforts other people are putting into their work and what rewards follow them. This social comparison process is driven

by our concern for fairness and equity. Research by Adams (1965) and others confirms equity theory as one of the most useful frameworks for understanding work motivation. Workers are motivated when they discover that they are treated fairly in compensation, promotion and that there is transparency in their evaluations. On the other hand, workers reduce their efforts (are de-motivated) if they feel that they are treated inequitably; hence, employees must perceive the outcome of PAS as fair if it is to be effective in employee motivation (Fulk, Brief and Barr, 1985; Hyde, 2005; Klingner and Nabaldine, 1998; Murphy and Cleveland, 1991; Roberts and Pavlak, 1996).

Expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) indicates that employees will be motivated to exert high level of effort when they believe that their efforts will lead to higher performance (expectancy), higher performance will lead to rewards (instrumentality) and the rewards are valuable to them (valence). In other words, an employee will pursue organizational objectives even in the face of obstacles when he/she is convinced that effort will lead to good performance appraisal and followed by organization rewards such as bonus, salary increment or promotion which later satisfy personal goals (Vroom, 1969 in Ott, 1989). Based on expectancy theory, the motivational force of a job can be calculated if the expectancy, instrumentality and valence values are known.

Goal-setting theory was developed by Locke and Latham (1979). It states that motivation and performance are higher when individuals are given specific goals, when goals are difficult but accepted and when there is feedback on performance. Participation in goal-setting is important as a means of getting agreement to the setting of higher goals. Motivation and performance will improve if people have challenging but agreed goals and receive feedback (Armstrong, 2006).

Human resource managers have recognized the important relationship between organizational justice and organizational effectiveness (Folger, 1997). Distributive justice deals with the ends achieved or the content of fairness, whereas procedural justice is related to the means used to achieve those ends or the process of fairness.

Research has shown that managers frequently distort appraisal results to further their own self-interests (Longenecker, Gioia & Sims, 1987). If the above observation is true, then due-process systems may well provoke negative reactions from managers by constraining their ability to distort the results of appraisal. But according to Bernardin & Villanova (1986) and Murphy & Cleveland (1991), it is also true that managers' own performance is highly dependent on the efforts of those who work for them. Consequently, it might be argued that they will react favourably toward a due-process appraisal system.

According Bernardin & Villanova (1986) and Murphy & Cleveland (1991) due-process appraisal systems inform employees of managers' performance expectations from the very beginning, provide opportunities for open exchanges about factors that may impede employees' ability to meet expectations, and provide ongoing performance feedback.

A due-process appraisal system has three main characteristics namely; adequate notice, fair hearing and judgement based on evidence (Folger et al, 1992). Adequate

notice requires organizations and their agents to publish, distribute, and explain performance standards to employees, discuss how and why such standards must be met, and provide for regular and timely feedback on performance. Fair hearing requires a formal review meeting in which an employee is informed of a tentative assessment of his or her performance and how it was derived by his or her manager, who should be familiar with the employee's performance. Employees are also permitted to challenge this assessment by conducting and presenting a self-appraisal. Finally, judgment based on evidence requires the organization and its agents to apply performance standards consistently across employees, without yielding to external pressure, corruption, or personal prejudice. The features described call for employee involvement in the appraisal process from planning through implementation to review if the process is to serve as motivation mechanism to employees.

Employees' reactions to the fairness and accuracy of the appraisal system may affect their motivation to correct weak performance or develop unused potential. Similarly, managers' reactions to performance appraisals are a necessary, if not sufficient condition to collect the relatively unbiased performance information needed for reward allocation or legal documentation. Although often ignored, employees' and managers' reactions to appraisal systems are essential to successfully attaining at least three purposes of appraisals - employee development, reward allocation, and legal documentation (Murphy & Cleveland, 1991).

There are several additional fairness criteria, such as: supervisors' ability to suppress bias, create consistent allocations, rely on accurate information, be correctable, represent the concerns of all recipients, and focus on prevailing moral and ethical standards. Greenberg (1986) suggested that soliciting and using input prior to evaluations, two-way communication, ability to challenge evaluations, rater familiarity with the ratee's work and consistency in applying standards are all related to the procedural dimension. Performance-based ratings and rating-based recommendations for salary or promotion are related to the distributive dimension.

Just as the fairness of the procedures associated with organisational decisions ranging from layoffs to pay allocation have been shown to affect employees' reactions directly (Folger and Konovsky, 1989), so are appraisal systems based on theories of procedural justice expected to affect the attitudes and behaviours of employees and managers who use them. Although often ignored, employees' and managers' reactions to appraisal systems are essential to successfully attaining the three purposes of appraisals (Murphy & Cleveland, 1991). Thus, Tyler & Lind (1992) concluded in their extensive review of the procedural justice literature, that in most situations, procedural justice judgments lead to enhanced satisfaction with both the process and the outcome.

Studying a sample of managerial employees, Greenberg (1986) found that the two-way communication during the review, opportunities to rebut evaluation (fair-hearing feature), and the consistent application of a priori performance standards (adequate notice) were significantly related to individuals' perceptions of the fairness of the appraisal. The procedural justice-satisfaction relationship is supported by

several correlation studies of performance appraisal. Dipboye and de Pontbriand (1981) reported that discussing performance objectives and plans (adequate notice), providing employees with the opportunity to state their side of the issues (fair hearing), and using job-relevant performance dimensions in appraisal (judgment based on evidence) were related to employees' favorable reactions toward the appraisal system, while the first two system characteristics were also related to their satisfaction with their ratings (Burke and Wilcox, 1969; Nathan, Moorman, and Milliman, 1991).

Kanfer, Sawyer, Earley & Lind (1987) found that subordinates who were permitted to provide their manager with information about their performance reported greater satisfaction with their job assignments. Similar results were found in two correlation field studies. Burke and Wilcox (1969) found that employees who reported relatively open communications with their manager about performance appraisal also had higher job satisfaction, while Nathan, Moorman & Milliman (1991) reported that employees' opportunity to participate in the appraisal review was positively related to satisfaction with their work.

Whereas appraisal systems traditionally have been shown to strain managers' relationships with their employees (Bernardin & Villanova, 1986; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991), due-process appraisal systems inform employees of managers' performance expectations from the very beginning, provide opportunities for open exchanges about factors that may impede employees' ability to meet expectations, and provide on-going performance feedback.

Prior research by Tyler and Lind (1992) suggests that as the organizational agents responsible for implementing the procedural justice appraisal system, managers will gain increased legitimate power, that is, ability to win employee acceptance of work goals and rules. Thus, managers' ability to influence employees' behaviour without relying on the distortion of appraisal results or coercion should increase. Since influencing others' behaviour through the use of legitimate power is assumed to be more pleasant and easier than using manipulation or coercive power for these ends, managers should experience greater satisfaction with their job under a due-process performance appraisal (Tyler and Lind, 1992).

Herzberg (1987) argues that in order to motivate employees through performance appraisal, the system should be used for reward and recognition. But initial consideration of reward and recognition systems could lead to the belief that they consist only to provide extrinsic motivation. This argument is supported by Deci (1972) who showed a decrease in intrinsic motivation when extrinsic rewards were used to promote behaviour. It is important to note that the reduction in intrinsic motivation occurred with monetary rewards, but not with verbal praise. There is no doubt, however, that extrinsic incentives can boost performance (Herzberg, 1987).

What types of reward or recognition are best to increase intrinsic motivation and enhance individual performance and job satisfaction? Popp & Fox (1985), Kovach (1987) and Hede (1990) conducted surveys and provided answers to this question. They found that employees sought achievement, responsibility and growth as the highest priority for incentives in their work. A reward and recognition system that addresses

these areas should produce the desired outcome. This may be to ensure the rule of valence in expectancy theory by Vroom (1964). Joint goal setting can provide a number of these employee rewards as individual employees can negotiate desired outcomes with management (Dunford, 1992). The employee who plays an integral part in the development of these goals is more likely to perceive the outcome as being achievable and to be committed to achieving them.

Management involvement will ensure that the goals are consistent with corporate objectives and that they provide challenging opportunities for the employee to use their current skills and abilities and to encourage the development of new ones. Public acknowledgment of the agreed goals and their achievement is important to reinforce the desired behaviour. This could be undertaken in the form of a quarterly achievement award and presentation (London and Higgot, 1997).

VI. HYPOTHESES

The study tested the following hypotheses:

H1: Manager-subordinate relationship is a function of employee motivation.

H2: There is a significant relationship between appraisal outcome and employee motivation.

H3: Employee participation in the appraisal process and employee motivation are significantly correlated.

H4: Employee participation in the appraisal process is a function of employee satisfaction with feedback.

VII. RESEARCH METHODS

RESEARCH SETTING AND DESIGN

This study was carried out in Kumasi, the second largest city in Ghana. Nine financial institutions were selected for the study. There was the purposeful selection of three Microfinance institutions, three Savings and Loans companies and three Commercial Banking institutions. This was to help ascertain varied views or responses from three different groups of financial institutions on different tiers of operation. This study was exploratory and adopted the social survey design, making use of questionnaires. Exploratory study was considered because according to Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2007), it investigates a situation or a problem in order to explain the relationships between variables.

SAMPLE SELECTION

Purposive sampling technique was used to select the three groups of financial institutions in the Kumasi Metropolis. For each of the three groups of financial institutions (Microfinance, Savings and Loans and Commercial Banks) the three operating giants in each group were considered a stratum. Purposive sampling was then used to select five supervisory staff members from each stratum. This was done because the supervisory staff appraised the subordinates.

Combining each three institutions as a stratum, a sampling frame was constructed for subordinate staff in each stratum. From each of the sampling frame constructed, the systematic sampling technique was used to select 45, 42 and 47 subordinate employees from Microfinance, Savings and Loans and Commercial Banks respectively. This stratified sampling was proportionately done in order to allow for fair representation in the sample from the strata. In total, a sample size of 150 respondents was selected of which 15 were supervisory staff members and 135 were subordinates.

DATA COLLECTION

Self-administered questionnaire was the main tool used for the data collection. Two different sets of questionnaires were administered - one for supervisors (managers) and one for the subordinates. The choice of self-administered questionnaire was made because all respondents were literates and could therefore read, comprehend and write answers to the questions. They were hand-delivered and collected later. All questions were close-ended because open-ended questions were not answered by most respondents during the piloting of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data using the Likert Scale. This can be analyzed at the interval measurement scale (Boone & Boone, 2012). Piloting was done by mailing the questionnaires to two different financial institutions. Piloting of the research tool was necessary to ensure that the questions asked were understood by respondents and to ascertain logical sequence of questions asked.

RESPONSE RATE

All questionnaires were received but three of the questionnaires of the subordinates could not be included in the analysis. This was because they were not properly filled and could not be cleaned and added to the stack of questionnaires for analysis. This left us with 147 questionnaires. There was thus a response rate of 98 percent.

ANALYZING THE DATA

Data was cleaned and coded for entry into the SPSS for Windows software (Version 17.0). Computer editing was done after keying in the data. The data were analysed using frequency tables and multiple regressions.

The use of multiple regressions was necessitated by the scale used for measuring the variables - employee motivation and manager-subordinate relationship. That is the five point Likert Scale was used to generate responses for aspects of manager-subordinate relationship in the appraisal process giving respondents the opportunity to grade the nature or quality of their relationship with managers on a Likert scale. This was to enable the authors to find out if there was any relationship between the variables in the research hypotheses. Secondly, if there was any relationship, the authors were interested in knowing the direction of the relationship; whether positive or negative. Thirdly, the study was also intended to find out (in cases where variables were related)

how much the variables in the research hypotheses were related, that is, the margin of relationship.

VIII. DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

In a world where attention is gradually and consciously drawn towards women empowerment through education, political participation and waged employment in the non-agricultural sector, it would be heart-warming for feminists to note that the majority of the subordinate respondents (54.5 percent) were females whereas male respondents were 44.5 percent. Among the supervisory staff, however, the male population assumed a very significant dominance over the females as 83.3 percent of the respondents were males compared to only 16.7 percent female supervisors.

Educational attainment among the respondents was generally high. This was because 66.7 percent of the subordinate respondents had tertiary education, 30.3 percent had completed post-tertiary education and only 3 percent had secondary school certificates. The managerial staff proved superior to their subordinates in academic achievement as 58.3 percent of them had post-tertiary education and the remaining 41.7 percent had tertiary education.

EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN THE APPRAISAL PROCESS

One of the specific objectives of the study was to find out the level of employee involvement in the appraisal process. To this effect, respondents were asked to rate their participation/involvement in the three major stages of the appraisal process namely; setting of job objectives, performance evaluation and review interview. About 77.2 percent of respondents took part in setting job objectives and performance standards while 22.8 percent did not participate in setting standards which they worked to achieve. This meant that the job objectives of the employees were more or less imposed upon them. With regard to self-evaluation, an overwhelming majority (92.4 percent) of the respondents took part in evaluating their performance. The remaining 7.6 percent of respondents had their performance measured and rated entirely by someone else. On performance review, more than ninety percent (93.9%) of the respondents indicated that they had opportunity to review interview after receiving feedback from their appraisal. This meant that they had the opportunity to challenge their ratings for possible adjustment of results or at least they discussed with management the reasons for their successes and failures in the appraisal process.

MANAGER-SUBORDINATE RELATIONSHIP

The nature or quality of manager/subordinate relationship was studied in order to find out the consequences it could have on employee motivation. Areas of manager/subordinate

relationship which were studied included managers' level of assistance towards achieving goals, the quality of interpersonal communication between managers and subordinates, the level of managerial tolerance towards employees' failure to meet targets and level of recognition to employees' success in achieving organisational objectives. These factors can influence the level of belongingness and acceptance among organizational members and thus, have the capacity to influence employees' level of motivation.

All respondents in the study agreed that they were assisted by their managers in order to meet their job objectives and targets. However, the level of assistance they received varied from respondent to respondent. Thus, the majority (66%) of respondents rated the level of assistance they received as very good.

About 84.8 percent of the respondents said communication with their managers was very good. Only 15.2 percent of the respondents, however, rated the level of interpersonal communication with management as average. This meant that the quality of manager/subordinate interpersonal communication varied among employees indicating that not all employees enjoyed equal treatment in terms of manager/subordinate interpersonal relationship. But on the whole, communication with their managers was very good.

The majority (78.8%) of respondents viewed managers as tolerant even when targets were not met but 21.2 percent of respondents experienced managers as intolerant to failure. This meant that some managers blamed or scolded employees for failure to achieve objectives. On how much recognition employees received from their supervisors/managers for achieving their objectives, only 1.5 percent reported that managers did not show any appreciation for jobs well done as against 98.5 percent of respondents who said that their managers were appreciative of their success. Thus, an overwhelming majority of respondents either received verbal praises, letters of appreciation or some form of recognition from their managers for achieving organizational objectives.

EFFECT OF MANAGER/SUBORDINATE RELATIONSHIP ON EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION

All the respondents indicated that they (100 percent) were motivated by the level of quality of interaction between them and their managers/supervisors. It was pertinent to note, however, that some respondents were more motivated than others by their interaction with managers/supervisors. This was because 15 percent of them said their interaction with managers was an excellent source of motivation in their job performance, 38 percent rated it as very good source of motivation, 36 percent of them rated it as good and 11 percent described it as average. These figures testified that the behaviour of managers/supervisors was a vital component of employee motivation in work organisations.

USES OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL RESULTS IN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN GHANA

The majority of managers (67 percent) used feedback for rewards administration to employees compared to twenty five

percent (25%) of managers who used feedback to identify strengths and weaknesses of employees in order to train and develop them for improved future performance. The remaining 8 percent of the managers also used ratings for documentation and providing feedback to employees. From the responses so far, it is clear that managers used performance appraisal ratings for various motivation strategies and administrative purposes. Thus, appraisal systems played important roles in the organizational life of financial institutions and provided the platform for manager-subordinate relationship.

IX. REGRESSION ANALYSES

From the descriptive analysis, the relationship between managers and their subordinates was generally good among the majority of respondents. The aim of this section was to find out statistically whether this cordiality of manager-subordinate interaction had some significance in employee motivation. And if it had, then which aspect of the relationship was a key in employee motivation? With regards to the uses of appraisals and employee motivation, the authors wanted to find what appraisal outcomes motivated employees more compared to others? Finally, multiple regressions were also used to determine relationship between employee participation in the appraisal process and their satisfaction with results.

		Coefficients ^a				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.019	.401		2.540	.014
	Assistance towards goal achievement	-.202	.132	-.180	1.532	.131
	Interpersonal communication	.357	.116	.378	3.067	.003
	Tolerance to failure (accommodation)	.136	.063	.210	2.178	.033
	Recognition/appreciation to success	.481	.109	.469	4.398	.000

Dependent variable: Employee motivation. Alpha = .05.

Table 1: Multiple regression of manager/subordinate relationship and employee motivation

From Table 1, there is a strong correlation (Beta = .469) between recognition and employee motivation. What this means is that employees feel gratified when their managers or supervisors show appreciation to their efforts at goal achievement. This finding validates the use of praises, citations and letters of recommendations to motivate employees. Furthermore, the table indicates that there is moderate correlation (Beta = .378) between interpersonal communication and employee motivation. Thus, when managers take their time to communicate clearly and friendly to employees, the latter gets motivated to perform.

Managerial tolerance to failure is yet another aspect of the manager-subordinate relationship which is positively related to employee motivation (Beta = .210). Even though this may be a bit challenging to managers especially when they have targets to meet, employees will be motivated to improve upon future performance if they are not chastised for poor performance. The analysis also shows that there is weak negative correlation between assistance towards goal attainment and employee motivation (Beta = -.180). That is to say, employees will be de-motivated if managers constantly assist them in their work. This is because subordinates may interpret this as policing and a sign of incompetence. This relationship, however, is proven to be statistically insignificant since the p-value (.131) is greater than the alpha (.05).

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Std. Error		
1 (Constant)	.911	.326			2.791	.007
Rewards administration (pay adjustment, promotions, bonuses)	.178	.093	.232		1.899	.062
Recognition (letters/certificates/plagues of honour)	.593	.117	.625		5.077	.000
Documentation (providing feedback to employees)	-.145	.109	-.155		1.328	.189
Career development (training and development needs analysis)	.208	.095	.209		2.201	.032

Dependent variable: Employee motivation. Alpha = .05

Table 2: Multiple regression between appraisal outcome and employee motivation

The results of regression analysis from Table 2 depicts that there is significant positive correlation between employee motivation and recognition and career development. Specifically, there is a strong positive correlation between recognition and employee motivation (Beta = .625) and a moderate correlation between appraisal for career development and employee motivation (Beta = .209). These statistics therefore, imply that employee motivation increases when appraisal outcomes yield recognition and career development, all things being equal.

The use of appraisal to reward employees has been shown to be insignificant in employee motivation. This is because the p-value (.062) is greater than the alpha (.05), thus, nullifying

the suggestion of moderate correlation between the use of appraisal for rewards administration and employee motivation. Finally, the analysis also suggests that there is negative correlation between documentation of appraisal results and employee motivation. However, this correlation has been shown to be insignificant because the p-value (.189) is greater than the alpha (.05).

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Std. Error		
1	(Constant)	2.753	.310			8.883	.000
	Participation in setting objectives	.108	.050	.278		2.163	.034
	Participation performance evaluation	.114	.073	.201		1.556	.125
	Participation in performance review	.167	.073	.264		2.287	.026

Dependent variable: Employee satisfaction with feedback. Alpha = .05

Table 3: Multiple regression between employee participation in the appraisal process and employee motivation

Two major stages in the appraisal process correlate positively with employee motivation as shown in Table 3. These include employee participation in setting objectives and performance review which were observed to correlate moderately with employee motivation. This is because the p-values (.034 and .026) for the two variables are less than the alpha (.05). Participation in performance evaluation by employees, however, has been found to have no significant correlation with employee motivation.

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Std. Error		
1	(Constant)	2.340	.466			5.022	.000
	Participation in setting objectives	.100	.075	.185		1.335	.187
	Participation performance evaluation	.194	.110	.247		1.768	.082
	Participation in performance review	.172	.110	.194		1.562	.123

Dependent variable: Employee's level of satisfaction with feedback. Alpha = .05

Table 4: Multiple regression between employee participation in the appraisal process and employee satisfaction with feedback

Table 4 demonstrates that employee participation in the appraisal process (setting objectives, performance evaluation or performance review) do not have any significant relationship with employee satisfaction with appraisal feedback. This is because the p-values in all the three cases (.182, .082, and .123) are greater than the alpha (.05).

X. DISCUSSION OF MAJOR FINDINGS

Managers and supervisors perform an important role in the performance appraisal process since they are responsible for setting standards, monitoring the achievement of standards and rewarding performance in various ways. The value of this relationship in motivating employees and affecting the appraisal system as a whole cannot be overemphasized. The results of the study indicate that there was a strong correlation (Beta = .469) between recognition and employee motivation. It was found out that even though many people reckoned recognition with formal organizational arrangements such as plague of honour, letters of appreciation from superiors to subordinates and prizes or material awards during durbars or end of year speech and prize ceremonies, simple verbal praise or a tap on the back of a high performing subordinate could equally do the trick. For instance, according to Armstrong (2010), the manager or the superior should tell the subordinate what he or she has done right and how that has benefited the organization. Then after a pause, the manager simply says "Thank you" or offers a handshake or a tap on the shoulder. The pause is supposed to give the subordinate an opportunity to either reflect on the words of the supervisor or say something in response.

A supervisor who is socially concerned about subordinates does not have to wait for an occasion such as end of year party, a company picnic or annual awards ceremony to hand out certificates and cash prizes to employees as a sign of recognition following performance appraisal. There should a kind of verbal appraisal in the day-to-day supervisor-subordinate interaction at the workplace.

Managerial tolerance to failure was yet another aspect of the manager-subordinate relationship which was positively related to employee motivation (Beta = .210). Managers should be tolerant to the behaviour of low performing subordinate who does not or cannot achieve job objectives. This can be done by simply replacing the nagging with an explanation to the employee of how his inability to succeed is costing the organization and influencing his career development. This shifts the focus from the subordinate's failure to achieve goals to his career development and organizational success. Unlike feedback that is directed at performance of the work itself, career discussions enable people to know where they stand by focusing on how performance can lead to desired career outcomes (Nathan, Moorman & Milliman, 1991).

Research suggests that for appraisals to be effective, ratings should be used to reward employees such as salary administration, promotion decisions, retention-termination

decisions, and recognition of individual performance, layoffs and the identification of poor performance (Herzberg, 1987; Ostroff, 1993; Boswell and Boudreau, 2000). In this study, however, the use of appraisal to reward employees was indicated to be insignificant in employee motivation. This corroborated the findings of Blau (1964) and Meyer, Kay & French (1965) that the evaluative purposes of performance appraisal often yield negative employee reactions.

What types of recognition increases intrinsic motivation and enhances individual performance? Popp and Fox (1985), Kovach (1987) and Hede (1990) conducted surveys and provided answers to this question. They found that employees sought achievement, responsibility and growth as the highest priority for incentives in their work. Therefore, incentives should be used with caution when sustained employee motivation is envisaged. After a certain point, employees will not value rewards if they remain at the same position in the organizational ladder despite improvements in their performance.

The paper further identifies a moderate correlation between usage of appraisal for career development and employee motivation (Beta = .209). Thus, employees would prefer appraisal to be used for identifying individual training needs, providing performance feedback, determining transfers and assignments. This finding confirms the work of Prince & Lawler (1986) and Cleveland, Murphy & Williams (1989).

Two major stages in the appraisal process correlate positively with employee motivation. These include employee participation in setting objectives and performance review which were observed to correlate positively with employee motivation. Thus, the principle of due process in appraisal as proposed by Susan et al (1995) does not only enhance employee satisfaction with feedback, it also supplements employee motivation. The assumption is that when people jointly set standards and jointly review their performance with regard to those standards, it introduces transparency and trust into the appraisal system. This, therefore, prevents the tendency of subordinates to accuse supervisors of witch hunting and hate crime. Participation in performance evaluation by employees, however, was found to have no significant correlation with employee motivation.

The study demonstrated that the performance appraisal system can be an effective tool in employee motivation if both the process and outcome are fair. This corroborated several earlier studies (Hyde, 2005; Fulk, Klingner & Nabaldine, 1998; Roberts & Pavlak, 1996; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991) that the appraisal system could be used to motivate employees.

The study also revealed that employee participation in the appraisal process was high and this led to employee motivation and perception of the process and outcome as fair. This finding also confirmed the assumptions of equity theory which states that workers are motivated when they discover that there is transparency in their evaluations and that they are treated fairly in compensation and promotion (Adams, 1965).

Another key finding was that motivation and performance were enhanced when individuals participated in goal-setting. This corroborated Armstrong's (2006) assertion that motivation and performance would improve if people have challenging but agreed upon goals and receive feedback. Managers indicated that one of the functions of performance

appraisal was the provision of feedback to employees. This showed that employees feel motivated when they know how well they are doing on their jobs. This also informs employees of their value and future in the organization.

XI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that managers should appreciate the efforts of employees in their daily interaction with them. In addition, letters or citations which employees can keep as souvenirs of their performance are also recommended.

The authors also recommend that management should approach performance appraisal issues with good interpersonal communication and develop the capacity to tolerate poor performers. Such poor performers can, however, be taken through training to improve future performance.

Employees do not feel motivated when performance appraisal is conducted for the sake of documentation and rewards. Therefore, the study recommends that appraisal should be used for training needs analysis and career development instead of documentation which gives employees (especially poor performers) the impression that cases are built against them for eventual expulsion.

The findings of the study indicated that employee participation in PAS was very high and consequently, the process was perceived by most employees to be fair. Thus, subjectivity in appraisal can be minimized through the implementation of due-process metaphor.

The test of hypothesis, however, revealed that some other hidden factors other than participation also accounted for fairness in organizations. It is presumed that this has to do with how high managers fix performance standards, manager-subordinate interaction was also important in sustaining employee motivation and performance. It is recommended that these hidden factors must be considered to ensure fairness in PAS.

XII. CONCLUSION

The study demonstrated that the PAS can be an effective tool in employee motivation if both the process and outcome are fair. The test of hypothesis revealed that some other hidden factors other than participation also accounted for fairness/equity in organizations. The process of performance appraisal was not the only factor responsible for employee motivation in organizations. The outcome of the appraisal process as well as manager/subordinate interaction was also important in sustaining employee motivation and performance. In other words, salaries and other rewards and congenial organizational culture were significant factors in employee motivation. Finally, the study concluded that a participatory performance appraisal increased employee motivation and that employee motivation increased employee performance, all things being equal.

XIII. CONCLUSION

The foregoing is a concise how-to-do-it presentation of the splash-dye technique of fabric surface decoration which was inspired by Jackson Pollock's action painting. It is worthy of note that one of the writer's students has taken up the cellophane approach and makes a living with it. She wrote to the writer, expressing that she is making money from one of the techniques taught her and she won't ever reveal it to writer but unknown to her the writer had already noticed the products in Akwa Ibom State markets in Nigeria and knew it must be from one of his students. The splash-dye technique just like the regular resist techniques leaves a lot of room for experimentations, developments and further innovations. It is the writer's hope that both students and other dyeing enthusiasts will practice the technique and come up with patterns that will further add to the varieties achieved by the writer. This publication is also meant to serve as an informal registration of patent of the splash-dye technique. Designers who will embrace this technique should remember to acknowledge the innovator to deviate from the unfortunate persistent practice where textile designers in Nigeria are not given credit for their patents and designs, a situation that has given advantage to their pure fine artists' counterparts who always sign their creations and retain absolute informal patents and copyrights.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adams, J.S., (1965). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Volume 2, Elsevier Inc., United Kingdom.
- [2] Akuoko, K.O., *Supervisory Styles and Workers' Behaviour in Selected Organizations in the Ashanti Region of Ghana*, *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 2011, Vol. 4, No. 22, 129-150.
- [3] Armstrong, M. (2006: 2010). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, London: Kogan Page Limited.
- [4] Banks, C. G. and Murphy, K. (1985). *Toward Narrowing the Research-practice Gap in Performance Appraisal*. *Personnel Psychology*, 38: 335-345
- [5] Bernardin, H. J. and Villanova, P. (1986). *Performance Appraisal*. In E. A. Locke (ed.), *Generalizing from Laboratory to Field Settings*, Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- [6] Blau, P.M., (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, New York: Wiley.
- [7] Boone, Jr. H. N and Boone, D. A. (2012). *Analyzing Likert Data*. *Journal of Extension* [Online], 50(2) Article 2TOT2. Available at : <http://www.joe.org/joe/2012april/tt2.php>
- [8] Boswell, W.R., and Boudreau, J.W., (2000). *Employee Satisfaction with Performance Appraisals and Appraisers: The Role of Perceived Appraisal Use*, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(3), 283-299.
- [9] Bruce, A., Anne, S., Pepitone, J. and James S., (1999). *Motivating Employees*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [10] Burke, R.J. and Wilcox D.S. (1969). *Characteristics of Effective Employee Performance Review and*

- Development Interviews: Replication and Extension, *Personnel Psychology*, 25: 291-305.
- [11] Cleveland, J. N. Murphy, K. R. and Williams, R.E., (1989). Multiple Uses of Performance Appraisal: Prevalence and Correlates, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74: 130-135.
- [12] Coens, T. and Jenkins, M., Abolishing Performance Appraisals, *Innovative Leader*, July 2000, Volume 10, San Francisco.
- [13] Deci, E.L., The Effects of Contingent and Non-contingent Rewards and Controls on Intrinsic Motivation, *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 1972, Vol.8, 217-229.
- [14] Dipboye, R. L. and de Pontbriand, R., Correlates of Employee Reactions to Performance Appraisals and Appraisal Systems, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1981, Vol. 66, 248-251.
- [15] Dunford, R.W., (1992). *Organizational Behaviour: An Organizational Analysis Perspective*, Sydney: Addison-Wesley Business Series.
- [16] Folger, R., Distributive and Procedural Justice: Combined Impact of 'Voice' and improvement on experienced inequity, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1977, 35: 108-119.
- [17] Folger, R. and Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on reactions to pay raise decisions, *Academy of Management Journal*, 32: 115-130.
- [18] Folger, R., Konovsky, M. A. and Cropanzano, R. (1992). A due process metaphor for performance appraisal. 13: 129-177. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- [19] Fulk, J., Brief, A. P. and Barr, S.H. (1985). Trust-in-supervisor and perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluations. *Journal of Business Research*, 13: 299-313.
- [20] Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of Perceived Fairness of Performance Evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 340-342.
- [21] Hede, A. J. (1990). A Follow-up of the Victorian Senior Executive Service, Unpublished Paper, University College of Southern Queensland.
- [22] Herzberg, F. (1987), One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, 53-63.
- [23] Horsoo, S.K. (2010). Employee Performance Appraisal, Rewards and Recognitions - A Case Study of Barclays Bank of Ghana Limited, Kumasi, Institute of Distance Learning, KNUST.
- [24] Hyde, A.C., (2005). The New Environment for Compensation and Performance Evaluation in the Public Sector, *Public Personnel Management*, 17: 351-358.
- [25] Kanfer, R., Sawyer, J., Earley, P. C. and Lind, E.A. (1987). Fairness and Participation in Evaluation Procedures: Effects on Task Attitudes and Performance, *Social Justice Research*, 1: 235-249.
- [26] Kellough, J. E. and Nigro, L. G. (2002). Pay for Performance in Georgia State Government: Employee Perspectives on Georgia Gain after 5 years, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 22(2), 146-166.
- [27] Klingner, D.E. and Nalbandine, J. (1998). *Public Personnel Management: Contexts and Strategies*, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [28] Kovach, K.A., (1987). What Motivates Employees? Workers and Supervisors Give Different Answers, *Business Horizons*, Vol. 30 No.5, 58-65.
- [29] Lawler, E.E., (1971). *Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [30] Locke, E.A. and Latham, G.P., (1979). Goal-setting: A Motivational Technique that Works, *Organizational Dynamics*, 8(2), 68-80.
- [31] London, C. and Higgot, K., (1997). An Employee Reward and Recognition Process, *The TQM Magazine*, Vol.9, No.5, 328-335.
- [32] Longenecker, C. O., Gioia, D. A. and Sims, H.P. (1987). Behind the Mask: The Politics of Employee Appraisal, *Academy of Management Executive*, 1(3): 183-193.
- [33] Manu, J. S., (2004). *Training and Development Techniques for Improving Organizational Performance for Ghanaian firms*. The Graduate School, University of Wisconsin - Stout. May 2004.
- [34] Meyer, H.H., Kay, E. and French, J.R.P., (1965). Split Roles in Performance Appraisal, *Harvard Business Review*, 5(1): 68-76.
- [35] Murphy, K. R. and Cleveland, J.N. (1991). *Performance Appraisal: An Organizational Perspective*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- [36] Nathan, B. R., Moorman, A. M. and Milliman, J., (1991). Interpersonal Relations as a Context for the Effects of Appraisal Interviews on Performance and Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Study, *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 352-369.
- [37] Ohemeng, F.L.K., (2009). Constraints in the Implementation of Performance Management Systems in Developing Countries: The Ghanaian Case, *International Journal of Cross-cultural Management*, 9(1), 109-132.
- [38] Osei-Wusu, J. (2013). *Management of Product Branding in Microfinance Institutions*. Unpublished Master's Thesis Submitted to the School of Business, KNUST, Kumasi, Ghana.
- [39] Ostroff, C. (1993). Rater Perceptions, Satisfaction and Performance Ratings, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66, 345-356.
- [40] Ott, J.S., (1989). *Classic Readings in Organizational Behaviour*, Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- [41] Perry, J.L., (2003). Compensation, Merit Pay and Motivation, In S.W. Hays and R.C. Kearney (eds.), *Public Personnel Administration: Problems and Prospects*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [42] Popp, G.E. and Fox, H.W., (1985). What Rewards Do Australians Say they Want from their Job? *Human Resource Management Australia*, Vol. 23, 41-44.
- [43] Prince, J.B. and Lawler, E.E., (1986). Does Salary Discussion Hurt the Developmental Performance Appraisal? *Organizational Behaviour and Human Resource Decision Processes*, 37, 357-375.
- [44] Roberts, G.E. and Pavlak, T., (1996). *Municipal Government Personnel Professionals and Performance*

- Appraisal: Is there a Consensus on the Characteristics of an Effective Appraisal System? *Public Personnel Management*, Vol.32, No.1, Spring 2003.
- [45] Risher, S. (2002). Pay-for-Performance: The Key to Making it Work. *Public Personnel Management*, 31(3), 317-332.
- [46] Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research Methods for Business Students*, Edinburgh Gate, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- [47] Susan, M.T., Kay, B.T., Monika, K.R., Harrison, J.K. and Stephen, J.C. (1995). *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol.40 1995.
- [48] Tyler, T. R., and Lind, E.A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. Zanna, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25: 115-191. New York: Academic Press.
- [49] Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley.

IJIRAS