



Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Business and Economics
Department of Public Administration and Development
Management

Assessment of the Implementation of Performance Appraisal System in
Ethiopian Public Universities in the case of Ethiopian Civil Service University
and Kotebe Metropolitan University

By: Demes Mered

Advisor: DR. Friehiwot G/Hiwot

Submitted to School of Graduate Studies, College of Business and Economics Department of Public Administration and Development Management, Distance Program In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master in Public Management and Policy Studies specialization in Development Management

November, 2017

Addis Ababa

Declaration

I, Demes Mere'd Moltot, declare that this work entitled "Assessment of the Implementation of Performance Appraisal System in Ethiopian Public Universities in the case of Ethiopian Civil Service University and Kotebe Metropolitan University", is the outcome of my own effort and study and that all sources of materials used for the study have been duly acknowledged. I have produced it independently except for the guidance and suggestion of the Research Advisor. This study has not been submitted for any degree in this University or any other University. It is offered for the partial fulfillment of the degree of Masters of Public Management and Policy (MPMP) in the Specialization of Development Management.

Demes Mered Signature_____ Date_____

Approval

The under signed here by certify to the Addis Ababa University the acceptance of the thesis submitted by Demes Mered entitles: Assessment of the Implementation of Performance Appraisal System in Ethiopian Public Universities in the case of Ethiopian Civil Service University and Kotebe Metropolitan University in the partial fulfillment of the requirement for Masters of degree in Public Management and Policy [MPMP] in Specialization of Development Management.

Signature _____ Date _____

Frehiwot G/hiwot, PhD (Advisor)

Signature _____ Date _____

Gemechu , PhD (Internal Examiner)

Signature _____ Date _____

Tariku Atomisa, PhD (External Examiner)

Signature _____ Date _____

(Chairperson of Department or Graduate Programs Coordinator)

Acknowledgement

First of all, I would like to thank the Almighty God for His interminable help. Without His help, this research could not have been realized. I am grateful to my advisor, Dr. Frehiwot G/hiwot, for her committed and motivated guidance to successfully complete this research project.

I owe my families, friends and colleagues a huge amount of gratitude for their support and understanding during my studies. Without their help and encouragement this work would never come to an end.

Finally, I would like to thank academic staffs and department heads of Ethiopian Civil Service University and Kotebe Metropolitan University who have helped me to collect the necessary data.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Declaration..... | ii |
| Approval | iii |
| Acknowledgement | iv |
| Lists of Tables..... | vii |
| Acronym..... | viii |
| Abstract..... | ix |
| Chapter One: Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1. Background of the Study | 1 |
| 1.2. Background of Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU)..... | 2 |
| 1.3. Background of Kotebe Metropolitan University (KMU)..... | 3 |
| 1.4. Statement of the Problem..... | 4 |
| 1.5. Research Questions..... | 7 |
| 1.6. Objective of the Study | 7 |
| 1.7. Scope of the Study | 7 |
| 1.8. Limitation of the Study | 8 |
| 1.9. Significance of the Study | 8 |
| 1.10. Definitions of Terms | 8 |
| 1.11. Organization of the Study | 9 |
| Chapter Two: Literature Review | 10 |
| 2.1. Introduction..... | 10 |
| 2. 2. Historical Development of Performance Appraisal | 10 |
| 2. 3. Conceptual Framework to Analyze Academic Staffs’ Performance Appraisal..... | 11 |
| 2.4. The Definitions and Concepts of Performance Management and Performance Appraisal..... | 12 |
| 2. 4.1. Definitions of PM and PA..... | 12 |
| 2.4.2. Purposes of Performance Management..... | 13 |
| 2.5. Process of Performance Appraisal | 14 |
| 2.6. Approaches of Performance Appraisal | 15 |
| 2.6.1. Performance Appraisal Criteria | 16 |
| 2.6.2. Responsible Body to Conduct PA of Employees | 17 |
| 2.6.3. Time to Conduct Performance Appraisal..... | 18 |
| 2.7. Factors that can Distort Appraisal..... | 18 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 2.7.1. Problems Emanating from the Raters | 18 |
| 2.7.2. Problems Emanating from the System of PA..... | 19 |
| 2.7.3. Problems Emanating from the Ratees | 19 |
| 2.8. Employee perceptions and PA | 20 |
| 2.9. Challenges of Performance Appraisal..... | 21 |
| 2.10. Empirical Studies | 22 |
| Chapter Three: Research Design and Method..... | 25 |
| 3.1. Research Design..... | 25 |
| 3.2. Research Tools..... | 26 |
| 3.3. Research procedure..... | 27 |
| 3.4. Population and Sampling | 27 |
| 3.5. Data Analysis | 28 |
| 3.6. Test of Validity and Reliability..... | 28 |
| 3.7. Ethical Consideration..... | 29 |
| Chapter Four..... | 31 |
| Data Presentation and Analysis of the Research Result | 31 |
| 4.1. Introduction..... | 31 |
| 4.2. Profile of the Respondents | 31 |
| 4.3. Data Presentation, Discussion, and Analysis of the Research Results..... | 33 |
| 4.3.1 Purposes of Performances Appraisals..... | 33 |
| 4.3.2. Performance Appraisal System..... | 37 |
| 4.3.3. Performance Appraisal Process and Practices | 43 |
| 4.3.4. Academic Staffs' Perceptions about PA | 46 |
| 4.3.5. Challenges of Performance Appraisal at ECSU/KMU | 51 |

Lists of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 4.1. Profile of the Respondents | 33 |
| Table 4.2: Purposes of PA | 34 |
| Table 4.3. PA system of ECSU and KMU..... | 38 |
| Table 4.4. PA Process and practices | 44 |
| Table 4.5: Academic staffs Perception about PA result..... | 52 |
| Table4.6.: Subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria..... | 53 |
| Table 4.7: PA process demands too much time and effort | 53 |
| Table 4.8: standards and rating criteria are used unfairly by the raters | 54 |
| Table 4.9 : appraisers' personal values..... | 55 |
| Table 4.10: staffs' roles in the process of PA are overlooked along..... | 55 |
| Table 4.11:Performance appraisers give a disproportionate ratings | 56 |
| Table 4.12: Little time is spent on the appraisal process | 56 |
| Table 4.13: performance appraisers consistently give average ratings | 57 |
| Table 4.14: penalizes the outstanding performer | 58 |
| Table 4.15: lack of commitment to providing feedback | 58 |
| Table 4.16::Resistance to performance PA practices..... | 59 |
| Table 4.17: Academic staffs' entire year of very favorable performance..... | 59 |

Acronym

- AAU: Addis Ababa University
- PA: Performance Appraisal
- PE: Performance Evaluation
- ECSU: Ethiopian Civil Service University
- KMU: Kotebe Metropolitan University
- PM: Performance Management
- PMS: Performance Management System

Abstract

Performance management and performance appraisal are now issues of crucial concern in higher education owing to factors like increased numbers of students and increasing overall expenditures. Empirical evidence suggests that the implementation of performance appraisal systems in academic institutions often result in tension between academic employees and management. The present study assessed the perception of academic staffs regarding the implementation of performance appraisal system in Ethiopian public universities with special reference to the Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU) and Kotebe Metropolitan University (KMU). The study used survey research design, using both quantitative and qualitative research approach. The quantitative data were collected from academic staffs and the qualitative data was collected from department heads. The total sample of the study comprised of 106 academic staffs. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics. The findings showed that PA results were used to provide information about administrative decisions and performance appraisal criteria have been clearly identified. However, the subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria, biasedness of the appraisers and limited commitment to provide feedback were the challenges of PA practices in the study area. Therefore, the findings have managerial implications for training, motivation and provision of resources for effective performance appraisal. ECSU and KMU should make the academic staff participate in preparation of PE criteria to minimize the subjectivity and provide PA result feedback to academic staffs on time; this benefits the students, the university, and the academic staffs; since if the academic staffs know their performance where they are, they will strive to improve their performance

Key Words: *Performance Appraisal, Performance Evaluation, Academic staffs, Performance Appraisal System, Performance Appraisal Result.*

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

The concept of managing, workforce or employees can be traced back to pre-historic times. Armstrong and Angela (1998) stated that the emperors of the Wei dynasty in China had an Imperial Rater whose task was to evaluate the performance of the official family. The first formal monitoring systems, however, evolved out of the work of Frederick Taylor and his followers before World War I (Price, 2011). Rating for officers in the US armed services was introduced in the 1920s, and this spread to the UK, as did some of the factory based US systems (Goel, 2008). Merit-rating came to practice in the USA and the UK in the 1950s and 1960s. Management by objectives then came and went in the 1960s and 1970s and, simultaneously, experiments were made with the critical incident technique and behaviorally anchored rating scales. A revised form of results-oriented performance appraisal emerged in the 1950s which still exists today. The term performance management was first used in the 1970s but it did not become a recognized process until the latter half of the 1980s (Price, 2011). Thus, the history of performance management goes in such a way that from trait-oriented to developmental or result oriented management practices.

Performance management is the total system of managing the achievement of assigned duties and tasks by employees aimed at the attainment of an organization's mission. Performance can be conceptualized from organizational, departmental/divisional, or individual perspectives (Price, 2011). Performance from the organizational perspectives is defined as the attainment of the key results expected from an organization as derived from its mission. Similarly, from the individual perspective, performance can be defined as the carrying out of assigned duties and tasks according to expected standards. Besides, from the departmental/divisional perspective, performance can be defined as the carrying out of the shared activities of the organization (Elaine, 2004).

Performance management describes the systematic approach to performance involving the setting of performance, objectives, and targets for programs (Brown, 1988). Managers are responsible for each program to implement the processes to achieve these objectives and targets. The actual level of performance against targets is measured and reported. The information is passed on to review,

bodies such as legislative Committees, organizational committees or external management auditors. The reward system to some extent flew to the development of targets set (Brown, 1988; Longenecker & Fink, 1999).

Therefore, Performance management is the systematic process by which an agency involves its employees, as individuals and members of a group, in improving organizational effectiveness in the accomplishment of agency mission and goals.

Appraising employee performance in organizations is a complex and challenging task. It is an often unacknowledged but always inevitable component in the supervisory process. Judgments about how individuals are performing will be made whether or not there is a formal performance appraisal system because people regularly make judgments about others (Grote, 1996 & Seldin, 1988).

FAO (2013) stated that Performance appraisal (PA) is one of a powerful management tool for motivating people, increasing productivity and attainment of organizational as well as employees' objectives. It has two very broad goals. These goals include developmental and administrative. The former represents the development of employee in salary increase, bonus, which has greater implication for the enhancement of organizational success. While the later shows that taking the results of PA as a source of information for administrative decision making like who is legible to be promoted/demoted, who needs additional training/coaching/mentoring.

Thus, performance appraisal data enables management to make career planning, training and development, pay increases, promotion and placement decisions and assess the success of recruitment, selection, placement, and other related activities.

1.2. Background of Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU)

The Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU) was established in 1995 with the legal mandate to operate as an institution of higher education. Its vision is to become a center of excellence for building an effective, efficient, transparent, and accountable civil service, which contributes to the development and transformation goal of Ethiopia. through the provision of among others training and educational programs that cater to the needs of the public sectors with special emphasis on the

civil service; conducting research and providing consultancy services relevant to the needs of the civil service system; and training and certifying professionals as stated in 20th years anniversary of Magazine (ECSU,2015)

ECSU has been providing long and short course training programs to meet the needs of civil servants and further noted the existence of a growing demand for these services both at the federal and regional levels. The university has been working with three colleges such as College of Finance, Management and Development, College of Leadership and Governance and College of Urban Development and Engineering.

These colleges have been giving six Ph.D. programs, twenty-five Master programs and ten Bachelor degree programs currently as it is seen in the broacher of ECSU (2016). There are also centers like research Research and Community Service, Center for Research for Ethics and Integrity, Center for Research in Public Service Reforms, Community Service Directorate and Research and Publication Directorate. The university has been giving training and consultancy service for public servants based on their demand and its initiations. Like any other universities, ECSU has different administrative wings, departments and academic support management and administration offices. ECSU has more than 1100 staffs. From this, there are more than 300 both local and expatriate academic staffs and 850 hundreds administrative employees (Second Quarter Report, 2017) Source: <http://www.ecsu.edu.et/vision-mission>

1.3. Background of Kotebe Metropolitan University (KMU)

Kotebe Metropolitan University (KMU) Profile (2017) presented that the former Kotebe College of Teacher Education was set up within the Haile Selassie I University (HSIU) in 1959 under the name College. In 1969, the College left HSIU and went to the present Addis Ababa Technical and Vocational College where it came to be known as Teacher Training College. Later, the name was changed to Addis Ababa College of Teacher Education. It was in 1976 that the College transferred to the present site and got its name, Kotebe College of Teacher Education.

Upon the approval of the Commission of Higher Education, the college launched degree program in six areas of study: English Language and Literature, Ethiopian Languages and Literature, Geography, History, Health and Physical Education and Mathematics in 1989.

In 1997, the Addis Ababa City Administration took over the responsibility of running the college from the Ministry of Education. Following the transfer of the college to Addis Ababa City Administration, degree programs except for the Department of Health and Physical Education were discontinued.

After nine years of relentless effort made by the college management, the College community, former graduates of the college and other stakeholders, the degree program was re-launched in 2007 in affiliation with Bahr Dar University. Degree program students were assigned in 10 departments namely Biology, Chemistry, Civics and Ethical Education, English Language, and Literature, Ethiopian Languages and Literature, Sports Science, History, Geography, Mathematics, and Physics. It also ran a diploma program in linear and cluster modalities.

The year 2014 ushered a major landmark in the history of Kotebe College of Teacher Education When Addis Ababa City Government granted it the status of University College by Regulation Number56/2013. Another milestone in the history of the institution occurred on December 15, 2016, when Kotebe University College is upgraded to full-fledged Metropolitan University (KMU).KMU is restructured into 8 units. These are College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, College of Natural and Computational Sciences, Faculty of Languages and Humanities, Faculty of Urban Development Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Faculty of Business and Economics, Sports Science Academy, and Science and Technology Innovation Center.

At present, the University is running certificate, diploma, undergraduate and graduate studies in its regular, evening extension and summer programs. The number of KMU staff accounts about 710 of which 264 represents the academic staff (Broacher of Public Relation Office of KMU, 2017)

1.4. Statement of the Problem

Performance appraisal is one of the essential management principles and tools for both organizations as well as employees to achieve organizational goal (Brown, 1988). Some of the significances of PA include: providing employees a recognition for their work efforts, creating discussion forums between employees and managers to clarify what is expected from them in the process, making managerial decisions on the issues of merit-based reward/punishment and human resource functions like promotions, transfers, terminations, demotions, and recognizing and agree

upon individual skill gaps to design training and HRD programs so as to fill the identified gaps (Forrest, 2009).

Researchers explained the problems of performance appraisal system and practices in different ways but with the same issues. Elaine (2004) stated that managers are reluctant to provide frank feedback and have honest discussions with employees for fear of reprisal or damaging relationships with the very individuals they count on to get work done. Brown(1988) added that Employees feel that their managers are unskilled at discussing their performance and ineffective at coaching them on how to develop their skills. Many managers and employees complain that the performance management system is cumbersome, bureaucratic and too time to consume and does not add for the achievement of organizational goals. This leads both managers and employees to treat performance management as a necessary evil of work life. Elaine (2004) also added that in spite of the difficulties, performance management is an essential tool for high-performing organizations. Thus, this situation is also common in Ethiopian public universities practices.

Performance management and performance appraisal are now issues of crucial concern in higher education owing to factors like increased numbers of students, increasing overall expenditures and inadequate government grants. Empirical evidence suggests that the implementation of performance appraisal systems in academic institutions often result in tension between academic employees and management, since thereby -long debate on the necessity for academic freedom in institutions of higher learning globally (Esther , 2015) .

This study focused on the assessment of performance Appraisal system in the Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU) and Kotebe Metropolitan University (KMU) that have been working on the same issues but with different focuses, mission and mandate. The task of teachers' performance appraisal is essential and yet a sensitive responsibility. Various reasons could be cited as for why the task is considered to be sensitive and complex. Primarily, performance appraisal deals with the measurement of teachers' efforts, competence, professional skills (teaching, research, and consultancy) and attitude to achieve the mission and vision of their universities and how much effort they are putting in their jobs. However, there are instances where staffs are not clear about objectives of appraising performance and they give it less of their time and attention. Furthermore, the performance appraisal measuring criteria could either be vague or might not

contain the necessary qualities that need to measure the performance of the academic staffs; the performance evaluation system can be influenced by the behavior of the appraisees, the appraisers (Elaine, 2004).

ECSU and KMU, as a higher institution that has academic staffs in various disciplines, are not free from of these problems. According to the report of ECSU (2012) lack of clarity or the ambiguity of performance evaluation criteria, subjectivity of the criteria to evaluate the performance of the staffs, biasedness of the evaluators, and lack of clarity on who is evaluated by who are the challenges of PA. Elaine (2004) added that insufficient communication between employee and managers on the process and the result, the inability of performance appraisal criteria to evaluate the academic staffs' performances and the inability to use the results of performance appraisal to basic management decisions like promotion, incentive payments, training and development programs are pitfalls of the processes of PA.

The study focused on the assessment of performance appraisal in the Ethiopian Civil Service University and Kotebe University mainly for academic staff. The academic staffs are not evaluated according to the performance evaluation criteria, the format and methods which are regulated by the Federal Ministry of Public Service and Human Resources Development like administrative staffs. The Ethiopian public universities have been evaluating their academic staffs by designing their own performance evaluation criteria, the format, and methods. Thus, it has become a source of dissatisfaction for appraisees, appraisers and the management. Different issues have been rising regarding the performance appraisal criteria and evaluators of PA for academic staffs. It has taken a long time to prepare the performance appraisal formats and criteria in Ethiopian Civil service University and still some of the teachers are not satisfied with it. Academic staffs are appraised by their students, colleagues and department heads. The staffs and the management of the universities are complaining the performance appraisal results since the performance results of the academic staffs are exaggerated and it did not show the actual performances of them according to the annual report 2015/2016 academic calendar of ECSU. Therefore, the staffs are not expecting benefit and/or any recognition after performance appraisal has been conducted.

The researcher, therefore, is initiated to assess the performance Appraisal system in Ethiopian public universities with reference to the Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU) and Kotebe Metropolitan University since there are continuous complainants about the performance evaluation

results of academic staffs so as to award best performers of them. Staffs are heard complaining about their promotion, job assignment, payment, incentives and training, and development program.

1.5. Research Questions

This research attempted to answer the following four basic research questions.

- What are the purposes of conducting PA in the study area?
- What are the staffs' expectations after performance appraisal has been performed?
- How do the academic staffs perceive the performance appraisal system and PA criteria?
- What are the problems encountered in academic staffs' performance appraisal practice?

1.6. Objective of the Study

The general objective of this study is to assess the 'Implementation of Performance Appraisal System in Ethiopian Public Universities particularly in Ethiopian Civil Service University and Kotebe Metropolitan University.

The specific objectives are:

- to investigate the objectives of performance appraisal under study.
- to examine the staffs' expectations after performance evaluation has been performed.
- to assess academic staffs perception about the PA practice and results.
- to assess the performance appraisal criteria that are used to evaluate the academic staffs
- to analyze the challenges of performance appraisal processes, system and practice.

1.7. Scope of the Study

This research was intended to address PA issues pertaining to academic staffs in the Ethiopian Public universities as they were primary contributors to success or failure of the education system. This research has focused on assessing the 'Implementation of Performance Appraisal System in Ethiopian Public Universities particularly in Ethiopian Civil Service University and Kotebe Metropolitan University. The study covered only the academic staffs' performance appraisal practices and systems of the university. Therefore, the research delimited itself from PA

procedures adopted for other employees such as administrative workers or academic supports of ECSU and KMU.

1.8. Limitation of the Study

Though ECSU and KMU have two staff categories that are administrative and academic like any other universities, due to financial and time constraints, the researcher would not include the administrative staffs. This project did not include the other public universities which were found in Addis Ababa and regions since their proximity to the research center located in the researcher area and convenience for data collection, cost minimization and time management made the researcher his focal area of research. Therefore, because of time and finance constraint, the researcher would not include other public universities in this research.

1.9. Significance of the Study

This research is significant to give feedback to academic staffs, directors of the colleges and department heads, other stakeholders and researchers about the performance appraisal systems, practices and problems encounter in public universities. Performance appraisal results help the academic staffs to have career development, identify training needs, promotion and identify their strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, it helps to improve staffs' job performance; it encourages them to express their views; it facilitates selection for reward and promotion of the best qualified academic staffs. These, in turn, help the public universities to benefit from the improved performance of academic staffs. If the level of motivation among academic staffs is high, the quality of education, training, consultancy service, and research will be to the standards. Additionally, this study also helps researchers in the provision of information as secondary data for future use in the academic arena and research.

1.10. Definitions of Terms

- Performance Appraisal: It is a formal system of review and evaluation of individual or team task performance, and in general peers review an individual's performance on a continuing yearly basis (Fletcher, 2001).

- Performance Evaluation: The process of interpreting a measurement by means of a specific value, or set of values, to determine the degree to which the measurement(s) represent a desirable condition (Daugherty, 2001)
- Performance Appraisal system: a group of interactive processes determining job expectations, writing position descriptions, determining appraisal criteria, developing assessment tools, and collecting and reporting results (Brown, 1988).
- Academic staffs mean all who make teaching, training, consultancy, and research in the University and include professors, associate professors, Assistant Professors, Lecturers, Assistant Lecturers, Graduate Assistants, consultants, and researchers.

1.11. Organization of the Study

The study was divided into five chapters. The first chapter dealt with the background, statement of the problem (including research questions), objectives, scope, and significance of the study. Chapter two will include the review of related literature. The research design, methods, and research procedures were described in chapter three. Chapter four focused on data presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the research. In the last chapter, summary and conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations were presented and discussed.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

In the preceding chapter, the background of the research, research problem and questions, objectives, significance, and limitations of the study were discussed. This chapter dealt with the concepts of performance management (PM), performance evaluation (PE) and performance appraisal (PA). It starts from the historical development of performance appraisal (PA). The major topics are the purposes of PA, academic staffs' perception on PA, Methods of Performance Appraisal and the challenges of PA. Finally, empirical studies for this research were reviewed. Different resources have been referred so as to review, to analyses critically and widen the subject as follows.

2. 2. Historical Development of Performance Appraisal

A number of theories can be mentioned in relation to PM and PA. Different paradigms have been advocating and insisting that performance management and appraisal should be seen from their perspectives. The historical development of performance management and performance appraisal has been explained by many authors/researchers and some of the explanations are presented as follows.

Armstrong and Angela (1998) remarked that the emperors of the Wei dynasty in China had an Imperial Rater whose task was to evaluate the performance of the official family. The first formal monitoring systems, however, evolved out of the work of Frederick Taylor and his followers before world war I. Rating for officers in the US armed services was introduced in the 1920s, and this spread to the UK, as did some of the factory based US systems (Price, 2011). He added that merit-rating came to practical in the USA and the UK in the 1950s and 1960s when performance appraisal. Management by objectives (MBO) came and went in the 1960s and 1970s and, simultaneously, experiments were made with the critical incident technique and behaviorally anchored rating scales. A revised form of results oriented performance appraisal emerged in the 1950s which still exists today. Price (2011) also added that the term performance management was first used in the 1970s but it did not become a recognized process until the latter half of the 1980s.

On the other hand, Murphy & Cleveland (1995) stated that while the importance and usage of performance appraisal has grown over the past 45 years, the formality of evaluating employees through the use of performance appraisal has been present for centuries. The first business use of merit rating was probably made by Robert Owen at his cotton mills in New Lanark, Scotland, in the early 1800s (Heilbroner, 1961). In the cotton mills, wooden cubes of various colors representing various levels of merit and achievement were hung over each employee's work area. As employee performance varied, the wooden cube was changed to reflect it.

Thus, the history of performance management has explained in such a way. It is seen from trait-oriented to developmental or result oriented management practices. If the historical development is described like this, the definitions and conceptual frame-work of PM and PA have been presented as follows.

2. 3. Conceptual Framework to Analyze Academic Staffs' Performance Appraisal

There are challenges to understand the complex range of features associated with academic staffs' performance appraisal. The main policy objective is to ensure that academic staffs' performance appraisal contributes to the improvement of quality education, training, consultancy, problem solving researches and community service through enhanced teaching, research training and consultancy performance. The conceptual framework for this project has five main interrelated aspects as it is discussed as follows.

- Purposes of PA: what are the purposes of PA in Public University at the staff level, university level, and country level?
- PA system and Practice: how does the PA system conduct? Who evaluate the academic staffs? Why do they evaluate the staff and what are the expectations from them?
- Capabilities to assess and to use feedback: This aspect concerns the preparation to evaluate, to be evaluated and to use the results of an evaluation as well as the choice of decision making. It includes issues such as the choice of the evaluators and the development of the skills to perform the assessment of the staff.
- Academic staffs' perceptions and expectation: How and what are the perceptions of academic staffs on PA? Their perception can be positive or negative. What are the staff

expectations? This encompasses the objectives of a particular academic staffs PA practice, process and the mechanisms designed to ensure that evaluation results are used in a way such objectives are reached.

- Challenges: What are the factors that affect academic staffs' performance appraisal results? PA issues cannot be practiced in isolation. Appraisees, PA system, appraisers, PA criteria, and university -level factors all influence PA results of the staffs. These factors influence the design of approaches to academic staffs' evaluation in terms of the needs for new policy initiatives, the factors that constrain policy opportunities, and the factors that influence policy implementation.

2.4. The Definitions and Concepts of Performance Management and Performance Appraisal

Different researchers define PM and PA in different ways with similar concepts. Some of the definitions and concepts like purposes of PA are presented as follows which are relevant for this research.

2. 4.1. Definitions of PM and PA

Many writers define PM and PA in many ways but with similar issues. Sayantani (2015) and Farheen (2004) stated that Performance Management is a broader concept, encompassing performance appraisal as one of its corner stone component of management. Like any management concept and tool, the success and failure of any performance management can be attributed primarily to the management and its employees. Performance management is at a promising stage as organizations still have performance appraisal system in place, primarily for financial reward administration and various administrative decisions making.

Armstrong (2009) defines also performance management as a process which is designed to improve organizational, team and individual performance and this is owned and driven by the line manager. Therefore, Performance management is the systematic process by which organization involves its employees, as individuals and members of a group, in improving organizational effectiveness to accomplish its mission and goals.

Similarly, Bacal (1999) explained that Performance management(PM) aims to foster efficiency and effectiveness in the workplace by maximizing and maintaining individual, team, program, organization and, ultimately, government outcomes. In a simple systems model of government work, performance can be managed and measured at any stage of the input, throughput, output or outcomes of government.

Therefore, from the above definitions, it is possible to say that PM is linked to the wider framework of strategic management and to strategic human resource management. The link between strategic human resource management and performance management is important because public sector managers need to be able to connect the action they take in conducting any one individual's performance appraisal to the wider system so as to improve the organization's and government's performance and mission.

Performance Appraisal is a formal system of review and evaluation of individual or team task performance, and in general peers review an individual's performance on a continuing yearly basis. The Performance Appraisal System (PAS) is a development tool used to measure the actual performance in an organization, aligning the strategic goals with that of individual performance (Bacal, 1999)

From the above writers' definitions, there is difference between performance management and performance appraisal. PM has wider and broader concept than PA. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that PA is a process and used to identify the strengths and weaknesses of employees of organizations on a specific period of time. It can also help to fill the identified gaps of employees and to reward for those who perform well. Therefore, PA is a very important management tool for the attainment of organizational as well as individual employees' goals.

2.4.2. Purposes of Performance Management

Many researchers have studied the purposes of PM and PA. Some of the results of these studies are presented as follows. Aswathappa (2005) stated that Performance management system provides the information related to salary, compensation plans, feedback, employees strength, and weaknesses. Aswathappa (2005:227) further explained the main purposes as: to effect promotion based on

competence and performance, to confirm the service of probationary employees upon their completing the probationary period satisfactorily, to assess the training and development needs of employees, to decide pay raise, to let the employees know where they stand so far in their performance, to improve communication and to determine whether the human resource programme such as selection, training, and transfers have been effective or not.

Elain (2004) added that performance management is the systematic process of planning and appraising performance by providing timely feedback and guidelines to employees for the enhancement of their performance. And the performance appraisal is the crucial part of performance management. Performance management is the process of enhancing the performance of the organization through individual and team performance. The basic purpose of performance management is to align the individual performance with organizational goals and objectives.

On the other hand, Mark (1995) has seen PM in different way from Elain (2004). Mark (1995) stated that PM is basically related with finding out weaknesses, their improvement and establishment of performance of individual. Mark (1995) also added that this process includes the alignment of vital goals with individual performance and proper feedback. Performance management provides the way to managers to overcome and improve the sudden changes very soon.

To summarize the above discussion, the performance management has great importance for attaining competitive advantage as it is considered the back bone of Human Resource Management. There are two basic purposes of PM: decision making and Employee development. In decision making, appraisal appraisal is used for the purpose of pay increment, promotions, transfers, assignments and decrease in work force. While in case of employee development the appraisal system works for training, job experience, monitoring and other development activities.

2.5. Process of Performance Appraisal

Appraisal should be an ongoing part of any program being developed. It can contribute most when it is established at the beginning of any undertaking for which relevant information is needed along the way. The performance appraisal process is one of the human resource activities in government

and private organizations in Ethiopia. The practice and process of the performance appraisal in any government employees under Federal Civil Service is according to the proclamation number 515/2009 declared in chapter four, stating that the federal civil servants proclamation performance evaluation purpose is to enable civil servants (a) effectively discharge their duties in accordance with the expected level quality standard time; (b)-identify their strengths and weaknesses: (c) improve their "future performances and develop self-initiative. The performance evaluation shall be transparent and shall be carried out with the collective participation of civil servants working together. The performance evaluation shall be carried out in accordance with, directives issued by the Commission as (Chemed,2012) stated his view.

Gabedi (2011) stated that Performance appraisal process is stated as: establishing performance standards, communicating standards to employees, measuring performance, comparing performance with standard, discussing appraisal with the employee and initiating corrective action.

On the other hand, Hamilton (1975) has seen the PA procedure from the goals and objectives of organization. According to Hamilton (1975), the procedures which must be included in any appraisal process are: enumeration of goals, objectives and /or standards of the program, designation of information essential to compare the performance with the goals, objectives and/ or standards for the program, design of instruments or other method of collecting the data desired, and identification of the discrepancies between what is desired and what exists, and indication of what corrective actions should be taken to lessen or eliminate the discrepancy.

Thus, PA process must be viewed as a procedure that can benefit all parties in the organization especially the rates and to achieve the organization's goal. It is not one -time task; it is the continuous processes

2.6. Approaches of Performance Appraisal

The PA approaches have been seen from PA criteria, responsible body for conducting PA, and time to conduct PA perspectives. These points are discussed, reviewed and analyzed critically based on the literatures here.

2.6.1. Performance Appraisal Criteria

Armstrong (2009) stated that the criteria for reviewing performance should be balanced between; achievements in relation to objectives; the level of knowledge and skills possessed and applied (competencies or technical competencies); behavior in the job as it affects performance (competencies); the degree to which behavior upholds the core values of the organization; day-to-day effectiveness.

Generally, criteria are relevant when they measure employees on the most important aspects of their jobs. But there are also problems with the criteria.

Aswathappa (2005:240) also added that one of the steps in designing appraisal programs is to determine the evaluation criteria. The criteria should be related to the job. There are six criteria that should be used related to the job. These are:

1. Quality: the degree to which the process or result of carrying out an activity approaches perfection in terms of confronting some ideal way of performing the activity.
2. Quantity: the amount produced, expressed in monetary terms, numbers of units or number of completed activity cycle.
3. Timeliness: the degree to which an activity is completed or result produced at the earliest time desirable from standpoint of both coordinating with the outputs of others and of maximizing the time available for other activities.
4. Cost effectiveness: the degree to which the organization's resource is maximized in the sense of getting the highest gain.
5. Need for supervision: the degree to which a job performer can carry out a job function without either having to request supervisory assistance or requiring supervisory intervention to prevent an adverse outcome
6. Interpersonal effects: the degree to which a performer promotes the feeling of self-esteem, goodwill and co-operating among co-workers and subordinates.

These criteria also supported by Ethiopian Federal Democratic Republic, Ministry of Public Service and Human Resource Development, Government Employers the Proclamation number 2009/515 Article 31/1 and it is stated that employee performance appraisal has to be measured based on time, quality, quantity, cost effectiveness.

2.6.2. Responsible Body to Conduct PA of Employees

Even though it varies from one organization to the other, PA can be carried out either by individual employee themselves, colleagues, immediate/line supervisor/manager, customers or both (Mark & Cook, 1995). Self-assessment refers to when individuals assess themselves against rating criteria or targeted objectives. The other form of assessment is the peer. Peer reassessment follows team members, departmental colleagues, or selected individuals with whom an employee has working interaction, provide the assessment. Research indicates that evaluations from peers are just as precise as those conducted by the supervisors. For the reason that peers are more in contact with the employee, witness the day to day activities and observe behaviors that would be overlooked by a supervisor, the evaluation will tend to be more inclusive. The employee's immediate supervisor(s) also provide the assessment because they are in the best position to monitor and assess their subordinates (Mark & Cook, 1995).

Senate Legislation of ESCU(2012) Article 58/3 stated that Teaching effectiveness for Academic Staff shall be determined by evaluations of the staff member's performance, by students, colleagues, and the department head or the staff's immediate supervisor at the end of each semester or academic year. The contribution of each of the components of the system of evaluation to the overall rating of the teaching effectiveness of an Academic Staff member shall be as follows.

- Evaluation by students..... 50%
- Evaluation by Head of Department..... 35%
- Evaluation by colleagues.....15%

Senate Legislation of KMU(2012) Article 48/2.1 stated that effectiveness in teaching of Academic Staff shall be measured by the staff member's performance, by students, colleagues or professional peers, and the department head or the staff's immediate supervisor at the end of each semester or academic year.

The contribution of each of the components of the system of evaluation to the overall rating of the teaching efficiency and research effectiveness of an Academic Staff member shall be as follows.

- Evaluation by students.....50%
- Evaluation by Head of the Department.....30%

- Evaluation by colleagues..... 15%
- self-evaluation.....5%

From the above discussion, PA can be carried out either by individual employee themselves, their colleagues, immediate/line supervisor/manager, customers or both.

2.6.3. Time to Conduct Performance Appraisal

In any administration activity of an organization, PA has its own time to be conducted. As Chemeda (2012) Cited from (Mullins 1996), with the majority of schemes, staff receives an annual appraisal and for many organizations, this may be sufficient. Also, more frequent appraisals may be appropriate for new members of staff, those recently promoted or appointed to a new position or for those whose past performance has not been up to the required standard..

Aswathappa (2005:242) Appraisals most often are conducted once a year, usually near the employees’ anniversary date. For new employees, an appraisal for 90 days after employment, again at six months, and annually these after is common timing. This regular time interval is a feature of formal appraisals and distinguishes them from informal appraisals.

Thus, both employees and managers are aware that performance will be reviewed on a regular basis, and they can plan for performance discussions. In addition, informal appraisals should be conducted whenever a manager feels they are desirable.

2.7. Factors that can Distort Appraisal

There are many factors that can distort PA results. Many researchers have been pointing out the factors which are emanating from raters, Rattee, and systems. These factors are presented as follows.

2.7.1. Problems Emanating from the Raters

The appraiser's intentional or unintentional biases distort the performance evaluation results and produce rating errors. Scholars pointed out these factors and presented as follows. Seldin (1988)

and Aswathappa (2005) provide a list of five potential biases that could arise in this situation: Halo bias refers to the tendency of supervisors to be influenced in one area of performance by the rating. Leniency occurs when a supervisor gives a disproportionate number of favorable or unfavorable ratings. Central tendency bias refers to when a supervisor consistently gives average ratings and avoids the favorable and unfavorable ends of the rating scale. Recency bias occurs when recent events have more influence on the appraisal than less recent events. Guessing bias occurs when the supervisor does not have relevant information to render a meaningful judgment, but provides a response anyway based on some aspect of the employee's performance.

2.7.2. Problems Emanating from the System of PA

Problems can emanate from the system of appraisal which involves the objective of the appraisal it wants to serve, administrations system, forms used and procedure used to make up the system. According to Michael Beer (1987) many of the problems in performance appraisal stem from the appraisal system itself the objectives, it is intended to serve, the administrative system in which it is embedded, and the forms and procedures that make up the system. (As cited Chemedda (2012), to Michael Beer (1987), the problems of performance evolution is related to the forms and procedures that make up the performance appraisal system. The form used to record the performance of the employees is blamed if it is cumbersome, not customized and if employees did not participate in the design of the form of evolution.

2.7.3. Problems Emanating from the Ratees

The problems of performance evaluation can also be attributed to the ratees and involves the instance of their attempt to create the unnecessary impression is one of the major problems with respect to ratees. According to Mark Cook (1995), while discussing impression management, organizations occasionally exist in which subordinates gain credit for pushing ahead with management plans that are absurdly wrong, in pursuit of aims which are completely pointless, stifling criticism either of purpose or of the method with cries of 'commitment' and 'loyalty'. Thus, PA can be distorted by the rate themselves, raters, the PA system. attention should be given for these factors

2.8. Employee perceptions and PA

Perception is the intuitive understanding, recognition, and interpretation of things and events. Behavior will be influenced by the perceptions of individuals about the situation they are in. Therefore, the perception of the employee about their performance appraisal depends upon their understanding of themselves and interpretation of their own According to (Armstrong, 2009).

In the performance appraisal process, employee attitudes toward the system are strongly linked to satisfaction with the system. According to Boswell and Boudreau (2000), perceptions of fairness of the system are an important aspect that contributes to its effectiveness of PE. Understanding employee attitudes about the PAS in organizations is important as they can determine its effectiveness (McDawall & Fletcher, 2004).

Extreme dissatisfaction and perceptions of unfairness and inequality in the ratings may lead to the failure of the system as (George , Elijah & Stephen, 2012) cited from (Cardy & Dobbins, 1994; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). The criteria that must be met in order to make the system be perceived by ratees to be fair include having a formal system of appraisal, ratees must have a very high degree of job knowledge, they must have an opportunity to appeal against their performance ratings, the dimensions of performance must be relevant, and having action plans to deal with any weaknesses.

Thurston & McNall (2010) remarked that PA perceives as fair and accurate among employees and it becomes a motivational element and vice versa. PA results not only affect employees' attitudes towards their supervisor but also towards their job and the organization. Folger (1997) points out that if PA is perceived as unfair and biased, it can be a major source of disappointment for employees.

Research reveals that employee perceptions are closely related to the characteristics of raters such as their personality, competency, their interactions and their intentions to motivate or develop employees (Ahmad & Bujang, 2013). Employee perceptions also directly dependent upon the rater's attitude towards the appraise (Greenberg 1986). As it has been discussed the perception of employees on PE and PA, there are different views and there is no common understanding or view about the PA practices and results.

2.9. Challenges of Performance Appraisal

Challenges of PA can result from not just a single factor rather it is the result of interwoven cumulative factors. Ahmad & Bujang (2013) described the factors are that are challenged for PA. One of its first challenges is subjectivity. Evaluations are dependent on the rater's personal preferences, prejudices and biases. The rater who has a biased or prejudiced attitude toward certain groups of people looks for behavior in these groups that confirms his or her prejudices. The subjectivity of the evaluation discourages employees on supporting the measurement of performance appraisal.

Performance measurement as a mechanism in service delivery still presents many challenges in its implementation, especially in most organizations working in African countries. A number of causes have been raised in the literature such as the lack of real commitment to the PM process, lack of reward for good performance, absence of training, highly bureaucratic management systems, poor information system and resistance to performance measurement is considered as another obstacle to the full implementation of the performance measurement system (Bourne et al., 2000; Bourne & Neely, 2003).

Oberg (1972) mentions several pitfalls that are common to performance appraisal systems: they demand too much from supervisors, standards and ratings vary widely and sometimes unfairly, personal values and bias can replace organizational standards, employees may not know how they are rated due to lack of communication, the validity of ratings is reduced by supervisory resistance to give the ratings, negative feedback can demotivate employees. Thurston, & McNall (2010) found that organizations continue to do things that undermine the effectiveness of the appraisal process. Little time is spent on the appraisal process; raters are not trained and accountable. The employee's role in the process is overlooked along with potentially valuable sources of performance information from the employee, peers, and subordinates.

Murphy & Cleveland (1995) found that there are a number of ways that performance appraisal can hurt an organization. First, the system can overemphasize the work of the individual and underemphasize the work of the team. Second, performance appraisal can often send mixed

messages about the most and least important aspects of job performance and about the importance of performing well. Third, performance appraisal is often a source of discontent for the manager and the employee being appraised.

Longenecker (2005) found that several consequences of ineffective performance appraisals were identified. They included stifling performance improvement, demotivating managers, causing a loss of managerial focus on priorities, causing the breakdown of pay-for-performance systems and reducing the effectiveness of management development efforts.

To summarize the challenges facing performance appraisal, the main issue in the practice of performance appraisal activity is the fairness of the evaluation decision. Raters have problems evaluating the performance appraisal in a proper way. There is an issue of subjectivity in the performance evaluation in the public sector. Although it is written in black and white to be as objective as possible, however, during the implementation of performance appraisal, the evaluation becomes subjective.

2.10. Empirical Studies

Researches have been conducted on numerous facts of performance appraisals (PA) including purposes of PA issues, rater/ratee characteristics, perceptions of employees on PA results and processes, rater training, and challenges of PA and appraisal fairness. Bretz, Milkovich & Read(1992) investigated the uses of PA. How PAs are used has been shown to influence rating behavior and outcomes and be an important predictor of employee attitudes towards their supervisor, the job, and the performance appraisal process. Here, these researchers focused on the employees' perception about PA.

Similarly, Yazdani (2015) studied to explore the purpose of investigation about teachers' and managers' view about annual evaluation system of teachers' performance. The result shows that from manager's view the annual evaluation system of teachers' performance is appropriate, but from teachers' view it is not good. Also another result shows that, there are significant differences between teachers' and managers' view about quality of annual evaluation system of teachers' performance.

Boswell & Boudreau (1997) explored whether different PA uses have differing relationships with employee reactions to the appraisal and the appraiser. It was hypothesized that perceived PA use for development would positively associate with the attitudinal variables investigated, and the direction of influence of perceived PA use for evaluation was not hypothesized. Perceived PA use for development positively related to both PA satisfaction and satisfaction with the appraiser after controlling for justice, demographic, and PA outcome variables. The study adds to the understanding of the impact of different PA uses by investigating the relationship between employee perceptions of developmental and evaluative use and employee attitudes.

Atta Quartey (2015) studied to investigate staff's perception on the effectiveness of the annual assessment system and examine the motivation status of staff after assessment. It was concluded that performance appraisal, likewise performance management at the University of Cape Coast, lacks policy direction. Without the use of guiding principles for monitoring performance and appraising staff, it is possible that many people are actually not performing and therefore assessments showed variety of judgment errors and biases due to subjective appraisals.

Gabedi (2011) explored academic staff's perception of performance measurement at selected universities in the USA, UK, Australia, Nigeria and universities in South Africa. The author also argued for the importance of performance management in enhancing the effectiveness of lecturers in their work.

George, DElijah, & Stephen (2012) investigated the multifaceted factors influencing employee Performance Appraisal System in the Ministry of State for Provincial Administration, Nyamira District, Kenya. Results of the study showed that all the five factors: Implementation process, interpersonal relationships, rater accuracy, informational factors (, and employee attitudes had a significant positive relationship with the performance appraisal system .The regression results also showed that the variation in performance appraisal system can be explained by the changes in implementation process, interpersonal relationships, rater accuracy, informational factors and employee attitudes.

Marwa, Amirul & Yousif (2015) studied the challenges of performance measurement implementation in higher education sector in Sudan. The case findings reveal that several performance measurement practices in the University are adopted in a ceremonial way, which are driven by external pressure. An absence of clear strategies and plans to translate its mission and vision into workable programmes, the resistance to changes in an already established system of administration, insufficient governmental funding, and the lack of competent personnel in the field of quality and self-evaluation are the major challenges of performance measurement in the case University.

Kemal (2015) studied to investigate instructors' performance appraisal practice in Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia. The finding revealed that, the instructors' performance appraisal practice in Bahir Dar University seemed to be moderate. The majority of instructors and department heads know the objectives and accepted the necessity of performance appraisal. However, they perceived the current appraisal system have minimal contribution in helping to improve the teaching-learning process which rather used for administrative purposes; promotion and salary increments than for professional development of instructors and improvement of their performance.

Chemeda (2012) studied the practices and problems of performance appraisal in Ethiopian Higher Education Institutions: The case of Addis Ababa University and St. Mary University College. The study showed that PA is implemented in AAU at moderate level; while, it is implemented in the SUC relatively in a better way on the basis of the desired goals. However, the use of PA for motivational purposes is not at the desired level, and very low in AAU. Additionally, PA used by employees' close supervisors is not such a motivational approach. Rather, it consists of mixed interests which is vague, particularly to be used for the purposes of determining warnings, retentions or discharging low performing workers.

Therefore, from the above reviewing of empirical studies, researchers have been raising different issues in relation to PA purposes, systems, practices, perception, factors and challenges. Moreover, these researches would be continued.

Chapter Three: Research Design and Method

This chapter presented how the researcher collects data, administers, analyzes and interprets the results. More precisely, the chapter explained the research methodology employed by the researcher. In order to address the research questions, the researcher used the following research design, tools, analysis and procedure.

3.1. Research Design

The aim of this research was to assess the ‘Implementation of Performance Appraisal System in Ethiopian Public University in reference to ECSU and KMU. In this study, the researcher used the descriptive survey research design. According to Leedy et al (2005), the descriptive survey involves acquiring information about one or more groups of people, asking them questions and tabulating their answers. Leedy (2010) further explained that the ultimate goal of survey research design is to learn about a large population by surveying their representative sample, summarizing their responses in percentages, frequency, or more sophisticated statistical tools.

The researcher used the assumption of pragmatic world view and sequential explanatory research strategy. The mixed research design is appropriate to study this project because the researcher would be able to overcome the shortcomings of using only one method and this method would help the researcher to understand the situation under study and which was able to produce a quality work that contributed to the body of existing knowledge. The mixed research design provides a complete picture of particular phenomena in studies of human behavior. This design employed the combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches. Through this research method, the strength of both quantitative and qualitative research can be utilized (Creswell, 2009). Furthermore, Creswell (2009) identified different strategies when one uses mixed research method. One of these strategies is sequential explanatory Strategy. For the purpose of this research, the researcher used the sequential explanatory strategy which was enabled to collect data in a sequential manner. Particularly the sequential explanatory strategy has to be used to focus more on quantitative research method and then has to be supported by the qualitative method.

Thus, the academic staffs who were making teaching, training, consultancy, and research in ECSU and KU were the unit of analysis for this research. The quantitative data were collected from academic staffs and the qualitative data was collected from department heads and /or directors of the study universities.

The intent of this sequential explanatory mixed method was to assess the ‘Implementation of Performance Appraisal System in Ethiopian Public University in reference to ECSU and KMU. In the first phase, quantitative research questions were addressed the relationship or comparison of management decision making like promotion, rewards, training and development program (independent) and performance appraisal results (dependent) variables with academic staffs (participants) at ECSU and KMU. Information from the first phase (quantitative data) was explored further in a second qualitative phase. In the second phase, qualitative interview was used with department heads at ECSU and KMU to advance significant assessment of the quantitative results by exploring aspects the ‘Implementation of Performance Evaluation System’ in these Universities. The reason for following up with qualitative research in the second phase was to make better understand and explained the quantitative results.

3.2. Research Tools

This study used quantitative and qualitative research approaches. The questionnaire was the foundation for the quantitative research method while interview and secondary data were used for the qualitative approaches. The primary sources of data were generated through questionnaire and semi-structured interview. The questionnaire was employed so as to obtain quantitative data from the academic staffs. The questionnaire included closed and open-ended questions. It was pilot-tested so as to verify its validity and reliability of the data that would be collected from the respondents. Their feedback was used to verify the content and format of questionnaires that was developed for an actual survey.

The questionnaire was designed from the literature review and adapted from similar researches that have been done. It has five parts such as the profile of the respondents, purposes of PA, PA system and practices, the perception and expectation of academic staffs on PA and the challenges of PA practice. The items were measured using likert scale ranging from 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree and 5 strongly agree. In each statement respondents had to indicate the

degree of their agreement or disagreement. The 5-point scale on all items was transformed into a 3-point scale indicating agreement, neutral and disagreement. In other words, 'strongly agree' was merged with 'agree' and 'strongly disagree' with 'disagree' to provide stronger and simpler explanations of the perceptions of respondents.

A semi-structured interview was used mainly to get in-depth information from the subject under study. The researcher developed an interview guide so as to get the necessary information from department heads. The interview questions were designed based on the flows, formats or structures of the questionnaires. Secondary sources like books, articles, Senate regulations, proclamations and other documents in relation to PA system were used to collect and analyze data.

3.3. Research procedure

Support letter was requested from Department Head office by the researcher in order to start the data collection. The request letter was submitted to ECSU and KMU to get the necessary support accordingly. Administration of the Survey: Self-administered survey questionnaire was used to collect data (annex 1). The questionnaire has a covering letter indicating the purpose of the research, ethical issues and confidentiality. The questionnaires were distributed to academic staffs through department heads consultation whereas interview was conducted for department heads. The total numbers of distributed questionnaires were 122 and 106 questionnaires were filled and collected. The response rate was 88.3 % which was satisfactory to analysis and assists the finding; open-ended questionnaires and interview output were used to triangulate the research.

3.4. Population and Sampling

The target populations of the study were the academic staffs such as lecturers, researchers, consultants, professors and department heads of the ECSU and KMU. The total number of the academic staff for ECSU was 250 and KMU was 270 which were totally 520. The entire samples for the study were selected using simple random sampling to collect quantitative data and purposive sampling techniques to have qualitative data. As Patton (2002) points out, the logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Purposeful sampling will be deemed the most suitable type of sampling for such type of study. Cochran (1977) has taken to calculate sample size or the number of respondents needed in a survey using

the free online sample size calculator. The population size was 520 academic staffs, the confidence interval was 90%-99%, from this, 20% of the population has taken to the sample size and it became 122 respondents with the confidence level of 95% and the confidence interval of 6.22. This indicated the sample size for this study was representative of the targeted population.

3.5. Data Analysis

The responses from the questionnaires were automatically captured and coded in the Microsoft excel on time when they were collected, and this facilitated to capture the data in a reduced time. Then the data were copied to 22 IBM SPSS for further analysis and analyzed by descriptive statistics like frequency, percentage and mean.

The qualitative data was collected using semi-structured interviews. This would be enabled the researcher to triangulate the data gathered through both methods. For the interview, purposive sampling was used. As indicated by Leedy & Ormrod (2010), purposive sampling can be used when there exists a “typical” of a group or those who can represent the diverse perspective of an issue. Semi-structured questions were developed to make the interviewees be more free and flexible and express their feelings about the situation. The responses of the interview were collectively viewed with the results of the quantitative results.

3.6. Test of Validity and Reliability

Validity is the extent to which an instrument measures what it is intended to measure (Leedy & Ormarod, 2010). Thus, the researcher focused on content, internal and external validity to address the validity of this study. Reliability and validity is ensured by pre-testing the research instrument in a pilot study. The data for this study gathered though survey questionnaires. After refining, categorizing and comparing the information with relevant theoretical and empirical evidence, this is used as a guideline to develop the content of survey questionnaires for pilot study. The brief pilot study is an excellent way to determine the feasibility of the study (Leedy and Ormrod, 2010). A pilot study was conducted on five experienced academic staff. Their feedback was used to verify the content and format of questionnaires developed for an actual survey.

In order to address the issues of reliability and validity, this study also used the Cronbech's Alpha to insure the reliability of instrument. Cronbach's alpha is the most common measure of internal consistency reliability. The result of the reliability test was 0.87 as it is seen in the following table. Interpreting the value of alpha can be somewhat subjective and the closer alpha is to 1, the better. A reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in most social science research situations. (SPSS FAQ, 2012) Reliability is the consistency with which a measuring instrument yields a certain result when the entity being measured has not changed (Leedy and Ormarod, 2010). To enhance the reliability of the study, the researcher used the similar template to collect the information from the respondents. Thus, the respondents were selected based on their teaching, research, training experience and professional capability.

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|----------|---|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 5 | 83.3 |
| | Excluded | 1 | 16.7 |
| | Total | 6 | 100.0 |

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .873 | 45 |

Source: survey analysis using 22 IBM SPSS version

3.7. Ethical Consideration

The performance appraisal case is a sensitive issue. That is why this research requires various ethical considerations. The ethical issues are:

- The respondents participated in this study voluntarily and answered the questionnaires on their own free will with fully informed consent. Prior to obtaining informed consent, the aim of the study and the process of data collection were explained so that they could choose to whether to participate or not.
- The identity of participants and their respective responses were confidential. Participants

were informed that confidentiality and anonymity would be maintained.

- The participants were provided with necessary debriefing, counseling and additional information required to relieve them from psychological discomfort and to get their honest and accurate responses. It helps to convince respondents by stating clearly the purpose of this research is only for academic purposes.
- This study was reported by incorporating its genuine findings without distortion and addition.

Chapter Four

Data Presentation and Analysis of the Research Result

4.1. Introduction

The previous chapters dealt with the background of the study, relevant literature on the research topic and research methodology used in the research. This chapter presented the finding or results from the survey made through questionnaires, secondary data analysis and interview responses. The questionnaires were distributed and collected from academic staffs whereas interview was conducted for department heads. The total numbers of distributed questionnaires were 122 and 106 questionnaires were filled and collected. The response rate was 88.3 % which was satisfactory to analysis and assessed the finding; open-ended questionnaires and interview output were used to triangulate the research. The questionnaire had six parts including the background of the respondents and there were statements under each of part. These statements were presented using table and analyzed by frequency, percentage and mean. After the main parts of the questionnaire presented and analyzed, open-ended questions and interview were followed and discussed.

4.2. Profile of the Respondents

The study included four demographic variables which were used to describe the respondents' profiles. These were: gender, age, the level of education and service years of the respondents.

The preceding table shows the frequency distribution of participants' response to their profiles information. The majority of the respondents were males which were 79.2% (n=84). The rest respondents 20.8% (n=22) were females. This indicated that the number of males' academic staffs was large in size when it was compared with females' staffs.

As it is seen in table 4.1., 26.4 % of the academic staffs /respondents were within the age of 21-30 and 34.9% (n=37) of them were within the age of 31 to 40 years. The majority age of the respondents (90.6 % of them) were between the age of 21 to 50 years and only 9.4 % were above 51 years old.

The respondents who had the first degree (BA/BSC) were thirteen (12.3 %). The majority of the respondents (68.8%, n=73) had the second degree and 18.8 % (n=20) of them had Ph.D. degree/ third degree. The universities need to have Ph.D. qualified academic staffs.

The cross relationship between gender of the respondents and their educational level/qualification (annexed ii) indicated that all female respondents except one had MA degree; fifty two male respondents had MA degree and twenty male respondents qualified in PhD degree.

As it is seen in the next table, most of the respondents (44.3%, n=47) have worked in the university for 1 to 5 years. Respondents who have served below one year of service were excluded from the study since they did not have performance appraisal result or experiences to give the necessary data for the study. 34.9% (n=37) of the respondents have worked in the university between 6-10 years. This shows 79.2 % of the respondents had served below ten years and 13.2% (n=14) of them worked for 11-16 years and 7.5% of them served for 16 and above years.

The cross relationship between gender of the respondents and their service years (annexed ii) indicated that all female respondents have served below ten years and from 22 female respondents, sixteen respondents have served below five years. However, forty two male respondents have served from one to ten years and the same numbers of respondents served above eleven years.

Table 4.1. Profile of the Respondents

| Respondents profile | | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| Gender | Female | 22 | 20.8 |
| | Male | 84 | 79.2 |
| Age | 21-30 | 28 | 26.4 |
| | 31-40 | 37 | 34.9 |
| | 41-50 | 31 | 29.2 |
| | Above 51 years | 10 | 9.4 |
| Educational Level | BA/BSC | 13 | 12.3 |
| | MA/MSC | 73 | 68.8 |
| | Ph.D. | 20 | 18.8 |

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------|----|------|
| Service years | 1-5 | 47 | 44.3 |
| | 6-10 | 37 | 34.9 |
| | 11-15 | 14 | 13.2 |
| | 16 and above | 8 | 7.5 |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

4.3. Data Presentation, Discussion, and Analysis of the Research Results

In this part of the study, quantitative data that were obtained from the questionnaires and qualitative data that were gathered from open-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interview questions were presented and analyzed in an integrated manner. After the quantitative data had been presented and discussed, it was supported and followed by the discussion of open-ended questions and interview to triangulate the research findings. The questionnaire has five major variables in relation to performance appraisal practices such as Purposes of PA, Performance Appraisal system, Performance Appraisal practice, the Academic Staffs' Perceptions of Performance Appraisal, and Challenges of Performance Appraisal and for each statement/variable, the title was given, data was presented in table and discussion was held based on the responses.

4.3.1 Purposes of Performances Appraisals

The respondents (academic staffs) were asked to state their extent of agreement with seven different statements relating to the purposes of performance appraisal (PA) and their responses were presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Purposes of PA

| Purposes of PA | Measurement (n=106) | Strongly disagree | disagree | Neutral | agree | Strongly agree | Mean |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|----------|---------|-------|-------------------|------|
| provide information about administrative decisions | Frequency | 12 | 19 | 28 | 26 | 21 | 3.24 |
| | % | 11.3 | 17.9 | 26.4 | 24.5 | 19.8 | |
| Effect promotion based on PE results | Frequency | 16 | 22 | 21 | 31 | 16 | 3.08 |
| | % | 15.1 | 20.8 | 19.8 | 19.2 | 15.1 | |
| | Frequency | 14 | 23 | 32 | 23 | 14 | 3.00 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| remove communication gap between the academic staffs and top management | % | 13.2 | 21.7 | 30.2 | 21.7 | 13.2 | |
| identify the strengths and weaknesses of academic staffs in their performances. | Frequency | 4 | 27 | 24 | 31 | 19 | 3.7 |
| | % | 3.8 | 25.5 | 22.6 | 29.2 | 17.9 | |
| determine academic staffs and organizational training and development needs | Frequency | 7 | 30 | 32 | 28 | 9 | 3.01 |
| | % | 6.6 | 28.3 | 30.2 | 26.4 | 8.5 | |
| provide feedback for academic staff based on their performance results | Frequency | 8 | 32 | 21 | 32 | 13 | 3.35 |
| | % | 7.5 | 30.2 | 19.8 | 30.2 | 11.3 | |
| review the past performance of the academic staff. | Frequency | 6 | 29 | 22 | 31 | 18 | 3.24 |
| | % | 5.7 | 27.4 | 20.8 | 29.2 | 17.0 | |

Source: Survey Data, April 2017

Thirty-one respondents (about 29.2%) according to table 4.2. stated that PA result did not use to provide information about administrative decisions like promotion, recognition, retention, and detentions. Twenty-eight respondents (26.4% of them) were not sure whether PA used or not to provide information about administrative decisions like promotion, recognition, retention, and detentions. The majority of them which is forty-seven respondents (44.3% of them) agreed that their PA results were used to provide information about administrative decisions like promotion, recognition, retention, and detentions.

As it is indicated in the above table, thirty-eight respondents (about 35.8%) stated that the result of PA did not make the academic staffs' promotion effective based on their performance evaluation results. Twenty-one respondents (19.8% of them) were not sure whether it contributed to make academic staffs' promotion effective based on their performance evaluation results or not. The majority of them which was forty-seven respondents (44.3% of them) agreed that PA results were used to make academic staffs promotion effective based on performance evaluation results. Even if the majority agreed with these issues, there were academic staffs that were not clear about the purposes of PA result and its purpose.

As it is seen from the table 4.2, thirty-seven respondents (about 34.9%) said that PA did not use to remove communication gap between the academic staffs and top management in the achievement of the goals of universities. Thirty-two respondents (30.2 % of them) were not sure whether PA result contributed to removing communication gap between the academic staffs and top

management or not. Thirty-seven respondents (34.9% of them) agreed that PA result used to remove communication gap between the academic staffs and top management. Generally, 3.00 mean of the respondents were not sure whether PA result used to remove communication gap between the academic staffs and top management or not. This indicated regarding PA purpose as to remove communication gap was not used in the study area.

As it is indicated from the table 4.2, thirty-one respondents (about 29.9%) said that PA results did not use to identify the strengths and weaknesses of academic staffs. Twenty-four respondents (22.6 % of them) were not sure whether PA contributed to identifying their strengths and weaknesses. Whereas the majority, fifty respondents (47.1% of them) stated that PA used to identify the strengths and weaknesses of academic staffs. Generally with 3.70 mean of the respondents said that PA results were used to identify the strengths and weaknesses of academic staffs in their performance results as it seen in the above table.

The respondents were asked to rank the use of PA result in determining academic staffs and organizational training and development needs. Thirty-seven respondents (about 34.9%) said that PA result did not use to determine academic staffs and organizational training and development needs and thirty-two respondents (30.2 % of them) were not sure whether it contributed to determining their and organizational training and development needs. Thirty-seven respondents (about 34.9%) agreed that PA results used to determine academic staffs and organizational training and development needs.

The respondents also stated their agreement whether PA results provide feedback for academic staff based on their performance results. As it is seen in the above table 4.2, forty respondents (37.7% of them) said that they were not provided feedback for them based on their performance results and twenty-one (19.8%) respondents were not sure about the use of PA to provide feedback based on their performance results. On the other hands, forty-four respondents (41.5 %) agreed that they were provided feedback.

The last statement about the purposes of PA was in reviewing the past performance of the academic staff. Thirty-five respondents (about 33.0%) said that PA did not use to review the past performance of them and Twenty-two respondents (20.8 % of them) were not sure whether PA

contributed to review the past performance of them or not. Forty-nine respondents (about 46.2% of them) agreed with the PA uses as to review the past performance of the academic staff. All in all with the mean of 3.25 the respondents agreed indifferently regarding the purposes PA in this study.

- **the participants ‘profile and PA Purposes cross relationship**

The cross relationship of respondents’ profiles (annexed iii, iv, v and vi) with PA purposes, PA systems and practice, perception and expectation of staffs, and challenges of PA were described. Female participants did not agree with the purposes of PA like to make administrative decisions, to effect promotion, to provide feedback for them and to identify their strengths and weaknesses. (annexed iii). However, the majority of male participants agreed with the purposes of PA. Respondents also ranked their level of agreement with four years’ service category such as from 1-5 years, 6-10 service years, 11-15 years and above 16 years’ service. it is seen (annexed iii) that respondents who had serviced from 1-5 years did not agree with the purposes of PA that have stated here. Whereas the respondents who served more than 11 years agreed with the purposes of PA (annexed iii). Respondents based on their level of education also ranked their agreement about the purposes of PA. Respondents who had BA degree did not agree with the purposes of PA whereas respondents who had Ph.D. degree agreed with the purposes of PA (annexed iii). From 73 respondents who had MA/MSc degree, twenty two respondents did not agree with the purposes of PA and thirty of them were not sure the purposes of PA and the same number agreed that PA provided different purposes (annexed iii).

According to the information collected from department heads of ECSU and KMU through the interview, the purposes of performance appraisal were described as follows. Five department heads were interviewed which were three from ECSU and two from KMU. Their responses were presented using like head one, head two and head three for confidentiality. They explained the purpose of PA in their university perspective and their responses were presented as follows.

Head one stated that PA results are used:

- To review the performance of the staffs over a given period of time.
- To judge the gap between the actual and the desired performance of the staffs.

- To help the management in decision making and exercising organizational control.
- To diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of the individuals so as to identify the training and development needs of the future.
- To provide feedback to the academic staffs regarding their past performance.
- To enhance the overall improvement of the university in teaching and research practice.

Head Two stated that PA used:

- to give feedback for the appraised individual, giving praises/encouraging /for appraised individuals by the different mechanism, to perform better and advising/coaching the poor performer and support them.

Head three stated that the intention has been to give rewards/incentive for the staffs but not as such practical even if it is stated in the legislation.

Head Four stated that PA results could be used

- to have the quality education, training, and research,
- to assess the staffs' strengths and weaknesses and give feedback.

In nutshell, the finding showed that the majority respondents from the questionnaire agreed about the purposes of PA like to provide information about administrative decisions (promotion, recognition, retention, and detentions), to fill the communication gap and predict the training and development need. Moreover, responses from interview emphasized that PA results were used to provide information about administrative decisions like promotion, recognition, retention, and detentions, to fill the communication gap and predict the training and development need. However, female respondents, respondents who served below five years and who had BA degree did not agree with the purposes of PA

4.3.2. Performance Appraisal System

Seven statements were set to get responses from academic staffs about Performance Appraisal (PA) system. Based on this variable, the academic staffs' responses were presented in Table 4.3 and discussed using percentage and frequencies as follows

Table 4.3. PA system of ECSU and KMU

| PA system | Measurement(n=106) | Strongly disagree | disagree | Neutral | agree | Strongly agree | Mean |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|------|
| ECSU/KMU has got a completed performance appraisal system | Frequency | 9 | 8 | 30 | 46 | 13 | 3.43 |
| | % | 8.5 | 7.5 | 28.3 | 43.5 | 12.3 | |
| Key PE criteria have been clearly identified | Frequency | 9 | 22 | 25 | 42 | 8 | 3.16 |
| | % | 8.5 | 20.8 | 23.6 | 39.6 | 7.5 | |
| The PA criteria have been developed in consultation with academic staffs | Frequency | 15 | 28 | 31 | 24 | 8 | 2.8 |
| | % | 14.2 | 26.5 | 29.2 | 22.6 | 7.5 | |
| The performance evaluation criteria have been extracted related from an up-to-date job description. | Frequency | 10 | 40 | 31 | 21 | 4 | 2.7 |
| | % | 9.4 | 37.7 | 29.2 | 19.8 | 3.8 | |
| The performance criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness and cost effectiveness can be measurable. | Frequency | 8 | 33 | 30 | 22 | 12 | 3.15 |
| | % | 7.5 | 31.5 | 28.3 | 20.8 | 11.3 | |
| The PE of academic staffs has to be appraised by colleagues, department heads, and students. | Frequency | 4 | 18 | 20 | 32 | 32 | 3.66 |
| | % | 3.8 | 17 | 18.9 | 30.2 | 30.2 | |
| PE that can be appraised by department heads, students and colleagues or peers are effective, efficient and reliable | Frequency | 4 | 22 | 28 | 30 | 22 | 3.41 |
| | % | 3.8 | 20.8 | 26.4 | 28.3 | 20.8 | |

Source: Survey data, 2017

The respondents were asked to rank if KMU/ECSU has got a completed performance appraisal system such as formats, procedures, rules, and regulations. As it is seen from the table 4.3, seventeen respondents (about 16.0% of them) said KMU/ECSU has not got a completed performance appraisal system. Out of the total of respondents, thirty respondents (28.3 % of them) remained indifferent with respect to performance appraisal systems such as formats, procedures, rules and regulations and the majority respondents, forty-nine respondents (about 45.7% of them) agreed on it. The mean of 3.43 respondents said that KMU/ECSU had a completed performance appraisal system such as formats, procedures, rules, and regulations or not. This finding shows that

certain staffs did not have clear idea about PA systems such as formats, procedures, rules, and regulations

The respondents ranked their level of agreement in the identification of the performance evaluation criteria. As it is indicated from the table 4.3, seventeen respondents (about 16.0% of them) said the performance evaluation criteria have not been clearly identified and thirty-one respondents (29.2 % of them) were not sure whether the Key performance evaluation criteria have been clearly identified or not. Fifty respondents (about 47.1% of them) which is the majority agreed on this issues and the mean of 3.16 of them did not have the idea whether Key performance evaluation criteria have been clearly identified or not.

As it is indicated in the above Table 4.3., the majority respondents, Forty-three respondents (about 40.6% of them) said the PE criteria have not been developed in consultation with academic staffs and department heads. Thirty-one respondents (29.2 % of them) were not sure whether the PE criteria have rated in consultation with academic staffs and department heads or not. Thirty-two respondents (about 30.1% of them) said that the PE criteria have been developed in consultation with academic staffs and department heads. Majority of the respondents disagreed with the mean of 2.8 that Key performance evaluation criteria have been clearly identified as it is seen in the above table.

Regarding the performance evaluation criteria and its relation to the job description, the respondents ranked their agreement in above Table 4.3. fifty respondents (about 47.2% of them) said the performance evaluation criteria have not been extracted/related from their job description which is the majority of the respondents and thirty-one respondents (29.2 % of them) were not sure whether the performance evaluation criteria and job description have relation or not. Twenty-five respondents (about 23.6% of them) agreed on this issue. The respondents disagreed with the mean of 2.7 about the performance evaluation criteria and its relation with the current job description. This result indicated that the performance evaluation criteria have not been related from an up-to-date job description and it needed to revise and discussed with the staffs.

The respondents were asked to rank the performance criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness and cost effectiveness measurability. As it is seen from the above table 4.3, forty-one respondents (about 38.7% of them) said the performance criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness, and cost-

effectiveness could not be measurable and thirty respondents (28.3 % of them) were not sure whether the performance criteria could be measurable or not. Thirty-four respondents (about 32.1% of them) said that the performance criteria were measurable. On the whole, the respondents have responded indifferently with the mean of 3.15 that the performance criteria were measurable. This would show that most staffs perceived the performance criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness and cost effectiveness whether it was measurable or not. On the whole, the academic staffs were not sure with mean of 3.1 about PA System of ECSU and KMU

The Senate legislation of the University stated that staffs' performance appraisal is conducted by department heads, colleagues, and students. From this data, it is possible to understand that combination of appraisers is used in the university to conduct academic staffs' performance appraisals.

The responses that obtained from academic staffs and department heads through open-ended questionnaires, revealed that there is a deviation between the objectives and criteria to achieve the intended outcomes, there is lack of awareness how to conduct performance appraisal in the side of appraisers and no mechanisms was seen to provide feed-back on time for appraisees.

Finally, the Senate legislation of the University revealed for the effectiveness of the instructors in teaching, research and community services, academic staffs were evaluated by students, colleagues, and department head. The overall rating of the teaching effectiveness of an academic staff was based on the contribution of each of the components of the system of evaluation consisting evaluation by students, head of department/dean, and colleagues. However, the values of the percentage that assigned for appraisers were not the same rate. It varies from universities to universities as it is seen from Senate legislation of ECSU, KMU, and AAU.

The respondents ranked their agreement about the PA result that can be appraised by department heads, students and colleagues or peers were effective, efficient and reliable to achieve the goal of the university. As it is seen from the above table 4.3, twenty-six respondents (about 24.5% of them) said the PA result that could be appraised by their department heads; their students and their colleagues or peers were not effective, efficient and reliable to achieve the goal of the university. Twenty-six respondents (24.5 % of them) were not sure whether PA results were effective, efficient and reliable to achieve the goal of university or not. Fifty-two respondents (about 49.1%

of them) agreed that the PA results were effective, efficient and reliable. There are responses differences among staffs in the Effectiveness and efficiency of PA result appraised by department heads, students and colleagues or peers. This issue was also supported by the interviewees. The department heads stated that the PE result which was conducted by students and colleagues were not effective, efficient and reliable. It is exaggerated.

- **the participants ‘profile and PA practices and Processes cross relationship**

The participants ‘profile and PA practices and Processes cross relationship (annexed iv) was analyzed here. The majority female respondents (annexed iv) were not sure whether ECSU/KMU has got a completed PAS such as formats, procedures, rules and regulations or not. 19 female participants from 22 said that PE criteria such as competencies, behaviors and the results or outcomes have not been clearly identified. All of them said that PA criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness and cost effectiveness could not be measurable (annexed iv). However, the majority male respondents (50 respondents) from 84 said that PE criteria such as competencies, behaviors and the results or outcomes for the performances of the staffs have been clearly identified and 30 male respondents were not sure whether PA criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness and cost effectiveness could be measurable or not. But 23 of the male participants agreed that PA criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness and cost effectiveness could be measurable. The majority male respondents (64 from 84) agreed that PE of academic staffs has to be appraised by colleagues, department heads and students and 12 female respondents were indifferent with this idea and 10 of them from 22 said that performance evaluation of academic staffs should not be appraised by colleagues, department heads and students.

Seventeen respondents who served from 1-5 years said that ECSU/KMU did not have a completed PAS and 11 of them were not sure about this concept. However, all of the respondents (42 respondents) who served more than 11 years said that ECSU/KMU had a completed performance appraisal system (annexed iv). All participants who served from 1-5 years said that PE criteria have not been clearly identified, not developed in consultation with academic staffs and department heads and not related from an up-to-date job description. They added that PE criteria

were not measurable and their appraisers were not effective, efficient and reliable to achieve the goal of university (annexed iv). However, all respondents who served more than 16 years and majority of the respondents who served from 6-10 years said that PE criteria such as competencies, behaviors and the results or outcomes for the performances of the staffs have been clearly identified, developed in consultation with academic staffs and department heads and extracted / related from an up-to-date job description, the performance criteria could be measurable and their appraisers were effective, efficient and reliable to achieve the goal of university(annexed iv).

All participants who qualified in BA degree said that PE criteria have not been clearly identified; PE criteria have not been developed in consultation with academic staffs and department heads, and not related from an up-to-date job description. performance criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness and cost effectiveness could not be measurable and Performance evaluation that appraised by department heads, students and their colleagues or peers were not effective, efficient and reliable to achieve the goal of university (annexed iv).

Nevertheless, all respondents who had PhD degree said that PE criteria have been clearly identified, developed in consultation with academic staffs and department heads, extracted / related from an up-to-date job description and performance criteria could be measurable and their appraisers were effective, efficient and reliable to achieve the goal of university (annexed iv). However, the respondents who had MA/MSC degree ranked the above concepts in three parts disagreed, neutral and agreed (annexed iv). 73 of them said that PE criteria were clearly identified. They ranked differently, some of them disagreed, the majority agreed and some were indifferent with these issues as it is seen

- **Responses to Open-ended Questionnaire and Interview Questions about PA system**

According to the information collected from department heads of ECSU and KMU based on the interview, the performance appraisal systems were described as follows. Five department heads were interviewed three from ECSU and two heads from KMU.

Head One said that there were completed performance appraisal systems such as formats, procedures, rules and regulations and the academic staffs PA was conducted twice a year. He also

explained that the performance evaluation of academic staffs has to be appraised by colleagues, department heads, and students; however, Performance measurements are not clear.

Head Two said that performance evaluation criteria such as competencies, behaviors and outcomes criteria for the performances of the staffs have been clearly identified and all performance criteria (quality, quantity, timeliness, and cost effectiveness) could not be easily measurable. It is possible to measure the quality in relation to teaching but behavior related criteria are difficult to measure it.

Senate Legislation of ESCU(2012) Article 58/3 stated that Teaching effectiveness for Academic Staff shall be determined by evaluations of the staff member's performance, by students, colleagues, and the department head or the staff's immediate supervisor at the end of each semester or academic year as the case may be according to Ethiopian Civil Service University (2012).

The contribution of each of the components of the system of evaluation to the overall rating of the teaching effectiveness of an Academic Staff member shall be as follows.

- Evaluation by students..... 50%
- Evaluation by Head of department..... 35%
- Evaluation by colleagues..... 15%

Senate Legislation of KMU stated that teaching effectiveness for Academic Staff by the same appraisers such as students, colleagues, and the department head. The contribution of each of the components of the system of evaluation to the overall rating of the teaching efficiency of an academic staff shall be:

- Evaluation by students50%
- Evaluation by colleagues 15%
- Evaluation by head of department30
- self-evaluation.....5%

4.3.3. Performance Appraisal Process and Practices

Eight statements were set to get responses from academic staffs of the study area about Performance Appraisal (PA) practices

Table 4.4. PA Process and practices

| Purposes of PA | Measurement(n=106) | Strongly disagree | disagree | Neutral | agree | Strongly agree | Mean |
|---|--------------------|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|------|
| Sufficient preparation is undertaken before appraisal process implemented. | Frequency | 13 | 29 | 24 | 23 | 17 | 3.01 |
| | % | 12.3 | 27.4 | 22.6 | 21.7 | 16. | |
| The appraisal process is fair and free from subjectivity. | Frequency | 9 | 24 | 35 | 26 | 11 | 3.54 |
| | % | 8.5 | 22.6 | 33 | 24.5 | 10.0 | |
| The appraisal process is designed to be a constructive and two-way communication. | Frequency | 13 | 27 | 28 | 25 | 13 | 2.98 |
| | % | 12.3 | 25.5 | 26.4 | 23.6 | 12.3 | |
| staffs are provided with regular feedback | Frequency | 14 | 33 | 24 | 26 | 9 | 2.84 |
| | % | 13.2 | 31.5 | 22.6 | 24.5 | 8.5 | |
| the feedback is constructive | Frequency | 15 | 24 | 32 | 21 | 12 | 3.16 |
| | % | 14.5 | 22.6 | 30.2 | 19.8 | 11.3 | |
| staffs provide input for design, development, and criteria for PA system. | Frequency | 14 | 26 | 29 | 30 | 6 | 3.06 |
| | % | 13.2 | 24.5 | 27.4 | 28.3 | 5.7 | |
| Academic staffs receive formal, performance appraisal results | Frequency | 11 | 22 | 30 | 32 | 11 | 3.09 |
| | % | 10.4 | 20.8 | 28.3 | 30.2 | 10.4 | |

Source: survey data, 2017

As it is seen from the above Table 4.4, forty-two respondents (about 39.6% of them) said that sufficient preparation was not undertaken by the heads/supervisors and staffs before PA process implemented. Twenty-four respondents (22.6 % of them) were not sure whether the sufficient preparation was undertaken or not. Forty respondents (about 37.7% of them), the majority, agreed that sufficient preparation was undertaken by the heads/supervisors and staffs before appraisal process implemented. With the mean of 3.01 of them were not sure the appraisers had taken sufficient preparation before appraisal process implemented.

The respondents ranked their agreement if appraisal process designed as to be constructive and allowed two-way communication so as to fit the purpose of performance appraisal results. As table 4.4. asserted, fort respondents (about 37.8% of them) said appraisal process was not designed as constructive and it did not allow two-way communication. Twenty-eight respondents (26.4 % of them) were not sure whether appraisal process was designed as constructive and allowed two-way communication. Thirty-eight respondents (about 35.9% of them) agreed on this issue.

Regarding the performance appraisal process fairness and free from subjectivity, the respondents were asked to rank their agreement. As it is seen in the above table 4.4. forty respondents (about 37.7% of them) said the performance appraisal process was not fair and free from subjectivity. Twenty-eight respondents (26.40 % of them) were not sure whether the performance appraisal process was fair and free from subjectivity. Thirty-eight respondents (about 35.9% of them) said that the performance appraisal process was fair and free from subjectivity. Thus, the respondents disagreed with the mean of 2.98 about the performance appraisal process being fair and free from subjectivity as presented in the above Table 4.4

Regarding the feedback in relation to PA results, the respondents expressed their level of agreement. Forty-seven respondents (about 44.3% of them) which is the majority said they were not provided regular feedback and twenty-four respondents (22.6 % of them) were not sure whether they were provided with regular feedback or not. Thirty-five respondents (about 32.0% of them) stated that they were provided with regular feedback. Generally, as presented in the above Table 4.4, the respondents disagreed with the mean of 2.84 being provided with regular feedback for PA .

As presented in Table 4.4, the respondents were asked to rank with regarding the feedback whether it was constructive or not after PE had been conducted. Thirty-nine respondents (36.8% of them) said that feedback was not constructive and thirty-two respondents (30.2 % of them) were not sure regarding the feedback was constructive or not. Thirty-three respondents (about 31.1% of them) agreed that feedback that was provided for them was constructive. Generally, the respondents disagreed with the mean of 3.16 on this issue. Thus, the finding revealed that the feedback was not properly provided to the academic staffs.

As it is seen in the above Table, forty respondents (about 37.7% of them) expressed their disagreement with the statement academic staffs provided input in the design, development, and choice of criteria that were used in the appraisal evaluation system. Thirty-nine respondents (27.4 % of them) were not sure whether academic staffs provided input in the design, development, and choice of criteria in the appraisal evaluation system or not. Thirty-six respondents (about 34.0% of them) agreed that academic staffs provided input in the design, development, and choice of PA

criteria and with the mean of 3.06 of them said that academic staffs were not sure in providing input in in the appraisal evaluation system as presented in Table 4.27.

The respondents ranked their agreement for the variable ‘academic staffs receiving a formal/ written performance appraisal results from the department heads’. Thirty-three respondents (about 31.1% of them) said that academic staffs did not receive a formal/ written performance appraisal results and 28.3 % of them were not sure whether academic staffs received a formal/ written performance appraisal results or not. Forty-three respondents (about 40.6% of them) agreed that academic staffs received a formal/ written performance appraisal results from the department heads. With the mean of 3.09 of them said indifferently if academic staffs received a formal/ written performance appraisal results from the department heads or not.

4.3.4. Academic Staffs’ Perceptions about PA

In a performance appraisal process, employee attitudes toward the system are strongly linked to satisfaction with the system. According to Boswell and Boudreau (1997), perceptions of fairness of the system are an important aspect that contributes to its effectiveness of PE. Understanding employee attitudes about the PA system in organizations is important as they can determine its effectiveness (McDowall & Fletcher, 2004). If the PA system is seen and believed to be biased, irrelevant or unfair, that may be a source of dissatisfaction with the system.

Boswell and Boudreau (1997) remarked that PA perceives as fair and accurate among employees and it becomes a motivational element and vice versa. Fletcher (2004) points out that if PA is perceived as unfair and biased, it can be a major source of disappointment for employees. Nine statements were set to get responses about the perception of academic staffs and their expectation in the Performance Appraisal (PA) system.

Table 4.5: Academic staffs Perception about PA result

| Academic staffs Perception | Measurement(n=106) | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Mean |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|------|
| staffs expect like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition | Frequency | 3 | 17 | 9 | 29 | 48 | 3.94 |
| | % | 2.8 | 16.0 | 8.5 | 27.4 | 45.3 | |
| | Frequency | 2 | 12 | 25 | 39 | 28 | 3.74 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|
| feedback of PA reflects the teaching and research performance of staffs. | % | 15.1 | 20.8 | 19.8 | 19.2 | 15.1 | |
| Academic staffs consider the appraisal process as the waste of time. | Frequency | 38 | 32 | 9 | 16 | 10 | 2.06 |
| | % | 13.2 | 21.7 | 30.2 | 21.7 | 13.2 | |
| Staffs expect training and development based on PA results | Frequency | 9 | 9 | 15 | 32 | 41 | 3.8 |
| | % | 8.5 | 8.5 | 14.2 | 30.2 | 38.7 | |
| staffs believe the performance appraisal process is used as a tool for victimized some staffs. | Frequency | 8 | 19 | 19 | 24 | 36 | 3.86 |
| | % | 7.5.6 | 17.9 | 17.9 | 22.6 | 34.5 | |
| PA is perceived as fair and accurate among staffs. | Frequency | 5 | 30 | 27 | 27 | 16 | 3.35 |
| | % | 7.5 | 28.3 | 25.5 | 25.5 | 15.1 | |
| PA results affect employees' attitudes towards raters their job and the organization | Frequency | 2 | 12 | 32 | 34 | 26 | 3.66 |
| | % | 1.9 | 11.3 | 30.2 | 32.1 | 24.5 | |
| academic staffs perceive that PA results are closely related to the characteristics of raters | Frequency | 5 | 15 | 29 | 42 | 15 | 3,88 |
| | % | 4.2 | 14.2 | 27.4 | 39.6 | 14.2 | |
| Performance appraisal should be fair and objective oriented | Frequency | 4 | 8 | 10 | 33 | 49 | 3.89 |
| | % | 3.8 | 7.5 | 9.4 | 31.1 | 46.2 | |

Source: Survey data, 2017

The finding revealed as presented in Table 4.5, the respondents' expectation like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results. Twenty respondents (about 18.9% of them) said that the respondents did not expect any incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results. Nine respondents (8.5 % of them) were not sure whether the respondents expected these issues or not and sixty-seven respondents (62.7% of them), the majority, expected like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results. The respondents asserted their agreement with the mean of 3.96 about their expectation like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results.

As it is seen from the table 4.5, fourteen respondents (about 11.1% of them) said that feedback of PA did not reflect their teaching and research performance. Twenty-five respondents (23.6 % of them) were not sure whether feedback of PA reflected their teaching and research performance or

not. The majority of the respondents, Sixty-seven respondents (about 63.3% of them) believed that feedback of PA reflected their teaching and research performance.

As it is indicated in the Table 4.5, eighteen respondents (about 17.0% of them) said that they did not expect training and development based on their PA results and fifteen respondents (14.2 % of them) were not sure whether they expected training and development or not. Seventy three respondents (about 68.9% of them), the majority, expected training and development and with the mean of 3.80 of them expected training and development based on their PA results.

Twenty-seven respondents (about 25.5% of them) said that they did not believe about the performance appraisal process used as a tool for victimized some staffs and thirty-five respondents (33.0 % of them) were not sure. Forty-three respondents (about 40.5% of them) believed the performance appraisal process was used as a tool for victimized some staffs. All in all the respondents believed with the mean of 3.68 about the performance appraisal process uses as a tool for victimized some staffs. The finding indicated the staff believed about the PA result as a tool for victimizing some staffs as it is seen in the Table 4.5.

Thirty-five respondents (about 28.3% of them) said that PA was not perceived as fair and accurate among staffs and twenty-seven respondents (25.5 % of them) were not sure about this issue. Forty-three respondents (about 40.6% of them) agreed that PA was perceived as fair and accurate among staffs

Fourteen respondents (about 11.1% of them) said PA results did not affect their' attitudes towards raters, their job performance and the feeling to their organization and thirty-two of them were not sure whether PA results affect respondents' attitudes towards raters their job and the organization or not. Sixty respondents (about 56.6% of them) which is the majority agreed that PA results affected their attitudes towards raters, their job, and their organization. The respondents disagreed with the mean of 3.66 that PA results not only affected respondents' attitudes towards raters but also towards their job and their organization.

As presented in Table 4.5, the respondents expressed their perception if PA results closely related to the characteristics of raters such as their personality, interactions, and intentions. Nineteen

respondents (about 14.2% of them) did not perceive that PA results in relation to the characteristics of raters' personality, interactions, and intentions and twenty-nine respondents (27.4 % of them) were not sure. The majority of them, fifty-seven respondents (about 53.8% of them) perceived that PA results were closely related to the characteristics of raters such as their personality, interactions, and intentions. They perceived with the mean of 3.66 that PA results were closely related to the characteristics of raters

Regarding Performance appraisal objectivity, the respondents were asked to rank it. Twelve respondents (about 11.3% of them) disagreed on the variable Performance appraisal should be objective oriented so as to align the staffs' development with organizational goals. Ten respondents (9.4 % of them) were not sure whether Performance appraisal should be objective oriented so as to align the staffs' development to organizational goals or not. Eight two respondents (about 77.3 % of them) agreed on this issue. On the whole, the respondents agreed with the mean of 4.85 that Performance appraisal should be objective oriented so as to align the staffs' development to organizational goals.

- **Participants' profiles and their PA perception cross relationship**

Participants' profiles and their PA perception cross relationship described (annex v). The majority female participants (16 from 22)) said that they did not expect like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results (annex v). The majority male respondents (51 from 84 respondents) they expected benefits like incentives, salary increments, and 72 of them considered the appraisal process a waste of time (annex v). All of the female respondents believed that the PA process was used as a tool for victimized some staffs. All female participants except one said that they did not expect training and development based on their PA results. 44 male respondents believed that the PA process was used as a tool for victimized some staffs and 27 of them were neutral (annex v). 62 male respondents said that PA was perceived as fair and accurate among staffs since it has a motivational element whereas 20 female respondents were not sure about this issue (annex v).

All participants (28) who served from 1-5 years said that they did not expect benefits like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results, they did not

believe the PA process as a tool for victimized some staffs and they said that feedback did not reflect their teaching and research performance (annex v).

Whereas the respondents (42) except five who served more than 11 years said that they expected like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results. All of them except one said that PA results used to effect promotion, provide feed-back for academic staff based on their, identify their strengths and weaknesses and to review the past performance of the academic staff(annexed v).

All respondents who had BA degree stated that they did not expect benefits like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results, they did not believe the performance appraisal process as a tool to victimize some staffs, all of them said that feedback did not reflect their teaching and research performance and they did not consider the appraisal process as a waste of time (annexed v). They did not perceive PA result as fair and accurate among staffs. The majority of them said that they did not expect training and development based on their PA results (annexed v). whereas twenty respondents who had PhD degree said that they expected benefits like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results, they believed that the feedback of PA result reflected their teaching and research performance and they expected training and development based on their PA results (annexed v). They perceived PA result as fair and accurate among staffs since it has a motivational element.

However, the respondents who had MA/MSC did not consider one part of the rank. 31 respondents from 73 said that they expected benefits like incentives or salary increments. 27 of them were neutral about this and 15 of them did not expect like benefits incentives or salary based on their PA results. The majority of them said that the feedback of PA did not reflect their teaching and research performance. 53 of them from 73 did not expect training and development based on their PA results. 40 of them (majority) agreed that PA was perceived as fair and accurate among staffs since it has a motivational element and 32 of them were not sure whether PA was perceived or not as fair and accurate among staffs.

- Responses from open-ended and Interview questions about the respondents' perceptions about the PA system and Practices

The researcher analyzed the respondents' perceptions about the PA system and process from the interview. This research question attempted to find out academics' staffs expectations from their PA system and practices. The following extracts are presented from the interview and from the open-ended question about the expectations of respondents.

Head one said that constructive feedback, self- development such as training and other capacity building mechanisms should be given when the performance not up to the expected result. Head Two expressed his expectation from PA result so as to know about the staffs' strengths and weaknesses so as to improve the gaps/weakness either through appropriate gap filling training or through regular education program or trough self-development mechanism. moreover, from PA result it is expected that everyone has to be treated as per their contribution to the university i.e. those who perform better should be recognized and those left back should be shown the direction to improve themselves or through the university facility. But this is possible when PA is well designed, objectively stated. Head four said that staff expected to receive a formal, well-written performance appraisal result and based on their PA result, they expected training and development.

Generally, as is seen in the discussion, respondents from questionnaire and interviewees expect like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results and they believed that feedback of PA reflected their teaching and research performance. Respondents did not consider the appraisal process a waste of time but they expected like feedback, training, and development. They also perceived that PA results affected their attitudes towards raters, their job, and their organization. Respondents perceive that PA as motivational factors was closely related to the characteristics of raters such as their personality, their interactions, and their intentions.

4.3.5. Challenges of Performance Appraisal at ECSU/KMU

Here fourteen statements were set to get responses from academic staffs about the challenges that they have faced during the Performance Appraisal (PA) practiced. The academic staffs' responses were presented in tables and discussed using percentage and frequencies as depict as follows

- the subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria

As seen from the Table 4.6, twelve respondents (about 11.3% of them) said subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria did not discourage the staffs and seventeen respondents (16.0 % of them) were not sure whether subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria discouraged the staffs or not. However, the majority of the respondents, seventy-seven respondents (about 72.7 % of them) agreed that subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria discouraged the staffs.

Table 4.6.: Subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria

| the subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria discourages the staffs | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 4.0 |
| Disagree | 10 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 11.3 | |
| Neutral | 17 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 27.4 | |
| Agree | 45 | 42.5 | 42.5 | 69.8 | |
| strongly agree | 32 | 30.2 | 30.2 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- PA process demands too much time and effort

The respondents were asked to rank whether PA process demanded too much time and effort or not from the appraisers. As it is seen from the table 4.7, twenty-seven respondents (about 25.5% of them) said PA process did not demand too much time and effort from the appraisers. Forty-three respondents (40.6 % of them) were not sure whether it demanded too much time and effort or not. Thirty-six respondents (about 33.9 % of them) agreed that PA process demanded too much time and effort from the appraisers.

Table 4.7: PA process demands too much time and effort

| PA process demands too much time and effort | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 5 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 3.3 |
| Disagree | 22 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 25.5 | |
| Neutral | 43 | 40.6 | 40.6 | 66.0 | |
| Agree | 26 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 90.6 | |
| strongly agree | 10 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- Standards and Rating Criteria for PA

As it is seen from the table 4.8, twenty-one respondents (about 19.8% of them) said the standards and rating criteria were used fairly by the raters. Thirty-four respondents (32.1 % of them) were not sure whether the standards and rating criteria were used fairly or unfairly. Fifty-one respondents (about 48.1 % of them), the majority, agreed that the standards and rating criteria were used unfairly by the raters.

Table 4.8: standards and rating criteria are used unfairly by the raters

| standards and rating criteria are used unfairly by the raters | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 7 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 3.6 |
| Disagree | 14 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 19.8 | |
| Neutral | 34 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 51.9 | |
| Agree | 37 | 34.9 | 34.9 | 86.8 | |
| strongly agree | 14 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- appraisers' personal values and bias on the academic staffs' PA results

. As it is seen from the table 4.9 below, fifteen respondents (about 14.2% of them) said appraisers' personal values could not distort the academic staffs' PA results. Thirty respondents (28.3 % of them) were not sure whether appraisers' personal values distort the academic staffs' PA results or not. Sixty-one respondents (about 57.6 % of them) which is the majority of them agreed that appraisers' personal values and bias could distort the academic staffs' personal values.

Table 4.9 : appraisers' personal values

| appraisers' personal values can distort the academic staffs' PA results | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.5 |
| Disagree | 11 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 14.2 | |
| Neutral | 30 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 42.5 | |
| Agree | 39 | 36.8 | 36.8 | 79.2 | |
| strongly agree | 22 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- staffs' roles in the process of PA

As seen from the Table 4.10, thirteen respondents (about 12.3% of them) said staffs' roles in the process of PA were unnoticed. Thirty-six respondents (46.2 % of them) were not sure whether staffs' roles in the process of PA were overlooked along or not. The majority of the respondents, Fifty seven respondents (about 53.8 % of them) agreed that staffs' roles in the process of PA were overlooked along. Generally, the respondents agreed with the mean of 3.1 that staffs' roles in the process of PA were overlooked along.

Table 4.10: staffs' roles in the process of PA are overlooked along

| staffs' roles in the process of PA are overlooked along | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|---|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid | Disagree | 13 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 3.1 |
| | Neutral | 36 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 46.2 | |
| | Agree | 37 | 34.9 | 34.9 | 81.1 | |
| | strongly agree | 20 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- Performance appraisers and their disproportionate number of ratings

As presented in Table 4.11, twelve respondents (about 11.3% of them) said the Performance appraisers did not give a disproportionate number of favorable or unfavorable ratings. Thirty eight respondents (35.8 % of them) were not sure whether the Performance appraisers gave a disproportionate number of favorable or unfavorable ratings or not. Fifty-six respondents (about 52.8 % of them), the majority, said that the Performance appraisers gave a disproportionate number of favorable or unfavorable ratings.

Table 4.11: Performance appraisers give a disproportionate ratings

| Performance appraisers give a disproportionate number of favorable or unfavorable ratings | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|---|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid | strongly disagree | 2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 3.2 |
| | Disagree | 10 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 11.3 | |
| | Neutral | 38 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 47.2 | |
| | Agree | 40 | 37.7 | 37.7 | 84.9 | |
| | strongly agree | 16 | 15.1 | 15.1 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- Little time whereby the rater on the appraisal process

Concerning time aspect, sixteen respondents (about 15.1% of them) disagreed with the idea that little time was spent on the appraisal process; Twenty respondents (19.9 % of them) were not sure whether the time aspect in relation to the appraisal process; the majority of the respondents, seventeen respondents (about 66.0 % of them) said that little time was spent on the appraisal process; Generally, respondents remarked with the mean of 3.4 that little time was spent on the appraisal process as it is indicated in the table 4.12;

Table 4.12: Little time is spent on the appraisal process

| Little time is spent on the performance appraisal process | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 3.4 |
| Disagree | 14 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 15.1 | |
| Neutral | 20 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 34.0 | |
| Agree | 40 | 37.7 | 37.7 | 71.7 | |
| strongly agree | 30 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- performance appraisers consistently give average ratings

As indicated in the Table 4. 13, Seventeen respondents (about 16.0% of them) stated that the performance appraisers did not consistently give average ratings. Thirty-seven respondents (34.9 % of them) were not sure whether the performance appraisers consistently gave average ratings or not. Fifty-two respondents (about 49.0 % of them) the majority agreed that the performance appraisers consistently gave average ratings at the end of the year. As the whole, the respondents almost agreed with the mean of 3.7 that the performance appraisers consistently gave average rating scale.

Table 4.13: performance appraisers consistently give average ratings

| performance appraisers consistently give average rating scale | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 3.7 |
| Disagree | 15 | 14.2 | 14.2 | 16.0 | |
| Neutral | 37 | 34.9 | 34.9 | 50.9 | |
| Agree | 31 | 29.2 | 29.2 | 80.2 | |
| strongly agree | 21 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- giving the average rating for academic staffs penalizes the outstanding performer

As presented in Table 4.14, the respondents were asked with regarding giving average rating result for academic staffs and this penalizes the outstanding performer and covers up the poor performance of underachievers. Nineteen respondents (about 17.5% of them) disagreed about the concept of giving the average rating for academic staffs and this penalized the outstanding performer and covered up the poor performance of underachievers. Thirty-one respondents (29.2 % of them) were not sure whether giving the average rating for academic staffs or not. Fifty-six respondents (about 52.8 % of them) agreed that giving the average rating for academic staffs penalized the outstanding performer and covered up the poor performance of underachievers. All of all the respondents agreed with the mean of 3.6 about giving the average rating for academic staffs.

Table 4.14: penalizes the outstanding performer

| penalizes the outstanding performer and covers up the poor performance of underachievers | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.6 |
| Disagree | 15 | 14.2 | 14.2 | 17.9 | |
| Neutral | 31 | 29.2 | 29.2 | 47.2 | |
| Agree | 38 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 83.0 | |
| strongly agree | 18 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- There is lack of/limited commitment to provide feedback

As presented in Table 4.15, the respondents ranked their agreement regarding the commitment to provide feedback to the staffs. Fifteen respondents (about 14.2% of them) said there was commitment to provide feedback to the staffs so as to know their performance strengths and weaknesses. Twenty-one respondents (18.8 % of them) were not sure whether there was limited commitment or not to provide feedback to them. Seventy respondents (about 66.1 % of them), the majority, stated that there was no commitment to provide feedback to the staffs and this did not make them know their performance strengths and weaknesses.

Table 4.15: lack of commitment to providing feedback

| There is lack of commitment to provide feedback to the staffs | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 3.62 |
| Disagree | 13 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 14.2 | |
| Neutral | 21 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 34.0 | |
| Agree | 50 | 47.2 | 47.2 | 81.1 | |
| strongly agree | 20 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- Resistance to PA practices

Table 4.16 showed the respondents agreement about the resistance to PA practices that was considered as obstacle to the full implementation of the performance evaluation system. Eighteen respondents (about 17.0% of them) said that resistance to performance PA practices was not considered as obstacle to the full implementation of the performance evaluation system. Twenty respondents (18.9 % of them) were not sure whether resistance to PA practices was considered as obstacle or not. Sixty-eight respondents (about 64.2 % of them) which was the majority agreed that the resistance to PA practices was considered as obstacle to the full implementation of the performance evaluation system. The respondents agreed with the mean of 4.01 that resistance to PA practices was considered as the obstacle to the full implementation of the PE system.

Table 4.16::Resistance to performance PA practices

| Resistance to PA practices is considered as obstacle to the full implementation of the PE system | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 4.01 |
| Disagree | 16 | 15.1 | 15.1 | 17.0 | |
| Neutral | 20 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 35.8 | |
| Agree | 50 | 47.2 | 47.2 | 83.0 | |
| strongly agree | 18 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- academic staffs' entire year of very favorable performance can be negatively impacted by a single unfavorable event

As presented in Table 4.17, fifteen respondents (about 14.2% of them) said academic staffs' entire year of favorable performance could not be negatively impacted by a single unfavorable event. Thirty-two respondents (30.2 % of them) were not sure whether the academic staffs' entire year of very favorable performance could be negatively impacted by a single unfavorable event or not. Fifty-nine respondents (about 55.6 % of them) agreed that academic staffs' entire year of very favorable performance could be negatively impacted by a single unfavorable event. The respondents agreed with the mean value of 3.6 that academic staffs' entire year of very favorable performance could be negatively impacted by a single unfavorable event.

Table 4.17: Academic staffs' entire year of very favorable performance

| academic staffs' entire year of very favorable performance can be negatively impacted by a single unfavorable event | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Mean |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 3 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.6 |
| Disagree | 12 | 11.3 | 11.3 | 14.2 | |
| Neutral | 32 | 30.2 | 30.2 | 44.3 | |
| Agree | 42 | 39.6 | 39.6 | 84.0 | |
| strongly agree | 17 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 106 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Source: Survey data, April 2017

- **Challenges of PA and Profiles of respondents' cross relationship**

Challenges of PA and Profiles of respondents' cross relationship are described here. 10 female respondents agreed that subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria discouraged the staffs on supporting the system of PA and 12 of them were indifferent about this issue. However, the majority male respondents (72 from 84 respondents) said that the subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria discouraged the staffs on supporting the system of PA. On the other part, 15 female respondents, the majority, from 22 females respondents stated that PA results of the academic staffs were acted based on the purposes of performance evaluation system and 45 male respondents agreed with the idea that the PA results of the academic staffs are not acted based on the purposes of performance evaluation system.

19 female respondents said that they were not sure if the standards and ratings criteria were used fairly or not and 61 male respondents (majority) from 84 respondents stated that standards and ratings criteria were used unfairly by the raters and 11 of them were not sure with statement. 18 female respondents/majority/ were neutral whether Performance appraisers gave a disproportionate number of favorable or unfavorable ratings and 70 male respondents agreed that Performance appraisers gave a disproportionate number of favorable or unfavorable ratings

The majority of female respondents (19 respondents) were not sure about penalizing the outstanding performer and covering up the poor performance of underachievers and 70 male respondents agreed that penalizes the outstanding performer and covers up the poor performance of underachievers. However, 12 of them did not agree with this idea.

68 male respondents said that performance appraisal results were not openly explained and discussed to the academic staffs and 16 female respondents were not sure whether the performance appraisal results were not openly explained and discussed to the academic staffs. six female respondents said that the performance appraisal results were openly explained and discussed to the academic staffs.

51 male respondents said that Resistance to performance PA practices was considered as another obstacle to the full implementation of the performance evaluation system and of them were not sure. 19 female respondents said that they were not sure about Resistance to performance PA

practices was considered as another obstacle to the full implementation of the performance evaluation system or not.

Sixteen respondents who served from 1-5 years from 28 respondents said that they were not sure whether the subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria discouraged the staffs on supporting the system of performance appraisal and of them disagreed with this idea. All respondents who served more than six years indicated that subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria discouraged the staffs on supporting the system of performance appraisal.

Twenty seven respondents who served from 1-5 years from 28 respondent said that PA results of the academic staffs are not acted based on the purposes of performance evaluation system whereas 32 respondents who served from 6-10 years from 36 said that PA results of the academic staffs are not acted based on the purposes of performance evaluation system and all of the respondents who served more than 11 years agreed that PA results of the academic staffs are not acted based on the purposes of performance evaluation system.

Twenty-one respondents who served from 1-5 years from 28 respondents said that PA process did not demand too much time and effort from the appraisers and 42 respondents who served more than eleven years said that PA process demanded too much time and effort from the appraisers whereas twenty-six respondents who served from 6-10 years were not sure about this issue and 10 of them agreed on the issue.

All of the respondents who served from 1-5 years from 28 respondent said appraisers' personal values and bias could not distort the academic staffs' PA results. However, the respondents who served more than eleven years said that appraisers' personal values and bias can distort the academic staffs' PA results. 21 respondents who served from 6-10 years did not agree with this idea and 15 of them from 36 respondents stated that appraisers' personal values and bias can distort the academic staffs' PA results.

- Responses from open-ended and Interview questions about the Challenges of PA practice for Academic Staffs

Interviewees were asked to explain the challenges for PA practices in their universities. The responses to the interview questions and open-ended questions are presented as follows.

Head one explained that there were provided the performance appraisal results which did not have any relation with the works done by teachers. The performance evaluation criteria like quality, cost related and behavior of the staff were difficult to measure the academic staffs' performance. The appraisers especially the students were not genuine when they rated their teachers, even colleagues were not performing the PA properly since they were evaluated each other. So nobody has got the real PA results. This makes difficult the university to award the best performer.

Head Two stated that PA has been conducted usually for the procedural purpose, not for making decision purposes. The performance appraisal was not done to differentiate those who perform well and who did not.

Head Three remarked that the criteria's to evaluate the performance of the academic staffs need to be objective based rather than subjective based, It has some subjectivity especially the behavioral parts of the PA criteria. Other interviewee stated that ambiguity in performance criteria, indicators and subjectivity were perceived as the challenges of PA process. There was no discussion in relation to PA practices and results before or after PA implemented.

Generally, respondents stated that the challenges to perform PA system and practices were: the subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria that discouraged the staffs on supporting the system of performance appraisal. The PA results of the academic staffs were not acted based on the purposes of performance evaluation system. Performance appraisers have given a disproportionate number of ratings and they consistently gave average ratings. The performance appraisal results were not openly explained and discussed to the academic staffs. There was limited commitment to provide feedback to the staffs regarding respondents' performance strengths and weaknesses.

4.4. Summary of the Findings

The respondents (academic staffs) were asked to state their extent of agreement with eight different statements relating to the purposes of performance appraisal (PA) so as to relate the the research questions. The study found that PA results were used to provide information so as to make about administrative decisions, to effect promotion, providing feed-back for academic staff, identifying their strengths and weaknesses and reviewing the past performance of them. The results of this

study also strengthen by literature. Aswathappa (2005) explained that the main purposes of PA are: to effect promotion based on competence and performance, to assess the training and development needs of employees, to decide pay raise, to let the employees know where they stand and to improve communication gap.

In nutshell, the respondents from the questionnaire and interview emphasized that PA results were used to provide information about administrative decisions like promotion, recognition, retention, and detentions, to fill the communication gap and predict the training and development need; however, there were some staffs that were indifference about the uses of PA as to make administrative decision.

On the other hand, Female respondents, who serviced from 1-5 years and respondents who had BA degree did not agree with the purposes of PA like to make administrative decisions, to effect promotion, to provide feedback for them and to identify their strengths and weaknesses (annexed iii). However, the majority of male participants, the respondents who served more than 11 years and respondents who had Ph.D. agreed with the purposes of PA (annexed iii).

Eight statements were set to get responses from academic staffs about PA system, practices, and criteria. The respondents were asked to rank whether they have got a completed performance appraisal systems such as formats, procedures, rules, and regulations. The study found that they have got PA systems such as formats, procedures, rules, and regulations and performance evaluation criteria have been clearly identified; however, the PE criteria were not developed in consultation with academic staffs and not extracted/related from their up-to-date job descriptions. Many researchers have studied the PA process with the goal of determining the components of successful PA system. Longenecker and Fink (1999) found that a successful PA system could be divided into three critical components: systems design, managerial practice and appraisal system support. The performance criteria, rating procedures, and feedback should be relevant and meaningful for both supervisors and their employees.

The study found that the PE of academic staffs was appraised by their colleagues, department heads and students and about 49.1% of them said that the PA results which were appraised by department

heads, their students, and their colleagues or peers were effective, efficient and reliable to achieve the goal of university. The performance criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness and cost effectiveness were measurable. However, there was difference of response about this issue from the interviewees' point of views.

On the other part, the study found that female respondents, respondents who serviced from 1-5 years and who had BA degree said PE criteria (indicated competencies, behaviors and the results or outcomes) were not clearly identified and the PA criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness and cost effectiveness were not measurable. However, the majority male respondents, respondents who served more than 11 years and who had PhD degree said that PE criteria have been clearly identified, developed in consultation with academic staffs and department heads, extracted / related from an up-to-date job description. They stated that performance criteria could be measurable and their appraisers were effective, efficient and reliable to achieve the goal of university.

The respondents were asked with regarding their beliefs about the feedback of PA whether it reflected their teaching and research performance. The result of the study found that feedback of PA reflected their teaching and research performance and they did not consider the appraisal process as waste of time. It seems obvious that in the absence of feedback, any career related discussions were also likely to have it. The respondents were asked with regarding the respondents' expectations about training and development based on their PA results. They expected training and development based on their PA results; nevertheless, some of them (about 40.5% of them) believed that PA process was used as a tool for victimized some staffs.

The study indicated that academic staff perceived PA result as fair and accurate among staffs; on the other hand, sixty respondents (about 56.6% of them) agreed that PA results not only affect respondents' attitudes towards raters but also towards their job and the organization.

Female respondents who had serviced from 1-5 years and who had BA degree said that they did not expect like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results (annex v). They believed that the PA used as a tool for victimized some staffs and they did not expect training and development based on their PA results. Nevertheless, the male respondents who served more than 11 years and had Ph.D. degree expected benefits like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results. They believed that the feedback

of PA result reflected their teaching and research performance and they expected training and development based on their PA results (annexed v). They perceived PA result as fair and accurate among staffs since it has a motivational element (annex v).

The respondents were asked with regarding the subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria whether it discouraged the staffs or not. The study found that subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria discouraged the staffs and PA results of the academic staffs were not acted based on the purposes of performance evaluation system. This finding also is supported by the literature. One of the challenges for PA practice is subjectivity of PE criteria. The subjectivity of the evaluation discourages employees on supporting the measurement of performance appraisal (Ahmad and Bujang, 2013).

The respondents were asked with regarding the standards and rating criteria whether it was used unfairly by the raters or not. The research indicated that the standards and rating criteria were used unfairly by the raters and appraisers' personal values /bias could distort the academic staffs' PA results. This finding was also supported by the literature. Ahmad and Bujang, (2013) said that one of the most difficult requirements of an effective PA system is to be as free as possible from bias.

The finding showed that giving the average rating for academic staffs penalized the outstanding performer and covered up the poor performance of underachievers. There were also limited commitment to provide feedback to the staffs, resistance to PA practices that was considered as obstacle to the full implementation of the performance evaluation system; therefore, the respondents could not know their performance strengths and weaknesses.

In general, the findings revealed that subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria discouraged the staffs; PA results of the academic staffs were not acted based on the purposes of performance appraisal system, PA process demands too much time and effort from the appraisers and the standards and ratings criteria were used unfairly by the raters and appraisers' personal values and bias could distort the academic staffs' PA results. The finding also showed that there was limited commitment to provide feedback to the staffs regarding respondents' performance strengths and weaknesses.

Chapter Five: Conclusion and Recommendations

In the previous chapter, analysis and interpretation of the study were made based on the data obtained through the questionnaire distributed and an interview conducted with Ethiopian Civil Service University and Kotebe Metropolitan University. Based on data presentations, analysis, interpretation of data, and the major findings, conclusion and recommendations of the study were presented as follows.

5.1. Conclusion

The study has assessed the implementation of performance Appraisal system in Ethiopian public universities with specific reference to the Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU) and Kotebe Metropolitan University (KMU) since there were continuous complainants about the performance evaluation results of academic staffs so as to award best performers to academic staffs. Therefore based on this information, this research attempted to answer basic research questions.

In this study, the researcher used the descriptive survey research design. According to Leedy et al (2005), the descriptive survey involves acquiring information about one or more groups of people, asking them questions and tabulating their answers.

This study used quantitative and qualitative research approaches. The questionnaire was the foundation for the quantitative research method while interview and secondary data were the bases for the qualitative approaches. Primary and secondary data were used to get relevant information. The primary sources of data were generated through questionnaire and the semi-structured interview.

The target populations of the study were the academic staffs such as lecturers, researchers, consultants, professors and department heads of the ECSU and KMU. The total number of the academic staff for ECSU was 250 and KMU was 270 which were totally 520 and 20% of them has taken as sampling which is 120 staffs. The research found that PA results were used to provide information about administrative decisions like promotion, recognition, retention, and detentions, to fill the communication gap and predict the training and development need.

Finally, it is concluded that PA results were used to provide information about administrative decisions like promotion, recognition, retention, and detentions, to fill the communication gap and predict the training and development need; however, some staffs were indifference about the uses of PA as to make management decision. This indicated PA practice and purposes have to be made clear for all staff to achieve the purposes.

Key performance evaluation criteria were clearly identified; however, the PE criteria were not developed in consultation with academic staffs, not related from an up-to-date job description and the performance criteria such as quality, quantity, timeliness and cost effectiveness were measurable. The performance evaluation of academic staffs was also appraised by colleagues, department heads and students and the Performance appraisal results which were appraised by department heads, their students, and their colleagues or peers were effective, efficient and reliable to achieve the goal of the university.

The respondents expected like incentives, salary increments, promotion or recognition based on their PA results. They also expected training and development; nevertheless, some of them believed that the performance appraisal process was used as a tool for victimized.

In general, the findings revealed that subjectivity of the performance evaluation criteria discouraged the staffs; PA results of the academic staffs were not acted based on the purposes of performance evaluation system. The PA standards and rating criteria were used unfairly by the raters and appraisers' personal values and bias could distort the academic staffs' PA results. Little time was spent on the appraisal process; Due to this, the performance appraisers consistently gave average ratings and avoided the favorable and unfavorable ends of the rating scale.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the analysis and findings of this research, the following recommendations have been forwarded:

- ECSU, KMU and other institutions of higher education should give feedbacks to the academic staffs on time; this benefits the students, the university, and the academic staffs. Since if the academic staffs know where they are, they will strive to improve their

performance. As a result, if their performance is improved, university's efficiency will be improved.

- ECSU and KMU, as well as other public universities, should be clear the purposes of PA practice since it helps to make decision objectively.
- The PA criteria should measure academic staffs' achievement and accomplishments; the staffs should participate in the preparation of performance appraisal system and criteria development. These can create transparency and promote trusts.
- The main issue in the practice of performance appraisal activity is the fairness of the evaluation decision. Raters should be fair when they evaluate the performance of the staffs. Appraisers should make the PA of the academic staffs based on facts, practices and tangible data.
- There is an issue of subjectivity in the performance evaluation in the public sector. Although it is written in black and white to be as objective as possible, however, during the implementation of performance appraisal, the PA criteria are not free from subjectivity. The subjectivity of the evaluation discourages employees on supporting the measurement of performance appraisal. Therefore, the academic staffs should participate in the design of PA criteria so as to make objective the PA criteria.
- Ethiopian Public Universities should use the performance appraisal result for decision making purposes like promotion, developmental purposes and to identify the training and development needs of their staff.

Further Research Implication

If the study were done again, questions would be added to seek more direct input from the respondents concerning how their current appraisal system could be improved. In the open-ended question, there were some responses that addressed this issue, but the study could have been more intentional in seeking out this information. The study could have also been strengthened by asking additional open-ended questions where more in-depth explanations and understandings could have been obtained from the respondents. This may have brought greater clarity and understanding to some of the responses received in the study.

References

- Ahmad,R. & Bujang, S. (2013).Relationship between performance appraisal communication, procedural justice and job satisfaction GEOGRAFIA Online TM Malaysian Journal of Society and Space 12 issue 2 (15 - 26)
- Aswathappa, K (2005) Human Resource and Personnel Management: Text Cases, New Delhi: The McGraw-Hill Companies
- AttaQuartey, J.E. (2015) An Evaluation of the Annual Performance Appraisal System at the University of Cape Coast. Open Journal of Social Sciences, 3, 247-260.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jss.2015.37037>
- Banerjee. R, K, and Agarwal V.K. (2005) Human Resource Management, Meerut: Pragati Prakashan
- Bretz Jr., R. D., Milkovich, G. T., & Read, W. (1992). The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: Concerns, directions, and implications. *Journal of Management*, 18(2).
- Boswell, W. R. & Boudreau, J. W. (1997). *Employee attitudinal effects of perceived performance appraisal use* (CAHRS Working Paper #97-14). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies. retrieved from: <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cahrswp/155>
- Bretz, R. D., Jr., Milkovich, G. T., & Read, W. (1992). The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: Concerns, directions, and implication. *Journal of Management*, 18, 321-352
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons
<https://www.checkmarket.com/sample-size-calculator/> available at May 10, 2017
- Chemed Diriba (2012) A Comparative Study of Employees Performance Appraisal Practices and Problems in Ethiopian Higher Education Institutions: The Case of Addis Ababa University and St. Mary University College: A Thesis Submitted to The Department of Management Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Business Administration in Management Addis Ababa University Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Creswell, J. W (2009) *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 3rd edit, SAGE Publications, California, USA.

- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, D. V. L. P. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage Publications.
- Elaine, D. (2004). *Performance Management: A roadmap for developing, implementing and evaluating performance management systems*, SHRM Foundation at 703-535-6020. retrieve from www.shrm.org/foundation.
- Esther M. (2015) .*Academic Staff Perception Of Performance Management: A Case Study Of An Open Distance Learning Institution*. South Africa: South Africa University
- Farheen, M. (2004). *Implementation and Effectiveness of Performance Management System Alfalah Bank: Journal of Public Administration and Governance* retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/>
- Fletcher, C. and Williams, R.(1996). *Performance management, job satisfaction and organizational commitment*, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 7, pp. 169-79.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). *Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4), 473-487.
- Forrest, W. (2009). *Performance Appraisal Systems in Higher Educate Exploration of Christian Institutions: A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in the Department of Educational Research, Technology And Leadership in the College of Education at the University of Central Florida Orlando*.
- Gabedi N. M., (2011). *Performance measurement model and academic staff: A survey at selected Universities in South Africa and abroad Business School, Faculty of Management Sciences, Tshwane University of Technology, Tshwane, South Africa. African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 6(15), retrieved from <http://www.academicjournals.org/AJBM>
- Greenberg, M. (2006). *A university is not a business (and other fantasies)*. *Educause Review*, 39(2), 10-16.
- George, N, Elijah, M. & Stephen, M. (2012). *Factors Influencing Employee Performance Appraisal System: A Case of the Ministry of State for Provincial Administration & Internal Security, Kenya: International Journal of Business and Social Science Vol. 3 No. 20 [Special Issue – October 2012]*
- Grote, R. C. (1996). *The complete guide to performance appraisal*. New York: AMACOM.

- Grote, R. C. (2002). *The performance appraisal question and answer book: A survival guide for managers*. New York: American Management Association
- Karuhanga, B. N. (2010). Challenges of Performance Management in Universities *in Uganda*. Paper presented at the International Research Symposium in Service Management, Le Meridien Hotel, Mauritius, August 2010 24-27.
- Kemal Abdurahim (2015) Instructors' Performance Appraisal Practice in the Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia *Journal of Resources Development and Management* www.iiste.org ISSN 2422-8397 An International Peer-reviewed Journal Vol.14, 2015
- Leedey, P.D. & Ormrod, J. E. (2010). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*, 9thed. New Jersey: Pearson Education International.
- Longenecker, C. O. & Fink, L. S. (2007). The performance management and appraisal of middle managers in rapidly changing organizations. *Journal of Compensation & Benefits*, 23(2)
- Longenecker, C. O. (2005). Managerial performance appraisals: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Compensation & Benefits*, 21(3), 30-37.
- Longenecker, C. O. & Fink, L. S. (1999). Creating effective performance appraisals. *Industrial Management*, 41(5), 18.
- Lowery, C. M., Petty, M. M., & Thompson, J. W. (1995). Employee perceptions of effectiveness of a performance-based pay program in a large public utility. *Public Personnel Management*, 24, 475-492.
- Mark C. (1995). Performance appraisal and true performance. *Journal of managerial phil*Marwa Abdalla, Amirul Shah & Yousif Abdelbagi (2014): Understanding Challenges of Performance Measurement in a Public University: Evidence from Sudan *Asian Social Science*; Vol. 11, No. 15; 2015 ISSN 1911-2017 E-ISSN 1911-2025, retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n15p10>
- Martin, D. C., Bartol, K.M. & Kehoe, P. E. (2000). The legal ramifications of performance appraisal: The growing significance. *Public Personnel Management*, 29(3), 379-406
- Marwa Abdalla, Amirul Shah & Yousif Abdelbagi (2015). Understanding Challenges of Performance Measurement in a Public University: Evidence from Sudan : Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education. *Asian Social Science*; Vol. 11, No. 15;

2015ISSN 1911-2017 E-ISSN 1911-2025 Retrieved from doi:10.5539/ass.v11n15p10
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n15p10>

- Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of applied psychology*, 84(1), 123.
- Michael, B. (1987). Performance appraisal, In Lorch, J.(Ed).Handbook of Organizational Behavior, Prentice Hall, Englewood, Cliffs, NJ, pp.286-299 Mondy, Neo, Premeax. (1999). Human Resource Management. 4th ed. Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- McDowall, C. (2004). Employee development: an organizational justice perspective, Personnel Review, Vol. 33 Issue Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1108/00483480410510606](http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483480410510606).
- Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sa Nickols, F. (2007). Performance appraisal: Weighed and found wanting in the balance. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 30(1), 13-16.*Performance Appraisal and Evaluation (PDF* Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/>
- Parsons, P. (2000): Performance Management and Academic Workload In Higher Education Dissertation Submitted in Fulfillment of the Requirements for The M.Tech: Human Resource Management in the Faculty of Management at the Cape Technikon: Cape Town
- Pearce, J. L., & Porter, L. W. (1986). Employee responses to formal performance appraisal feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 211. Oberg, W.(1972).Make performance appraisal relevant. *Harvard Business Review*,50(1), 61-67.
- Prasad, K.D.V., Vaidya, R. & Mrutyunjaya R, M. (2016) Evaluation of the Employee Core Competencies Influencing the Performance Appraisal System with Reference to Agriculture Research Institutes, Hyderabad: A Multiple Regression Analysis. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies* , 4, 281- 292 retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2016.44028>
- Roberts, G. E. (2003). Employee performance appraisal system participation: A technique that works. *Public Personnel Management*, 32(1), 89-98.
- Sayantani, G. (2015): Effective Implementation of Performance Management in Higher Educational Institutions (HEI) *Journal of Scientific Research and Development* 2 (11): 17-21, 2015 retrieved from www.jsrad.org.

Thurston, P. W. & McNall, L. (2010). Justice perceptions of performance appraisal practices. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25 (3), 201-228.

Yazdani, F. (2015) Investigation about Teachers' and Managers' View about Annual Evaluation System of Teachers' Performance in Iran: Scientific Research Publishing Inc. retrieved from <http://www.scirp.org/journal/ce> <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2015.614152>

_____ (2014). Senate Legislation: Ethiopian Civil Service University: Addis Ababa, ESCU

_____ (2016). Senate Legislation: Kotebe Metropolitan University

_____ (2012). Senate Legislation: Addis Ababa University

_____ ECSU (2015). Annual Report of Ethiopian Civil Service University, AA

_____ KMU (2017). Broacher of Public Relation office of KMU,

Proclamations: "Federal civil servants proclamation, No.515/2009"