

## **Performance Appraisal in the Ghana Education Service, the Case of Basic School Teachers in Ho Municipality**

**Lydia Sylvia Danku**

Lecturer, Department of Secretary ship and Management Studies, Ho Polytechnic, Ghana  
*kotowaa@yahoo.com*

**Newell Yao Soglo**

Registrar's Department  
Evangelical Presbyterian University College  
Ho, Ghana

**Francis Dordor**

Registrar's Department University of Allied Health Sciences, Hohoe, Ghana

**Marian Josephine Bokor**

Assistant Lecturer, Department of Secretary ship and Management Studies, Ho Polytechnic, Ghana

---

**Abstract:** *Formal performance appraisal (PA) is one of the most important human resource management practices in organisations. It is worth noting that extensive frustration and dissatisfaction with performance appraisal have challenged practitioners and researchers to appraise the efficiency of performance appraisal quality. In this paper, we focus on the reaction of employees to these performance assessments. In particular, we examine the performance appraisal process and tools used in basic schools, examine the perception of teachers regarding performance appraisal systems (PAS) and identified the challenges (barriers) of performance appraisal in Ghana Education Service (GES). Respondents sampled for the study were drawn from teaching staff of basic schools in the HoMunicipality made up of 200 teachers from 10 schools. Concerning the process of Appraisal, there was an indication that at the basic schools performance criteria do not take into consideration the opinion of staff. On the challenges to appraisal process in the sector, respondents identified certain factors as challenges to an effective appraisal process. These included the unavailability of the needed resources to enhance the appraisal process, insufficient funding and failure by authorities to act upon results.*

**Keywords:** *Performance Appraisal, Ghana Education Service, Basic Schools, Ghana.*

---

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Historically, higher educational institutions (HEIs) have been independent institutions, backed by an ideology that led staff to expect and enjoy high levels of independence and autonomy, relatively free from any sense of management, commercial responsibility and accountability. This is however not the case with regards to Basic Education (BE). In recent times, BE in Ghana has been subject to increasing levels of scrutiny and regulation spurred on by central government initiatives related to standards and quality, and ever increasing expectations from students. These developments have heralded changes in human resources policy reflected in teaching staff appraisal systems in the Ghana Education Service. This study examines the issue of performance appraisal in selected basic schools as a way of understanding the generality of performance appraisal in the Ghana Education Service (GES).

Basic education in Ghana has seen tremendous efforts from the government and International Agencies. After independence in 1957, basic education has become a high priority on the government of Ghana's agenda. There have been policies of free compulsory basic education, free textbooks for all students and the creation of local education authorities with responsibilities for buildings, equipment and maintenance grants for primary schools. The 1992 constitution of Ghana makes basic education a right for all Ghanaians. The constitution also makes basic education free and compulsory. The Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education (FCUBE) program of 1996 has contributed immensely to the structure of basic education that exists today in Ghana.

Basic education in Ghana consists of 2 years of kindergarten, 6 years of primary education followed by 3 years of junior secondary school (now Junior high School). Pupils spend a total of 11 years at this level of education. As outlined in the United Nation's Millennium Development goals, Ghana wants to achieve universal basic education by the end of 2015.

In order to increase access to basic education, the government introduced the Capitation grant. This initiative took care of tuition fees and made basic education free. There was a 10% increase in primary

school enrolment in 2005 after the introduction of the program. The school feeding program was also introduced to attract more children to go to school. Despite the gains, progress is not evenly distributed in the country and the quality of basic education has only improved marginally.

Performance appraisals are one of the most important requirements for successful institutional and human resource policy (Kressler, 2003). According to Pulakos (2003), rewarding and promoting effective performance in institutions, as well as identifying ineffective performers for developmental programs or other personnel actions are essential to effective human resource management. London (2003) states that performance appraisals can be conducted effectively if there is a fair and accurate assessment of an employee's performance. London (2003) views the evaluation of an employee's performance as a difficult task and opines that once the supervisor understands the nature of the job and the sources of information, the information needs to be collected in a systematic way, provided as feedback, and integrated into the institution's performance management process for use in making compensation, job placement, and training decisions and assignments.

Historically, formal employee performance evaluation programme is thought to have originated in the United States military establishment shortly after the birth of the republic (Lopez, 1968). In Ghana, this history has not been documented, or was not encountered in the literature, which strengthens the need for this study.

The measurement of an employee's performance allows for rational administrative decisions at the individual employee level. It also provides for the raw data for the evaluation of the effectiveness of such personnel- system components and processes as recruiting policies, training programs, selection rules, promotional strategies, and reward allocations (Landy, Zedeck, Cleveland, 1983). In addition, it provides the foundation for behaviorally based employee counseling. In the counseling setting, performance information provides the vehicle for increasing satisfaction, commitment, and motivation of the employee. In the education sector this will provide the impetus for enhanced performance of staff. Thus, according to Thurston, McNall, (2010), performance appraisal and its outcome play a key role in employees' job activities and the organization.

As the need for talented workforce is growing worldwide, so is the need for GES staff with requisite skills in the educational institutions to produce the base for generating such a work force. Businesses are continuously demanding fresh talent which can meet challenges of twenty-first century through innovative and out-of-the box thinking. Business leaders are counting on educational institutions for infusing well-qualified fresh talent into industry. Given these facts, it is important for GES to have a solid performance appraisal management skill. In this study, the researchers made an intense investigation on performance appraisal management perspective in GES. Emphasis was placed on what the situation was in performance appraisal in GES and how it should be handled in the future.

The quality of institutional outcomes depends fundamentally on the work of staff, individually and collectively. Systematic staff appraisal or performance management procedures are generally assumed to comprise an important part of quality management and development in educational institutions, for the purpose of this study the basic schools. Past approaches to such appraisal and performance management in basic educational institutions have had limited and confused purposes and their contribution to enhanced institutional performance and quality has been minimal. In some cases, the impact has been negative, as reflected in the falling standards in education especially in the basic educational institutions. For example, a report from the West Africa Examination Council (WAEC) on the 2011 Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) results revealed that, most of the students performed badly, leading to most students not being able to obtain admission into the Senior High Schools (SHS).

According to them the performance for the Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) nationwide was poor, with most schools scoring below 50%.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1. The Concept of Performance Appraisal**

To understand the definition of performance appraisal would enable us lay a solid foundation to capture what the concept of performance appraisal is all about.

Different experts have defined performance appraisal concept in different points of views; among the popular definitions:

## **Performance Appraisal in the Ghana Education Service, the Case of Basic School Teachers in Ho Municipality**

---

Performance appraisal more broadly defines as “activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, enhance performance and distribute rewards Fletcher (2001).

Performance appraisal is a system of review and evaluation of an individual’s (or team’s) performance Mondy et al., (2002).

Performance appraisal can be defined as the process of evaluating how well employees do their jobs compared with a set of standards and communicating that information to those employees (Robert L. Mathis & John H. Jackson, 1997).

Alo (1999) defines performance appraisal as a process involving deliberate stock taking of the success, which an individual or organization has achieved in performing assigned tasks or meeting set goals over a period of time.

Atiomo (2000) agrees with literature that performance appraisal is a system which provides organizations with a means of identifying not only what people’s performance levels are but which areas those levels need to be improved if maximum use is to be made of human resource. According to Atiomo, every organization should ensure that the individual is clearly aware of what his functions and responsibilities are to make performance appraisal effective.

Performance appraisal is defined as evaluating an employee’s current or past performance relative to his or her performance standards. The appraisal process therefore involves:

- Setting work standards,
- Assessing the employee’s actual performance relative to these standards,
- Providing feedback to the employee with the aim of motivating that person to eliminate performance deficiencies or to continue to perform above par (Dessler, 2000).

According to Dessler (2011), Performance Appraisal (PA) has been synonymous with performance review, performance evaluation, and other terms and combinations of terms. PA has, over time, referred to 1) an instrument or form to assess an employee's job performance, 2) an interview where an employee's job performance is assessed and feedback is given to the employee, 3) a system of setting employee job expectations/ employee actual job performance/assessing that performance/ feedback to the employee on the performance assessment and how to improve it in the future/setting new goals and expectations for another period, or 4) performance management with job performance appraisal a part of it

Performance appraisal is “the process of identifying, evaluating and developing the work performance of employees in the organization, so that the organizational goals and objectives are more effectively achieved, while at the same time benefiting employees in terms of recognition, receiving feedback, catering for work and offering career guidance” (Lansbury, 1988).

Performance appraisal has been described as the process of identifying, observing, measuring, and developing human performance in organization (Carrol & Scheider, 1982).

Analyzing the definitions of performance appraisal, Alo (1999) opines that performance appraisal practices should be deliberate and not by accident and that, it calls for serious approach to knowing how the individual is doing in performing his or her tasks.

### **2.2. Objective of Performance Appraisal**

Cumming (1972) states that the overall objective of performance appraisal is to improve the efficiency of an enterprise by attempting to mobilize the best possible efforts from individuals employed in it. Such appraisals achieve four objectives including salary reviews, development and training of individuals, planning job rotation and assisting in promotions. Mamoria (1995) and Atiomo (2000) agree that although performance appraisal is usually thought of in relation to one specific purpose, which is pay. It can in fact serve for a wider range of objectives which are; identifying training needs, improving present performance of employees, improving potentials, improving communication, improving motivation and aids in pay determination.

Performance appraisal has been considered as a most significant and indispensable tool for an organization, for the information it provides is highly useful in making decisions regarding various

personnel aspects such as promotions and merit increases. Performance measures also link information gathering and decision-making processes, which provide a basis for judging the effectiveness of personnel sub-divisions such as recruiting, selection, training and compensation. If valid performance data are available, timely, accurate, objective, standardized and relevant management can maintain consistent promotion and compensation policies throughout the total system, Burack, Elmer and Smith (1977).

All companies pay a lot of attention on their employees to gain the competitive advantage and HR practices play an important role in gaining that competitive advantage through employees. Among many HR practices and functions, an important function of HR is keeping the track of employees' performance within the organization which is generally known as the performance appraisal of the employees. An advantage of PA is that, the provided feedback and communication may signal employees that they are being valued by their supervisors and the firms, which make them to feel more as part of the organization. The incidence of an individual being covered by a PA system is also of economic relevance, as it has been shown that employee participation, feedback, and clarity of goals are positively related to job satisfaction, a predictor of productivity and performance (Nathan et al., 1991; Fletcher & Williams, 1996; Judge et al., 2001; Patterson et al., 2004; Whitman et al., 2010).

We contribute to the literature by addressing three main research questions. What are performance appraisal process and tools used in basic schools? What is the perception of teachers regarding performance appraisal systems (PAS)? And What are the challenges (barriers) of performance appraisal? These are critical questions that were addressed.

Previous research by Levy & Williams, (2004); Pichler, (2012) has broadly analyzed the impact of the social context of performance appraisals on employee reactions to these appraisals. One dimension focuses on the rater-ratee relationship comprising topics such as supervisor support, trust, rating accuracy, and reliability as a precondition for the acceptance and usefulness of formal appraisal systems. Rating distortions, which are very prominent in organizations according to (Kane et al., 1995; Moers, 2005), lead to less acceptance among employees and decrease the economic incentives to provide effort (Prendergast & Topel, 1996). These rating distortions may have very different reasons including strategic incentives of the raters such as favoritism or punishment (Poon, 2004) or interpersonal motives as opine by Murphy and Cleveland, 1995). Furthermore, it has been shown that raters' personality traits influence overall rating decisions (Krzystofiak et al., 1988).

Employees' satisfaction with the PA process as a whole, the performance appraisal feedback, or employees' evaluations of the perceived quality, justice, and fairness of the performance appraisal regime are other contextual factors highlighted by (Greenberg, 1986; Nathan et al. 1991; Blau, 1999; Pettijohn et al., 2001; Jawahar, 2006; Kuvaas, 2006; Lau et al., 2008; Sommer & Kulkarni, 2012; Gupta & Kumar, 2013). Furthermore, employee participation in the PA process is positively related to the satisfaction with the PA system, perceived fairness, and acceptance of such a practice (Cawley et al., 1998).

Brown et al. (2010) analyzed the relationship between PA quality measured by clarity, communication, trust, and fairness of the PA process and job satisfaction and commitment based on a sample of more than 2,300 Australian non-managerial employees of a large public sector organization and found that employees who report a low PA quality (lowest levels of trust in supervisor, poor communication, lack of clarity about expectations, perception of a less fair PA process) also report lower levels of job satisfaction and commitment.

### **2.3. The Process of Performance Appraisal**

Studies show that there are many approaches for evaluating employee behaviour and performance with respect to job tasks and/or organisational culture. As a result, various applications of PA have left many managers in a state of confusion and frustration with the employee evaluation process (Gurbuz & Dikmenli, 2007). This situation seems to negatively impact the popularity of appraisal systems in many organisations. Most people support the concept and purpose of PA, in spite of their concerns about the process and application of appraisal outcomes by managers (Grote, 1996). The biggest complaint from managers is that they are not given sufficient guidelines to assess people; and the biggest complaint from employees is that the process is not equitable and fair. PA concentrates much in assessing past behaviours of employees, a situation some managers' exploit to victimize unfavoured employees (Bersin, 2008).

The appraisal process has been categorised into: (1) Establishing job criteria and appraisal standards; (2) Timing of appraisal; (3) Selection of appraisers and (4) Providing feedback (Scullen et al., 2003). Early PA processes were fairly simple, and involved ranking and comparing individuals with other people (Milkovich & Boudreau 1997). However, these early person-based appraisal systems were fraught with problems. As a result, a transition to job-related performance assessments continues to occur. Thus, PA is being modified from being person-focused to behaviour-oriented, with emphasis on those tasks or behaviours associated with the performance of a particular job (Wellbourne et al., 1998).

#### **2.4. Fairness of Performance Appraisal System**

Employees want fair dealing in PAS, which is a vital component of organization's HRM. According to Latham & Wexley (1994), literature reveals that fairness perceptions about various components of PAS have very serious implications not only for employees, but also for an organization. (Martin & Bartol, 2003) state that due to the importance of PAS's fairness, it is a significant topic of investigation among researchers in the field of organizational psychology. According to Boyd & Kyle (2004), discussion continues among the scholars about unjust nature of PASs. In the context of performance appraisal, variables pertaining to fairness are: knowledgeable supervisor, chance given to employee for expressing his/her appraisal related feelings and appraisal frequency in a rating year (Landy, Barnes, & Murphy, 1978). If employees have an opportunity to change their ratings or given simple rights to raise their voice against ratings which they perceive unfair (Gabris & Ihrke, 2001; Taylor et al., 1995) then this will result in fair perceptions of PAS. Blau (1999) also argues that employees' satisfaction with various aspects of PAS, like, performance targets setting and performance feedback are related to fairness of appraisal system. Gilliland and Langdon (1998) claim that employees' fairness perceptions of PAS have significant effect on the performance appraisal rating's acceptance, ratees' satisfaction with performance appraisal process and organizational commitment. Many organizational researchers (Greenberg, 1986, Landy et al., 1978) have expressed fairness of performance appraisal in terms of Organizational Justice (OJ). Cropanzano & Greenberg (1997) opine that organizational justice deals with employees' fairness perceptions of various organizational procedures or outcomes in work settings. The study of fairness or organizational justice came out from Adam's equity theory in the social-psychology literature (Adams, 1965). Employees' perceptions of fairness depend on one or more of their perceptions concerning the various organizational outcomes which they receive from the organization (distributive justice), procedures used to make those decisions (procedural justice) and the treatment which they receive from organization (interpersonal justice) and all the required information related to various outcomes is provided within an organization (informational justice).

Distributive justice deals with outcomes fairness and in performance appraisal context, appraisal ratings are outcomes (Erdogan, 2002; Jawahar, 2007). Greenberg (1996) gives the second factor as procedural justice which is associated with the fairness perceptions of the standards followed, methods and processes used for appraising performance of employees, and the third factor called interpersonal justice, deals with appraisees' perceptions about the treatment of supervisor. Fourth factor in PAS related to fairness is called informational justice, it means providing appraisees all the information relevant to decisions or appraisal process. Employees always anticipate that organization will appraise and reward their performance fairly without concealed purposes (Cawley et al., 1998). Likewise, it is also important that management should give full attention to employees' fairness perceptions of PAS (Roberson & Stewart, 2006) to get users view about the system. Ultimately, this will help management to design and implement the appraisal system according to desires of its users. Once organization has established a fair PAS, then responsibility for its operation just and consistent manner, lies on the shoulders of people who conduct appraisal (Cook & Crossman, 2004).

Dulebohn and Ferris (1999) affirmed that organizational researchers emphasized a lot on the investigation of performance appraisal as a key element of human resource management. There is no doubt that all the organizations want their employees' to perform well on their jobs and they carry out performance appraisal to judge how well their employees are performing.

In this regard, the organizations must assure that the performance appraisal process is fair and it concludes the fair results about the performance of the employees. The performance appraisal can be used as an effective managerial decision tool if its results are providing the accurate information about

the performance of employees (Poon, 2004). The accuracy of the information provided by the appraiser or rater remains doubtful in the presence of politics involved in giving ratings during the performance appraisal process. The appraisers intentionally alter the appraisal results for their own interests and according to Longenecker et al., (1987) the ratings and results of the appraisal are changed for political reasons.

Reviewing the performance appraisals, many decision and actions are taken by the management such as giving rewards to the employees such as promotions for having good performance ratings or may be punishing employees having bad performance ratings. Furthermore, the biased ratings either positive or negative by the appraisers i.e. the politics involved in the performance appraisal will affect the management decisions about punishing or rewarding an employee.

The employees' satisfaction with performance appraisal is sometimes quite complicated and hard to predict due to its behavioral aspect of employee perception. Previous studies revealed that many employees are not happy with their appraisal scores and effects on their compensations. This may be due to different reasons from personal expectations to the economic factors.

Leventhal (1980) expanded the attributes of the fair procedures of performance appraisal to six items as follows.

- **Consistency:** maintaining consistency in performance standards over time and among employees.
- **Bias-suppression:** constraining self-interest by discussing performance expectations and discrepancies.
- **Accuracy:** training managers and employees to record performance accurately throughout the period and use this record to prepare and justify performance evaluations.
- **Correct ability:** instructing managers to listen to the employees opinions and change the evaluation if appropriate.
- **Representativeness:** discussing concerns of the employee and manager throughout each stage of the process.
- **Ethicality:** using procedures that are compatible with existing moral and ethical standards.

## 2.5. Performance Review Discussion

Performance review discussion is the key in performance appraisal. It requires managers reviewing employees' responsibilities and performance, exploring what have to do to improve their performance, and providing feedbacks to them. Generally, performance review discussion is conducted by interviews. (Stone, 2005) Before the interviews with employees, managers should make a sufficient preparation for the interview. They must review employees' job description, goal, and performance, consult with other managers who also know the employees, and list important points that will be discussed in the interview.

In the interview, managers should encourage employees to talk about what problems they have and their ideas about the future work. Furthermore, managers should give a feedback to them. This helps employees identify what skills and knowledge have to be developed (Ubeda, Santos, 2007). In this process, managers must avoid utilizing their authority. In other words, the interview should be freely and neutral. (Stone, 2005).

## 2.6. Errors /Challenges in Performance Appraisal

Many researches pointed to the errors that supervisors often make during performance appraisal which could be the main source of dissatisfaction. Such errors are very likely to affect employees' appraisal results by which the performance scores received by people may be inaccurate (Suhaimi, 2011, Kavanagh et al, 2007 and Latham et al, 2005).

In the study of Hannay, (2010) which quoted Nickols, (2007), specified number of perceived problems with performance appraisals such as:

- Reduction of performance as employees set "easily achievable" goals
- Creation of emotional negative feelings
- Against the need for team working

- Emphasis on task rather than overall process results
- Foster a short-term view
- Foster political game-playing
- Costly practice requires for designing, preparing and conducting appraisals including training costs and handling appraisal appeals and potential problems.

As opine by Kuvaas (2007), there are difference of opinions between researchers and practitioners of performance appraisal. The practitioners are much more concerned with the impacts of appraisal on the superior-subordinated relations. The researchers on the other hand, tried to emphasize more on refining the rating procedures and the processes to make them more accurate and beneficial for the organization and the individuals. The effectiveness of the performance appraisal process can only be made possible if the ratings of the appraisal are accurate.

In practice, there are many possible errors or biases in the PA process. Raters are usually blamed for most of these errors. They affect the objectivity of the appraisal negatively. The most common errors in appraisal are discussed. One of the most common errors in PA is the halo effect. It is the influence of a rater's general impression on ratings of specific ratee qualities (Solomonson & Lance, 1997). The rater gives subordinates good grades although their performances are not worthy. Sometimes one prominent characteristic of the subordinate may colour the supervisor's perception of other qualities of the subordinate.

This occurs because raters sometimes fail to evaluate the employee's other characteristics separately. From his review of several studies, Lefkowitz (2000) concludes that positive regard for subordinates is often associated with greater halo effect and better interpersonal relationship. Horn effect is the opposite of halo effect. It means that the rater might give poor grade even though the ratee's performance is commendable. Some raters have tendencies to view negatively all behaviours or actions of a subordinate because the superior dislikes a particular behaviour or action of the subordinate (Lefkowitz, 2000).

The leniency error is perhaps the second most common appraisal error (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). Some managers are concerned about damaging a good working relationship with a subordinate by giving poor or negative ratings. For this reason, they have the tendency to give ratees higher ratings than they truly deserve. Lenient raters have the tendency to rate subordinates higher just because they do not want to adversely impact the future of the subordinate or risk being perceived as a harsh superior. Management psychologists claim that PA ratings obtained for administrative purposes (such as pay raises or promotions) would be more lenient than ratings meant for feedback or employee development purposes (Jawahar & Williams, 1997).

The error of strictness error occurs when raters give unfavourable or poor appraisal regardless of the actual performance level of the ratee. The tight raters set very high evaluation standards. And they might score subordinates' performance below maximum level of the scale. In the view of Tziner and Kopelman (2002), the main reason for this error is that the rater may be uncomfortable that successful ratees may replace them in the future. It is also due to the fact that some raters want to create the impression that they are hard and perfectly placed, and are unwilling to give high ratings even if the ratee's performance is very commendable.

Rather than give extremely poor or good ratings, there is a tendency on the part of some raters to evaluate all ratees as average performers even if actual performances of employees vary. Some raters want to rate employees in the middle of the scale rather than the extremes. According to Dessler (2000), this error (the central tendency error) is mostly committed for two main reasons: when the rater lacks adequate information and knowledge of the employee and, therefore, attempts to reduce the risk of wrong judgment; and when the rater is of the view that appraisal is a waste of time and, as a result, provides average ratings regardless of employee's actual performance value.

Generally, appraisal is conducted once or twice a year in most organisations (Bersin, 2008). The period between one appraisal and the next might be very long for the rater to remember detail information of all relevant performance key points achieved by employees. As a result, some raters only consider the ratee's recent noticeable behaviours or actions on the job regardless of actual

performance overall. This is the recency error. Moreover, the ratings may even become more misleading as some ratees attempt to score high ratings by working very hard and demonstrating good performance when appraisal time is approaching (Bersin, 2008).

The contrast error occurs when an employee's evaluation is biased either upward or downward because of another employee's performance, evaluated just previously. Contrast errors are most likely when raters are required to rank employees in order from the best to the poorest. The probability for this error to occur is higher if the rater appraises many employees within a short period (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). In other words, an appraisal grade of a ratee may be affected by the grade of another ratee who gets appraised just before him or her.

The similarity effect occurs when raters succumb to the tendency to give better rating to those subordinates similar to themselves in terms of behaviour, personality, or background (Pulakos & Wexley, 1983). Employees might also contribute to this error when they make efforts to demonstrate that their behaviours, tastes and tendencies match those of the superior, or hide those not matching with the superior's, with the intent to please the superior for more favourable ratings. The effects of "similar to me" error can be powerful, and when the similarity is based on race, religion, or gender, it may result in discrimination (Pulakos & Wexley, 1983).

Although training for raters may provide solutions to rater errors in some cases, it is ineffective in other instances due to a myriad of factors that distort ratings (Gilbert, 1994). Roberts (2003) argues that four out of ten supervisors believe that employees are to blame for poor performance, when in reality it is poor management practices. To minimize these errors, raters must be fully knowledgeable of the system, and the organization should provide rater training for managers (Roch & O'Sullivan, 2003).

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

This research design was primarily descriptive. A descriptive research is a study that seeks to portray an accurate profile of persons, events or situations (Saunders et al 2007). It involves formalizing the study with definite structures in order to better describe or present facts about a phenomenon as it is perceived or as it is in reality. According to Malhotra (2007), descriptive research is a type of conclusive research that has as its major objective to give the description of something. Accordingly, the study is justified to be descriptive because the researchers' intention was to portray an accurate profile of the activity of performance appraisal in GES.

#### **3.1. Population and Sample Size**

The target population for the study was composed of 109 schools in Ho Municipality out of which respondents in the category of teaching staff of the selected basic schools were used. The simple random sampling techniques were used in selecting the various schools. In all, ten schools (both primary and JHS) were chosen.

Out of the sample frame, a sample size of two hundred (200) respondents was selected. This was considered as being representative enough of all the three categories of respondents selected.

#### **3.2. Sampling Technique**

The convenience sampling was used in the selection of the sample. This technique was chosen because the researchers considered the schedule of respondents (teachers) used and believed that selecting them at random was not possible hence through convenience means would suit the purpose while ensuring balanced representation. The simple sampling technique was however used in selecting the various schools.

#### **3.3. Research Instrument**

The researchers used structured questionnaires as the main instrument in collecting the necessary primary data for this study. Questionnaire was used because it is clear and uniformly workable. It will permit wide coverage for minimum expense both in terms of money and effort. The researchers believed that a questionnaire will elicit more candid and objective response since it does not require any means of identification.

The questionnaire comprises of four sections. Section A solicits general information from the respondents namely gender, age, marital status, years of service. Section B consists of 12 statements



## Performance Appraisal in the Ghana Education Service, the Case of Basic School Teachers in Ho Municipality

concerning the performance appraisal process and tools used in basic schools. Section C contains 6 statements about the perception of teachers regarding performance appraisal systems (PAS) and its fairness and Section D allowed respondents to identify the challenges (barriers) of performance appraisal in GES. Respondents were required to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with each of a series of statements or questions on a five (5) item Likert scale rating questionnaires (1= strongly agreed; 2= agreed; 3= normal; 4= disagreed; 5=strongly disagreed), which helps to obtain an objective data.

### 3.4. Method of Data Analysis

The data was coded for used by scientific package for social sciences (SPSS) version 22.0 for analysis and Microsoft Excel. It was analyzed descriptively by computing frequencies and percentages for identifiable variables.

## 4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1. Reliability Test

Cronbach's alpha reliability test ( $\alpha$ ) was carried out to measure the correlation among the variables of the scale of item of the questionnaire. It is the most common measure of reliability (consistency) of a scale. The higher the Cronbach alpha value, the more consistent the research instrument is. In general, the accepted Cronbach alpha value is 0.7 and above, while a reliability coefficient of 0.6 is acceptable for exploratory research. In this study, the value of the Cronbach alpha test was 0.782.

### 4.2. Sample and Response Rate

Two hundred (200) questionnaires in total were distributed to the respondents, being the sample size selected for the study. Out of the distributed questionnaires one hundred and eighty were returned, implying a 90% response rate.

### 4.3. Demographic Classification of Respondents

Respondents sampled for the study were drawn from GES staff in basic schools in the Ho Municipality. This comprised only the teaching staff of the selected area. Discussions are not school based, but generalized for all respondents used. Accordingly, the empirical analysis reflected responses across the basic schools used in the study from the municipality. General trends are drawn and appropriate comments made. Variable of gender, age and educational qualification were inquired in the questionnaire to know demographic and social features of the respondents.

#### Gender of Respondents

Gender	Respondents	Percentage
Male	110	61.1%
Female	70	38.9%
Total	180	100 %

Source: *Field survey, 2014*

#### Professionalism of Respondents

Teachers	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Professional	99	55
Non-professional	81	45
Total	180	100

Source: *Field survey, 2014*

#### Qualification of Respondents

Qualification	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Degree	18	10
Post Diploma	27	15
Diploma	36	20
Cert 'A'	63	35
SSCE/GCE	36	20
Total	180	100

Source: *Field survey, 2014*

From the table above, 18 of the respondents representing 10% were Degree holders, 27 or 15% were Post Diploma holders, 36 of them or 20% were Diploma holders, while 35% and 20% were Cert ‘A’ holders and WAEC/GCE holders respectively. It reveals that in the basic schools, most teachers are likely to be Cert ‘A’ holders.

#### 4.4. What Constitutes the Appraisal Process and how Consistent is it to Standards?

This question sought to assess the process and consistency of appraisal process to known standards.

##### Respondent’s perception of the consistency of PA in basic schools

Consistency of objectives with PAS	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Consistent	117	65
Inconsistent	63	35
Total	180	100

Source: Field survey, 2014

Most respondents representing about 65% indicated that in their opinion appraisal programmes in the basic schools follow standards and adopt the appropriate methodologies. The remaining 63 respondents representing 35% however disagreed and suggested that appraisal programs are inconsistent to standards. 35% is significant enough to suggest a certain level of inefficiency in the appraisal programme in the basic schools. Another explanation could be the irregular nature of the process as identified earlier in the study. It is important therefore that authorities ensure an improved reliability of PA programmes in the basic schools.

As part of the investigation into the appraisal process, respondents were asked if in their opinion appraisal programmes identify key performance criteria. 152 of the respondents representing 84.4% believed that appraisal programmes at the basic schools identify key performance criteria, 18 of them representing 10% disagreed while the remaining 10 respondents representing 5.6% could neither agree nor disagree.

##### Assessment tools are structured

Assessment tools	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Agree	161	89.4
Disagree	19	10.6
Total	180	100

Source: Field survey, 2014

On the question of whether appraisal criteria are developed in consultation with staff, most respondents disagreed. The breakdown revealed that 165 respondents representing 91.7% disagreed while only 15 respondents representing 8.3% agreed. It is an indication that at the basic schools performance criteria do not take into consideration the opinion of staff.

#### 4.5. Respondent’s Perception of the Appraisal Process

The perception of respondents was again sought on the general orientation of performance appraisal programmes in the basic schools. Criteria used included fairness, constructiveness, involvement of workers, and feedback. Findings revealed that most staff did not consider appraisal process at the basic school to be fair. A breakdown revealed that only 20 respondents or 11.1% believed that performance appraisal process is undertaken in fairness, the remaining 88.9% disagreed. This suggests that most people feel that the process is used to victimize some staff members.

##### Employees’ Perception of the Appraisal Process

Scale	1	2	3	4	5
Employees do not show cooperation in the appraisal process	40%	30%	5%	15%	10%
Employees do not believe that feedback reflects their performance	60%	22%	3%	6%	9%
Employees consider the appraisal process as waste of time	10%	57%	8%	15%	10%
Employees cannot relate the appraisal process to their personal development.	47%	21%	10%	16%	6%
Employees believe the appraisal process is only used as a tool for victimizing some workers	30%	33%	7%	14%	16%

Source: Field survey, 2014

Key: 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-not sure, 4-disagree, 5-strongly disagree

## Performance Appraisal in the Ghana Education Service, the Case of Basic School Teachers in Ho Municipality

The study found most respondents representing 75% indicating that they are given feedback after appraisal programmes although they conceded that this was not regular. The remaining 25% suggested otherwise indicating that they are not provided any feedback at all. It was again found that most respondents did not find the feedback they receive to be constructive.

Generally, the study gathered certain concerns from respondents which sums up the perception of staff of the appraisal process. Largely, the perception of employees on the appraisal process was mixed. 70% of respondents did not believe that feedback reflects their performance and questioned the need for the appraisal process. It came to light that over 50% of respondents consider the appraisal process as a waste of time as they could not relate the appraisal process to their personal development. This was in response to the statement “Employees considered the appraisal process a waste of time” as indicated in the table above.

In the light of these discussions it was observed that there is mistrust between the appraiser and the appraisee in instances where there is communication gap. The appraisee in such instances attributes his /her failure to other issues rather than his /her performance on the job. It is thus, important that teachers in the Ghana Education Service are well informed on the appraisal procedures in the Ghana Education Service and the periods in which appraisal will be performed. It would also be prudent for the appraiser to be appraised by the appraisee and both outcomes utilized for fairness. In the GES the head teacher appraises the teachers and the teachers should appraise the head teacher.

### 4.6. What are the Challenges of Performance Appraisal in Basic Schools in the Ho Municipality?

The study also identified some challenges to the PAS in basic schools in the Ho Municipality. These challenges largely bordered on the process, the parties involved, and the resources involved. Most respondents (about 60%) believed that the performance appraisal exercise is not given the seriousness it deserves by both appraisers and appraisees. This undermines the integrity of the whole process. Again, most respondents were not educated enough and encouraged to understand and participate effectively in the appraisal process as alluded to in earlier discussions. They obviously will show lack of interest and may not derive the intended benefits of performance appraisal.

Also, some employees have a negative attitude towards the appraisal process. This might stem from their perception of the process as unfair or an opportunity for superiors to victimize some subordinates. These perceptions will have to be worked on to get workers to develop the necessary attitude to performance appraisal at the sector. Further, failure to act on appraisal results is one of the many challenges suggested by most respondents. This described the lack of commitment by authorities to the PAS.

#### Challenges to the Appraisal Process

Perceived challenges of PAS	1	2	3	4	5
The exercise of an appraisal is taken seriously by appraisers and appraisees	15%	15%	10%	40%	20%
Workers are encouraged to participate in discussions	6%	10%	14%	44%	26%
Employees have a negative attitude towards the appraisal process	40%	29%	5%	15%	11%
Workers have misconceptions about the efficiency of the appraisal system	75%	10%	5%	6%	4%
Misconceptions held by workers negatively affect the appraisal process	70%	10%	11%	4%	5%
Appraisal results are acted upon?	5%	11%	2%	49%	33%
The needed resources are unavailable to carry out an effective appraisal.	50%	28%	10%	5%	7%
Supervisors do not display the right attitude to help the process.	20%	51%	16%	6%	7%

Source: Field survey, 2014

Key: 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-not sure, 4-disagree, 5-strongly disagree

As depicted by the table above, another challenge identified was the lack of competence on the part of some raters and supervisors. Top management should choose the raters or the evaluators carefully. They should have the required expertise and the knowledge to decide the criteria accurately. They should have the experience and the necessary training to carry out the appraisal process objectively. It

was found that the appraisal process has sometimes encountered resistance from the employees based on fear of victimization and negative ratings. Therefore, the process of appraisal and its purpose should be clearly explained and communicated to employees by the authorities responsible.

The attitude of some supervisors was also mentioned by about 71% of respondents as a challenge to the appraisal process. In their opinion some supervisors only saw it as an opportunity to victimize some workers and usually wouldn't give a true picture of the performance of some workers. About 78% of respondents suggested that usually resources were not available to enhance the process. Effectively this affects the organisation of performance appraisal in the education service.

The study also examined the perception of respondents on the appraisal programme. 152 of the respondents representing 84.4% believed that appraisal programmes at the basic schools identify key performance criteria. Most respondents however, did not consider the appraisal process as fair. It was found that respondents are largely encouraged to participate in discussions. Also, 75% of respondents said that they are provided with feedback as is expected, although not regular. The remaining 25% suggested that they are not provided any feedback at all.

Again, of the percentage that suggested that they are given feedback, 70% stated that feedback is usually not constructive but largely general comments that in their opinion made no impact or difference. 30% however felt that feedback is usually constructive, raising pertinent issues that made significant difference in the performance subsequently. Finally, evidence suggests that review of progress is largely absent in the basic schools in general.

The study found that most respondents did not believe that previous appraisal results were a true reflection of their ability and so discounted the pertinence of the performance appraisal system in their particular instance in identifying employee strengths and weaknesses; although there was the general belief that that should have been the case. Respondents could not relate change in employee attitude to PAS but rather suggested that employee attitude was more influenced by motivational policies and packages. Again, there was no evidence to suggest the existence of effective structures that address weaknesses and reward performance. Respondents had largely answered in the negative to this question.

On the relevance of the appraisal system, the study gathered that the appraisal process had effectively not promoted the professional development of workers. As respondents indicated, feedback is not usually constructive. Consequently, the process is unable to effectively identify strengths and weaknesses that would determine the strategies to help in the professional development of the worker. Again, respondents suggested that because it is usually carried out as, in the opinion of respondents, a mere formality, no measures are put in place although the appraisal process is able to identify systemic factors that are barriers to effective performance.

Further, respondents largely believed that the appraisal process had no bearing on the development of reward systems. In their opinion over the years, nothing had changed; they therefore could not relate the appraisal process to the development of a reward system. Respondents believed that the appraisal process have had some link to certain administrative decisions. Especially, they mentioned promotion as one administrative decision that is usually linked to appraisal process.

The study gathered certain concerns from respondents which sums up the perception of staff of the appraisal process. Findings are discussed below: Largely, the perception of employees on the appraisal process was mixed. 70% of respondents did not believe that feedback reflects their performance and questioned the need for the appraisal process. It came to light that over 50% of respondents consider the appraisal process as a waste of time as they could not relate the appraisal process to their personal development.

Finally, respondents suggested that over the years training had been suggested as recommendations to some appraisals conducted. However, they hardly could point to one instance where the training had actually been carried out. It suggests therefore that although the appraisal process is able to determine organisational training and development needs, the recommendation is usually not followed through.

On the challenges to appraisal process in the sector, respondents identified certain factors as challenges to an effective appraisal process. These included the unavailability of the needed resources to enhance the appraisal process, insufficient funding and failure by authorities to act upon results. This is in addition to other challenges such as the lack of interest by staff.

## **Performance Appraisal in the Ghana Education Service, the Case of Basic School Teachers in Ho Municipality**

---

Most respondents believe that the performance appraisal exercise is not given the seriousness it deserved by both appraisers and appraisees. This undermines the integrity of the whole process. Again, most respondents were not educated enough and encouraged to understand and participate effectively in the appraisal process. Also, some employees displayed a negative attitude towards the appraisal process. This stemmed from their perception of the process as unfair or an opportunity for superiors to victimize some subordinates. These perceptions will have to be worked on to get workers to develop the necessary attitude to performance appraisal in the basic schools. Further, failure to act on appraisal results is another of the many challenges suggested by most respondents. This describes the lack of commitment by authorities to the PAS.

### **5. CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the fairness of a performance appraisal system has been recognized as an important effect on the success of any organization because perceived fairness was connected to the acceptance of this system and eventually, the performance of employees and organization. Employees create conclusions about the appraisal systems fairness based on the system's results, outcomes and procedures and how supervisors treat employees when applying those procedures.

### **6. LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

The study result has an internal validity meaning it cannot be generalized because the data was collected from only one region in Ghana.

For the collection of data, survey questionnaire was used only as the data collection method. Other methods like interviews and observations are not used in this study which could be more accurate data collection method regarding such studies. The nature of this study was description and the numbers of respondents were few with perception based data. The study ideally should have covered all the ten regions of Ghana and not just a Municipality within a region in order to get a large sample size and respondents. The researchers suggest that future research should cover the entire country.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Authors wish to acknowledge the Ghana Education Service, especially Teachers in basic schools, Ho Municipality and all who in diverse ways contributed to the success of this study. Further Research Assistants who helped in data collection are all acknowledged not forgetting Madam Happy Eddico.

### **REFERENCES**

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (2, pp 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Alo O. (1999). *Human Resource Management in Nigeria*. Lagos: Business and Institutional Support Associates Limited.
- Atiomo, A.C. (2000). *Human Resource Management*. Lagos: Malthouse Management Science Books,
- Bersin, J. (2008). The business case for performance management systems: A handbook for human resource executives and managers. *Bersin and Associates Research Reports*, 10, 9–22.
- Blau, G. (1999). Testing the longitudinal impact of work variables and performance appraisal satisfaction on subsequent overall job satisfaction. *Human Relations*, 52(8):1099-1113.
- Boyd, N. M., & Kyle, K. (2004). Expanding the view of performance appraisal by introducing social justice concerns. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 26(3), 249-278.
- Brown, M., Hyatt, D., & Benson, J. (2010). Consequences of the performance appraisal experience. *Personnel Review*, 39(3):375-396.
- Burak, E. & Smith (1977). *Personnel Management: A Human Resource Systems Approach*. New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporations Ltd.
- Carrol, S. & Schneir, C. (1982). "Performance appraisal and review systems: The identification, measurement, and development of performance in organizations. *Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman*
- Cawley, B. D., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (1998). Participation in the performance appraisal process and employee reactions: A meta-analytic review of field investigations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(4):615-633.

- Cook, J., & Crossman, A. (2004). Satisfaction with performance appraisal systems: A study of role perceptions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(5), 526-541.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317-372.
- Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 159-180.
- Cummings, M.W. (1972). *Theory and Practice*. London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Dessler, G. (2000). *Human Resource Management*. (8th ed). New Jersey: Prentice Hall International, Inc
- Dessler, G. (2011). *Human Resource Management*. (12th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dulebohn, J. H., & Ferris, G. R. (1999). The role of influence tactics in perceptions of performance evaluations' fairness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 288-303.
- Erdogan, B. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of justice perceptions in performance appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(4), 555-578.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance Appraisal and Management: The Developing Research Agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 473-487.
- Fletcher, C., & Williams, R. (1996). Performance management, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *British Journal of Management*, 7(2):169-179.
- Gabris, G. T., & Ihrke, D. M. (2001). Does performance appraisal contribute to heightened levels of employee burnout? The results of one study. *Public Personnel Management*, 30(2), 157-172.
- Gilbert, C. A. (1994). *Performance Appraisal: A Process Analysis of Existing Methods and Trends*. [Online] Available: <http://home.fuse.net/cgilbert/appraise.htm> (May 19, 2012)
- Gilliland, S.W., & Langdon, J.C. (1998). Creating performance management systems that promote perceptions of fairness. In J.W.Smith (Ed.), *Performance Appraisal: State of The Art In Practice*, (209-243). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Greenberg, J. & Folger, R. (1983). Procedural justice, participation, and the fair process effect in groups and organizations. In P.B. Paulus (Ed.), *Basic Group Processes*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2):340-342.
- Greenberg, J. (1993a). The social side of fairness: interpersonal and informal classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Grote, D. (1996). *The complete guide to performance appraisal*. New York: American Management Association.
- Gupta, V., & Kumar, S. (2013). Impact of performance appraisal justice on employee engagement: a study of Indian professionals. *Employee Relations*, 35(1):61-78.
- Gurbuz, S., & Dikmenli, O. (2007). Performance appraisal in public organisations: An empirical study. *Magazine of Management Practice*, 13(1), 108-138.
- Hannay, M., 2010. Performance appraisal, who knows the best. Troy University: *Journal of Human Resources Education*, 4(4): 88-101.
- Jawahar, I. (2006). Correlates of satisfaction with performance appraisal feedback. *Journal of Labor Research*, 27(2):213-236.
- Jawahar, I. M. (2007). The influence of perceptions of fairness on performance appraisal reactions. *Journal of Labor Research*, 28(4), 735-754
- Jawahar, I.M., & Williams, C. R. (1997). Where all the children are above average: The performance appraisal purpose effect. *Personnel Psychology*, 50 (4), 905-925.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Thoresen, C.J., & Patton, G.K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3):376-407.

## Performance Appraisal in the Ghana Education Service, the Case of Basic School Teachers in Ho Municipality

- Kane, J. S., Bernardin, H. J., Villanova, P., & Peyrefitte, J. (1995). Stability of rater leniency: Three studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4):1036-1051.
- Kavanagh, p., J. Benson, M. Brown, 2007. Understanding performance appraisal fairness. *Asia Pacific journal of Human Resource*, 45(2): 89-99.
- Kressler, H.W. (2003). *Motivate and Reward Performance Appraisal and Incentive system for Business Success*. New York: Palgrave Mac-Millan
- Krzystofiak, F., Cardy, R., & Newman, J. (1988). Implicit personality and performance appraisal: The influence of trait inferences on evaluations of behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(3):515-521.
- Kuvaas, B. (2006). Performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: mediating and moderating roles of work motivation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(3):504-522.
- Kuvaas, B. (2007). Different relationship between perceptions of developmental performance appraisal and work performance. *Personnel Review*, 36(3), 378-397.
- Kuvaas, B. (2008). An exploration of how the employee-organization relationship affects the linkage between perception of developmental human resource practices and employee outcomes. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(1) (1-25).
- Landy, F. J., Barnes, J. L., Murphy, K. R. (1978). Correlates of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(6), 751-754.
- Landy, F.J., Zedeck, S., and Cleveland, J. (1983). *Performance Measurement and Theory*. Lawrence Erlbaum associate Publishers.
- Lansbury, R. (1988). Performance management: A process approach. *Human resource management*, Australia
- Latham, G. P. & Wexley, K. N. (1994). *Increasing Productivity through Performance Appraisal*. Reading Massachusetts: Addison Wesley.
- Latham, G.P., P.A. Heslin and D Vande Walle, 2005. The effects of implicit theory on performance appraisals. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90: 842-856.
- Lau, C. M., Wong, K. M., & Eggleton, I. R. C. (2008). Fairness of performance evaluation procedures and job satisfaction: the role of outcome-based and non-outcome-based effects. *Accounting & Business Research*, 38(2):121-135.
- Lefkowitz, S. W. (2000). The role interpersonal affective regard in supervisory performance ratings: a literature review and proposed causal model. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 73(1), 67-85.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). *What Should Be Done With Equity Theory?* In Gergen, K. J., Greenberg, M.S., and Willis, R. H. (Eds.) *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research*, 27-55. NY: Plenum.
- Levy, P. E., & Williams, J. R. (2004). The social context of performance appraisal: A review and framework for the future. *Journal of Management*, 30(6), 881-905.
- London, M. (2003). *Job feedback: Giving, seeking and using feedback for performance improvement*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Longenecker, C. O., Sims, J. H. P., & Gioia, D. A. (1987). Behind the mask: the politics of Employee appraisal. *Academy of Management Executive*, 1(3), 183-193.
- Lopez, F.M. (1968), *Evaluating Employee Performance*, Public Personnel Association, Chicago, IL.
- Malhotra, N. K. (2007). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation Pearson Education Incorporation* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), USA: Upper Saddle River.
- Mamoria, C.B. (1995). *Personnel Management*. Bombay: Himalaya Publishing House.
- Martin, D. C., & Bartol, K. M. (2003). Factors influencing expatriate performance appraisal system success: An organizational perspective. *Journal of International Management*, 9(2), 115-132.
- Milkovich, G. M., & Boudreau, J. W. (1997). *Human resource management*. Chicago: Irwin.
- Moers, F. (2005). Discretion and bias in performance evaluation: The impact of diversity and subjectivity. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, 30(1):67-80.

- Mondy, R.W., Noe, R.M. and Premeaux, S.R. (2002). *Human Resource Management*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Murphy, K.R., & Cleveland, J.N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational and goal-based perspectives*. California: Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Nathan, B. R., Mohrman Jr., A. M., & Milliman, J. (1991). Interpersonal relations as a context for the effects of appraisal interviews on performance and satisfaction: A longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(2):352-369.
- Nickels, F., 2007. Performance appraisal: weighed and found wanting in the balance. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 30(1): 13-16.
- Patterson, M., Warr, P., & West, M. (2004). Organizational climate and company productivity: The role of employee affect and employee level. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 77(2):193-216.
- Pettijohn, C.E., Pettijohn, L.S., & d'Amico, M. (2001). Characteristics of performance appraisals and their impact on sales force satisfaction. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(2): 127-146.
- Pichler, S. (2012). The social context of performance appraisal and appraisal reactions: A meta analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 51(5):709-732.
- Poon, J. M. L. (2004). Effects of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Personnel Review*, 33(3):322-334.
- Prendergast, C., & Topel, R. (1996). Favoritism in organizations. *Journal of Political Economy*, 104(5):958-978.
- Pulakos, E. D., & Wexley, K. N. (1983). The relationship among perceptual similarity, sex, and performance ratings in manager-subordinate dyads. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(1), 129-139.
- Roberson, Q. M. & Stewart, M. M. (2006). Understanding the motivational effects of procedural and informational justice in feedback processes. *British Journal of Psychology*, 97(3), 281-298.
- Roberts, G. E. (2003). Employee appraisal system participation: A technique that works. *Public Personnel Management*, 32(1), 89.
- Roch, S.G., & O'Sullivan, B.J. (2003). Frame of reference rater training issues: Recall, time, and behavior observation training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 7(2), 93-107.
- Saunders, M. & Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research Methods for Business Students* (4<sup>th</sup>ed.). UK: Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.
- Scullen, S.E., Mount, M.K., & Judge, T.A. (2003). Evidence of the construct validity of developmental ratings of managerial performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 50-66.
- Solomonson, A., L., & Lance, C. E. (1997). Examination of the relationship between true halo and halo error in performance ratings. *Journal of Academic Applied Psychology*, 82(5), 665-674.
- Sommer, K. L., & Kulkarni, M. (2012). Does constructive performance feedback improve citizenship intentions and job satisfaction? The roles of perceived opportunities for advancement, respect, and mood. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 23(2):177-201.
- Stone, R.J., (2005). *Human resource management* (5<sup>th</sup>ed.). Singapore: John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd.
- SuhaimiSudin, (2011). Fairness of and satisfaction with performance appraisal process. *Proceeding of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Business and Economic Research*. University Tenaga Nasional, pp: 1239-1255.
- Taylor, M. S., Tracy, K. B., Renard, M. K., Harrison, J. K., & Carroll, S. J. (1995). Due process in performance appraisal: a quasi-experiment in procedural justice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 495-523.
- Thurston, P.W. and mcNail, L. (2010). Justice Perception of Performance Appraisal Practices. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25 (3), 201-228.
- Tziner, A., & Kopelman, R. E. (2002). Is there a preferred performance rating format? A non psychometric perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 51(3), 479-503.
- Ubeda, C.L. and Santos, F.C. (2007), "Staff development and performance appraisal in a Brazilian research centre", *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 10 (1), 109- 125.



## Performance Appraisal in the Ghana Education Service, the Case of Basic School Teachers in Ho Municipality

Welbourne, T. M., Johnson, D. E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 540–555.

Whitman, D. S., Van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2010). Satisfaction, citizenship behaviors, and performance in work units: A meta-analysis of collective construct relations. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(1):41-81.

### AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHY



**Lydia Sylvia Danku** is a Ghanaian by birth, a full time Lecturer in the department of Secretaryship and Management studies in Ho Polytechnic, Ghana and also a part time Lecturer at Evangelical Presbyterian University College, Ho. She holds Bachelor of Arts Degrees in Management and Psychology and a Master of Arts in Human Resource Development. Currently, she is a Doctoral student in the Open University of the Netherlands. Her research interest is in the following areas: Employee Engagement, HRM Practices, Stress Management, Human Resource Development and Strategic Management.



**Newell Yao Soglo** is a product of Aberdeen Business School of the Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, Scotland. He is a Chartered Human Resource Management practitioner with over fifteen years' experience. He currently serves at the Registrar's Department of the Evangelical Presbyterian University College, Ho, Ghana and also a Lecturer in Human Resource Management at the same institution. His research interests are in the following areas; Training and Development, Leadership, Health and Safety and Organisation Development.



**Francis Dordor** holds Master of Technical Education Degree from Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Bachelor of Arts (Secretaryship) and Diploma in Education from the University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast. He has fifteen years working experience in Tertiary Administration in Ghana. Currently, he is a Senior Assistant Registrar of the University of Health and Allied Sciences, Hohoe campus. His research interest is in Management related issues.



**Marian Josephine Bokor** holds Master of Arts in Human Resource Development and Bachelor of Arts Degree in French. She is an Assistant Lecturer at the department of Secretaryship and Management studies in Ho Polytechnic, Ghana and Married with three children.