



Performance Appraisal as A Yardstick for Promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority

Ademeso, Tosin Success¹, Ibrahim, Hassana Ahmed², Livinus Ature Nandi³

¹Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Abuja

²National Institute for Legislative and Democratic Studies, National Assembly, Abuja.

³Department of Democracy and Governance, National Institute for Legislative and Democratic Studies, National Assembly, Abuja.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.2022.3.10.69>

ABSTRACT

This paper examined Performance Appraisal as a yardstick for promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority. The objectives of this study are to assess the performance appraisal systems in the Federal Capital Development Authority; to determine the relationship between performance appraisal and promotion, and to examine the challenges of implementing performance appraisal in the Federal Capital Development Authority. In order to achieve this, the paper employed a sampling technique, and the data collected were analyzed using simple percentages. Chi-square was used to test the formulated hypothesis. The study discovered that performance appraisal is not a yardstick for promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority then concluded and recommended that; there should be a measure in checking the effective implementation of the performance appraisal system in Federal Capital Development Authority; Performance appraisal should be a major yardstick to the promotion of any kind that might take place in the Federal Capital Development Authority; Promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority should be balanced; the management of Federal Capital Development Authority should find an immediate and lasting solution to any challenge that might arise in the cause of implementing performance appraisal in the Federal Capital Development Authority; and the right minds and brains in terms of competences and skills should be allowed to carry out the implementation of the performance appraisal in Federal Capital Development Authority.

Keywords: Performance appraisal, promotion, motivation, public service, personnel.

1. Introduction

Weak motivation has primarily been linked to inaccurate performance appraisal systems existing in organizations. It is argued that organizations do very little in trying to measure the performance of their employees. That performance is judged by the subjective impressions of the reporting officers who appraise performance in terms of intangible executive qualities; for example, leadership obedience-but without a tangible measure of performance to which these qualities can be linked. According to Blake (2005), such rating or promotion can easily vary depending on how well the appraiser gets along with the appraisee.

The major concern of performance appraisal is basically a review of the individual's performance during a set period to identify his area of strengths and weaknesses and establish targets for him to achieve within the overall corporate objectives of the organization. The growing recognition that business results are largely attributable to employee performance is leading many executives to seek creative ways of significantly improving that performance (Jimgris, 2007). Job value or size is measured by comparing the incidence of various factors in a job such as the knowledge and skills required, level of responsibility, level of decision-making, and impact on the end result, with the incidence of the same factor in other jobs. According to Ani (1997), to achieve organizational effectiveness, the extent of enhancing and managing productivity is crucial. Therefore, the essence of productivity and labour welfare is skill and motivation. It is the task of top management to coordinate the efforts of managers to improve productivity. Performance appraisal systems in Nigeria have been largely characterized by non-disclosure of appraisal results to the employees, (Ubeku, 1975). This apparent secrecy over performance appraisal results tends to put in the hands of supervisors and managers, a potential tool for cracking down on "recalcitrant" employees with impunity. The main purpose of performance evaluation is to provide a rational basis for the determination and management of internal relativity between jobs and for the design of pay structure (McNamara, 2007). McNamara (2007) indicated that promotions and pay increases could be based on objective performance data rather than on favoritism, subjectivity, observations, or opinions. By evaluating the employee's achievements, management helps them to discover their strength and weaknesses. This should motivate the employees to raise their levels of performance. It is in this regard that the study is aimed at examining the performance appraisal system in the Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA) with a view to showing how it can be used as a basis for promotion.

1.1 Objective of the study

The main objective of the study is to examine performance appraisal as a yardstick for promotion in the FCDA, and how it affects employees of the FCDA.

1.2 Hypothesis

The hypothesis to be tested in the course of the study is stated below;

Ho: The use of effective performance appraisal systems cannot reduce lopsided promotions in the FCDA.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Concept and Objectives of Performance Appraisal

All organization's activities are directed towards the realization of its set goals and objectives through the men and resources available. But man as a technical factor is with the subjective, changeable, and dynamic tendencies that vary with cultural, and personal background, economic events, and the passage of time. Therefore, to increase efficiency and effectiveness in the personnel system without undermining the human aspects of man, most organisation resorts to the use of a functioning performance appraisal system. A performance appraisal is a process of evaluating an employee's performance on a job in terms of its requirements. In some other clime, performance appraisal is known as Merit Rating. Merit Rating was originally the terminology used to refer to performance appraisal. Though firstly used in the army as the basic purpose was to compare man to man. Performance appraisal is also known as personnel appraisal, employee appraisa/personnel appraisal and employee evaluation. Basically, all signify the same thing. But merit rating is limited in scope as it only means determining the hierarchy of an employee in an organization while the others are the critical evaluations of the overall activities of an employee.

On the basis of the above, performance appraisal is an exercise to evaluate different traits and performance of an employee in relation to his job requirements. Performance appraisal as a modern management technique is the systematic evaluation of the individual with respect to his performance on the job and his potential for development. It provides a guide for channeling or directing staff development efforts as well as efficiency and effectiveness in an organisation, both public and private. It is equally a better way through which management obtains the necessary information regarding the strength and weaknesses of its employees.

According to Andrew F. Sikula "Employee appraisal or personnel performance appraisal is a systematic evaluation of a worker's performance and potential for development. It is a process of estimating or judging the value, excellence, qualities or status of some object, person or things".

Ubeku (1975) defined it as a review of the employees' performance based on the objectives agreed upon. This definition is more of Drucker's management by objectives. Although we can say here that the definition is too narrow because it views performance appraisal as just the review of the performance of the employees in accordance with the agreed or set goals and objectives. It is in this view that Ngu (1990) sees it as a system of measuring workers' output or productivity or efficiency either quantitatively or qualitatively. However, performance appraisal has a lot to do with the measurement of workers' productivity or output either qualitatively or quantitatively but it is more than that. This definition posited by Ngu views performance appraisal only from the perspective of measuring workers' performance neglecting the aspects of the essence of the measurement on the workers in terms of development and the rest.

2.2 Types of Performance Appraisal used in the Nigerian Public Service

The type of performance appraisal used in the Nigerian Public Service is known as the Annual Performance Evaluation Report (APER). Although, performance appraisal systems in Nigeria have been largely characterized by non-disclosure of appraisal results to the employees (Ubeku 1995). This apparent secrecy over performance appraisal results tends to put in the hands of supervisors and managers, a potential tool for cracking down on "recalcitrant" employees with impunity. Ubeku says the major concern of performance appraisal is basically a review of the individual's performance during a set period to identify his area of strengths and weakness and establish targets for him to achieve within the overall corporate objectives of the organization. He identifies what he refers to as the two major elements of the performance appraisal system:

- a What the organization wants from the exercise; and
- b What the individual employee wants from it.

Also, Banjoko (1982) is of the view that an open appraisal system allows feedback to be communicated to the employee and so encourages him/her to redirect his work habits in a manner that is conducive to better performance growth. He however quickly points out that in the Nigerian public service, feedback on the appraisal report is low because many supervisors feel reluctant to discuss the appraisal with their subordinates for the fear of confrontation, which is a result of a negative rating.

Its more effective use is usually restricted to private organizations especially those where it is possible to quantify performance very easily, but even then, it is mainly focused on employees who are deficient in performance. Banjoko posits that the solution to accessing employee performance is by rating them based on actual job behavior or culture otherwise the evaluation of employees will continue to be subjective.

On the other hand, Popoola and Blunt (2005) state that organisations should expose the criteria for performance evaluation and promotion, and such criteria should be unrelated to performance standards or be related in a manner that cannot be operationalized or linked with the precise standards by persons who are subjected to them.

It is important that organisations formulate and or operate on policies that will make them more productive. The general welfare of employees should also be something of interest to an organisation that wants to improve on its lot. Therefore, in appraising employees or subordinates on any level, the key result areas should be identified, performance should always be monitored with the key results, it should be made a point of duty to discuss evaluations with employees and finally, both parties should agree on development plans while the superior counsel the employee (Jimgris, 2007). It is in this view that performance appraisal is viewed as a means of bringing about motivation in employees – since motivation is those factors that contribute to job satisfaction.

2.3 Factors affecting effective Performance Appraisal in the Nigerian Public Service

Nevertheless, there are factors that can determine the accuracy of the appraisal systems in the Nigeria Public Service. Factors such as demographics, culture, age, communication methods, perceptions and many others will determine the appraisal success as well as the accuracy of the information gathered. The degree of seriousness that employees have towards the appraisal strongly suggests the impact and accuracy of the result. Discrimination can also be a factor that causes a defective appraisal. Managers with a negative attitude toward the employees will provide a negative evaluation. As a result, the employee will show minor improvement or needs to develop.

Banjoko (2002:160) argues that performance appraisal is highly susceptible to a number of errors or pitfalls. The three major factors affecting performance appraisal in the Nigerian Public Service have to do with issues relating to appraisal reliability, validity and rating bias.

How objective is the rater in assessing the performances of his subordinates? To enhance the accuracy and the acceptability of the appraisal reports, efforts must be made by individual raters as well as the organisation to deal with these problems. In most cases, errors in performance appraisals emanate from the following situations:

- i. The characteristics of the Rater: The outcome of an appraisal report is a reflection of the personality of the rater. Is he an impartial or an objective assessor?
- ii. The characteristics of the Ratee: Sometimes, the performance or non-performance behaviour of the ratee may make the supervisor be unduly favourable or unfavourable in his ratings of the subordinate.
- iii. The situational factors: Here, the issue is for what purpose is the appraisal going to be used? Is it for promotion?

Many extraneous variables often infiltrate to contaminate and bias the appraisal report. The rater would want ‘‘his man’’ to be promoted and hence would tend to colour his ratings so favourably that whoever reads the report, would feel convinced that ‘‘his man’’ is qualified to be promoted. On the other hand, the subordinate who has stepped on the boss's toes is bedeviled with a stinking appraisal report.

2.3.1 Validity of Appraisal

Validity in performance appraisal refers to the extent to which the chosen performance indices are valid indicators of what they are intended to assess and on which basis a judgement as to whether the ratee has performed well or not can be made (Banjoko, 2002). In the words of Salaman, Storey and Billsberry (2005) validity of appraisal refers to ‘‘whether the indicator actually measures what it is supposed to measure’’. For example, the profitability of a particular unit or group might be taken as an indicator of managerial effectiveness. It is possible that factors outside the manager’s control could have a greater effect on profitability, and thus it is not a valid indicator of managerial effectiveness. However, another example is in a checklist method appraisal, the raters often evaluate the employees on such criteria as personality, job knowledge etc. Personality as the variable may not be a valid determinant of performance in most jobs. An employee may achieve excellent performance results without necessarily having a nice personality. To that extent, the variable ‘personality’ may not be a universally valid measurement of employee performance. On the other hand, the extent of job knowledge as a performance criterion is a valid performance index (Banjoko, 2002).

The validity of appraisal results can also be affected by the following problems:

- i. Halo Effect: The ‘halo’ effect reflects the tendency for the rater to be unduly or unnecessarily carried away or impressed by one particular trait or behaviour in the employee that is being rated. For example, a bank worker whose performance has been on average may have his performance rating by his boss shooting up very high because he, for example, recently foiled a fraud attempt. The counterpart of the ‘halo’ effect is the ‘horn’ effect. The ‘horn’ effect works negatively for the employee. An employee who has maintained a very good rating since the beginning of the year may have his rating lowered by an unfavourable event e.g., if he gets involved in theft or fraud that occurs a few weeks before the appraisal period.
- ii. Bias: This is one of the most serious problems in performance appraisal, particularly in situations where objective performance measurement is not possible. Bias is an inhuman weakness which tends to render appraisal reports very unreliable. Positive bias often results in overrating while negative bias against an employee often leads to underrating. Bias can occur on the basis of sex, religion, tribe, or nationality.

- iii. Errors of Central Tendency: Here, the rater tries to play it safe by rating all employees as being average not wanting to hurt anybody's feelings. This practice is neither helpful to the subordinate being rated nor the organization at least from a development point of view. Employees are denied the opportunity to know how real they have performed.
- iv. The Leniency or strictness Tendencies: Sometimes, a rater is unnecessarily lenient in which case virtually all the raters get a high rating. Alternatively, the rater may be too strict to credit virtually all the ratees with a very low rating. Either way, there is a structural problem which must be controlled.

2.3.2 Reliability of Appraisal Reports

Reliability in performance appraisal refers to the extent to which the performance ratings of an employee tallies with the records of performance. Alternatively, the reliability of appraisal reports can also be determined by comparing how well the ratings of many raters on the same ratee tally with each other. In many instances, these independent ratings do not tally due to the presence of some of the structural problems discussed above. (Banjoko: 2002).

Reliability is a simpler criterion. According to Graeme, Storey and Billsberry (2005) reliability means that similar results will be discovered if the measure is used on the same object or person by different people and/or at different times.

2.3.3 Sociological and Attitudinal Factors Affecting Performance Appraisal in Nigerian Public Service

Some senior officials and heads of departments have been known to write untrue reports on their subordinates, giving to such subordinate's merits and virtues that they did not possess. The possible reasons for this situation are:

- i. Fear of Reprisal from Adverse Report on Subordinate Staff: A supervising/reporting officer who is, himself, guilty of unethical behavior and who knows that a certain subordinate officer is aware of the conduct becomes afraid to write an adverse report on the subordinate to avoid subordinate bringing to light his own misdemeanor (Adebayo, 1981). It is generally believed that some reporting officers are usually afraid of the social consequences that may ensue if they write adverse reports on their subordinates who have strong social connections by birth, tribe, or marriage.
- ii. Ethnicity and Nepotism: Primordial relations underscore everything in the Nigerian civil service. The merit system index under performance appraisal which is part of the American model is supposed to be objectively practiced and be the guiding principle in appointments and promotion in the service. This has not been applicable. Appointments, promotions and other privileges in the service are determined by ethnic considerations. The ethnic groups are all interested in who becomes the head of the service, permanent secretary, director, and other key positions. Co-operation or lack of it in the service depends on the ethnic origin of the officials. Co-operation is guaranteed among the immediate subordinates if they are from the same ethnic bloc as the superior, while it is denied if the contrary is the case. The service is also marked with favoritism. Administrative favors are extended to ethnic bloc members, friends, relations, and those generally known, while others are denied of the service needed outrightly unless they can bribe their ways out. Favoritism violates the principles of impartiality and impersonality of the civil service (Ayo, 1998, Ajayi, 2001).

2.4 Performance Appraisal as a yardstick for promotion in the Nigerian Public Service

Promotion, actual or notional, is a rise in the status of a civil servant to a position of higher grade which carries greater responsibilities and, in most cases, a change of duties and title. Higher salary also usually accompanies promotion but the change in the service status which the promotion entails is much more fundamental. Of course, there are rules, procedures, and principles for determining eligibility for promotion in the civil service. The right qualification is the period prescribed in the scheme of service for an employee to serve on a grade, satisfactory performance of duty as well as good conduct, passing of examinations, and interviews. The seniority and merit principles are taken into consideration quite significantly with even-handed fairness to ensure that resourcefulness and competence are given weight in the promotion exercise. The Federal Civil Service Commission which is vested with the authority of promotion will carefully and critically consider all cognate factors before reaching a decision on individual cases of promotion.

The Commission approves notional promotions in situations where the officers concerned are seconded to other organizations such as Foreign Service Officers deployed to United Nations Agencies for two or more years. If their colleagues on the ground are promoted, they are also granted promotion notionally so that their seniority in the service is not impaired. Salary does not come in at all as they are placed on a different scale in the UN system which may even be more advantageous compared to the earnings of their colleagues at home.

The Commission also strictly approves notional promotions to deserving officers who meet all the criteria for promotion but there are no established vacancies against which they will be held in their respective Ministries. The funds to pay for the new grades are not appropriated in the budget. The promotion cannot thus be immediately actualized. To all intents and purposes, such notional promotions are given to reward hardworking officers whose morale should not be dampened by postponing their due promotion to an indefinite period. If the financial situation of their ministry improves and the vacancies are created, some of the notional promotions, if not all could be actualized through payment of arrears against the notional date earlier announced. This is quite a significant principle of fairness and justice which the Commission upholds in treating cases of promotion. Essentially and conventionally too, the notional date is the effective date of the promotion for records, order of seniority, and other purposes. As an illustration, an officer promoted notionally in 1998 who suddenly died in 2003 without the promotion actualized, would nonetheless be paid death gratuity and other

entitlements based on the new grade to which he was notionally promoted. While I am not an advocate of the recently prescribed eight-year on-a-grade additional retirement criterion, I believe the notional rather than the actual promotion date of its victims will be picked. There is no doubt that on the whole, notional promotion offers contentment and far-reaching prestige in view of the higher status conferred which outweighs the immediate pecuniary advantage. It ensures not only fairness by not delaying promotions that are due but also enhances the dignity of those promoted in their struggle for self-actualization.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

Personality Theory: Dweck (1999) popularized this theory. He defines implicit theories as lay beliefs about the ability and personal attributes (e.g., ability and personality) that affect behavior. Original entity implicit theory assumes that personal characteristics are largely a fixed entity, whereas incremental implicit theory assumes that personal attributes are relatively malleable.

Implicit theory research, conducted with children and students by educational and social psychologists (Dweck, 1999), has focused largely on the motivational implications of holding a primary entity or incremental implicit theory. Within an organizational context, several studies have examined how implicit theories of ability influence aspects of self-regulation including the goals that people set (e.g., Wood and Bandura, 1989), their level of self-efficacy, the resilience of their self-efficacy following setbacks (e.g., Wood and Bandura, 1989), and their performance on complex decision-making tasks (e.g., Taberero and Wood, 1999).

However, there is a dearth of literature that examines the factors influencing supervisors'/managers' implicit theories on their judgments of others. This is the podium on which this study is built. Favoritism inherent in performance appraisal in Nigeria's civil service can be domain-specific, pertaining particularly to areas such as ability, morality, leniency, religious sentiment, and ethnic affiliation (inherent in evaluator) tend to influence supervisor or reporting officer judgment of subordinates. Chiu, Hong, and Dweck (1997) argue that judgments about others are more likely to be influenced by a person's implicit person theory (IPT), that is, his or her domain-general implicit beliefs about the malleability of the personal attributes (e.g., ability and personality) that define the type of person that someone is, as well as how he or she behaves.

This theory helps to explain the implication of the Nigerian civil service supervisors or managers' performance appraisal judgments. This is an important issue in Nigeria's civil service psychology because the failure of reporting officers/managers to recognize a significant decrease in the performance of medical surgeons, a paramedic, security guards, an accountant, an auditor, and directors holding sensitive positions in the Nigeria civil service, could be catastrophic. Similarly, failure to acknowledge a significant improvement in the behaviour of Nigerian civil servants can lead to civil servants' demoralization, frustration, resentment, and withdrawal.

3. Methodology

The research employed a survey method and the instrument of data collection was based on both primary and secondary sources of data collection. The primary data saw to the administration of questionnaire, which were distributed to staff of the Federal Capital Development Authority, Abuja. The secondary data includes textbooks, the internet, unpublished work, and other relevant materials that will provide useful information for the research. This research adopts a survey research design and simple random sampling technique and the researchers administered a total of 100 questionnaires to the staff and 77 questionnaires were successfully filled and returned. The data generated in this study were analyzed with percentages and presented in tables. chi-square is used to test the hypothesis.

4. Result and Discussion

Table 1: Response on whether performance appraisal is a yardstick for promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority

OPINION	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
AGREE	23	30
DISAGREE	54	70
Total	77	100

Field Survey, 2022

Table 1 shows the opinion of respondents on whether performance appraisal is a yardstick for promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority. 23 respondents representing 30% agree, while 54 respondents representing 70% disagree that performance appraisal is a yardstick for promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority. Base on the majority of the respondents that disagree show that performance appraisal is not a yardstick for promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority.

Table 2: Response on whether promotion in Federal Capital Development Authority is lopsided (not balanced)

OPINION	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
AGREE	49	64
DISAGREE	28	36
Total	77	100

Field Survey, 2022

Table 2 shows the opinion of respondents on whether promotion in Federal Capital Development Authority is lopsided. 49 respondents representing 64% agree, while 28 respondents representing 36% disagree. Therefore, based on the majority of the respondents that agrees, promotion in Federal Capital Development Authority is lopsided.

TABLE 3: Response on whether performance appraisal is not the best method of evaluating employee's performance in Federal Capital Development Authority.

OPINION	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
AGREE	32	42
DISAGREE	45	58
Total	77	100

Field Survey, 2022

Table 3 shows the response on whether performance appraisal is not the best method of evaluating employee's performance in Federal Capital Development Authority. 32 respondents representing 42% are of the opinion that the performance appraisal is not the best method of evaluating employee's performance in Federal Capital Development Authority, while 45 respondents representing 58% which happens to be the majority disagrees.

4.1 Test of Hypothesis

Ho: The use of effective performance appraisal systems cannot reduce lopsided promotions in the FCDA

Information on table 1,2 and 3 are used to test this hypothesis.

Table 4: Contingency table

Respondents	AGREE	DISAGREE	Colum Total
Performance Appraisal is a Yardstick for Promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority	23	54	77
promotion in Federal Capital Development Authority is lopsided (not balanced)	49	28	77
performance appraisal is not the best method of evaluating employee's performance in Federal Capital Development Authority	32	45	77
Row Total	104	127	231

Source: Computed by the Authors

Table 5: Expected frequencies of table 4

Cell	O	E
1	23	35
2	54	42
3	49	35
4	28	42
5	32	35
6	45	42

Table 6: Chi-square (χ^2) table

Cell	O	E	O-E	(O-E) ²	$\frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$
1	23	35	-12	144	4.11
2	54	42	12	144	3.43
3	49	35	14	196	5.6
4	28	42	-14	196	4.67
5	32	35	-3	9	0.26
6	45	42	3	9	0.21
Chi-square					18.28

Df = 3, Critical value = 7.815, level of significant = 0.05

Decision: If the calculated or observed value of the test statistics chi-square is greater than the value of the critical value, the null hypothesis should be rejected and the alternative accepted.

In table 6 above, the chi-square (X^2) calculation of 18.28 is greater than the critical value of 7.815 ($18.28 > 7.815$) at 0.05 significant value. Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, the use of effective performance appraisal systems cannot reduce lopsided promotions in the FCDA.

4.2 Summary of Findings

1. Performance appraisal is not the yardstick for promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority.
2. Performance appraisal in the Federal Capital Development Authority is characterized by favoritism, lobby, prebendalism.

4.3 Discussion of Findings

The findings of this research reveal that there is an effective performance appraisal system in Federal Capital Development Authority. During the field survey, it was revealed that performance appraisal is not a yardstick for promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority.

Moreover, the researchers visited the Federal Capital Development Authority in the process of this research, it was discovered via questionnaires administered that promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority is lopsided (not balanced), which makes the promotion of employees of Federal Capital Development Authority to be always delayed. Furthermore, the research reveals that performance appraisal in the Federal Capital Development Authority is characterized by favoritism, lobby, prebendalism and the like. These and many more have made the promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority to be unbalanced. Meanwhile, the research further reveals that performance appraisal is the best method of evaluating employees' performance in the Federal Capital Development Authority if it is done accordingly and effectively. The research further reveals that there are a lot of challenges in effectively implementing performance appraisal in the Federal Capital Development Authority.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

A greater number of people agree to the fact that there is an effective performance appraisal system in Federal Capital Development Authority; this condition can be accepted since all the respondents are staff of the Federal Capital Development Authority. More so, the majority of the respondents disagree that performance appraisal is not a yardstick for promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority. Furthermore, the research revealed that promotion in Federal Capital Development Authority is lopsided due to several factors ranging from political influence, nepotism, favoritism, godfatherism, lobby, corruption etc. Meanwhile, with the factors listed above, the research still revealed that performance appraisal is the best method of evaluating employee performance in the Federal Capital Development Authority. Based on the information gathered, performance appraisal remains an invaluable yardstick for promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority and any other organisation, both public and private but it must be effectively done devoid of biases whatsoever.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations have been made:

- 1) There should be a measure in checking the effective implementation of the performance appraisal system in the Federal Capital Development Authority;
- 2) Performance appraisal should be a significant yardstick to the promotion of any kind that might take place in the Federal Capital Development Authority;
- 3) Promotion in the Federal Capital Development Authority should be balanced, i.e., there should not be lopsidedness in the promotion system of FCDA;
- 4) The management of the Federal Capital Development Authority should find an immediate and lasting solution to any challenge that might arise in the cause of implementing performance appraisal in the Federal Capital Development Authority; and
- 5) The right minds and brains in terms of competencies and skills should be allowed to carry out the implementation of performance appraisal in the Federal Capital Development Authority.

Acknowledgement

The authors are thankful to staff of the Federal Capital Development Authority for their support and understanding to ensuring that this research work was successfully carried out.

Reference

- Cardy, R & Dobbins, G. (1994). "Performance appraisal: Alternate perspectives", South-Western Publishing Company, Cincinnati
- Cederblom, D. (1982). "The performance appraisal interview: a review, implications and suggestions", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 7 pp.219-27
- Daniels, A. (1999). "Bringing out the best in people" McGraw- Hill companies
- Derven, M. (1990). "The paradox of performance appraisal" Personnel Journal volume 69 4) Dechev, Z. (2010). Effective Performance Appraisal – a study into the relation between employer satisfaction and optimizing business results. Faculty of Economics of Business Department of Economics
- Esu, B.B and Inyang, B.J. (2009). A Case for Performance Management in the Public Sector of Nigeria, Vol.4 (4).
- Fletcher, C. (2004) Appraisal and feedback: making performance review work. 3rd ed. London:
- Frankel, J. R and Wallen, N. E. (2001). Educational Research (2nd edition): A guide to the process. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc. publishers.
- Hannabuss, S. (1991). Analysing appraisal interviews", *Scottish Libraries*, November/December, pp.13-15
- Hernandez, D. (2002), "Local government performance measurement", *Public Management*, Vol. 84 pp.10-11.
- Holbrook, R.L. Jr (2002), "Contact points and flash points: conceptualizing the use of justice mechanisms in the performance appraisal interview", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 12 pp.101-23.
- HR Department of Mumias Sugar Company. (2013). Performance appraisal affects employee productivity.
- Idemobi, E., and Onyeizugbe, C. (2011). Performance management as an imperative for effective performance in delta state of Nigerian public owned organizations. Sacha Journal of Policy and Strategic Studies, Volume 1 Number 2 (2011), p. 46-54 9)
- Javadin.Sayeed Reza, 2001. Human Resources Management, Tehran NegaheDanesh Publication. Johns, G., Xie, J.L. & Fang, Y. (1992). "Mediating and moderating effects in job design", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 18, pp. 657-76
- Kane, J.S., & Lawler, E.E. (2009), "Performance appraisal effectiveness: its assessment and determinants", in Staw, B.M. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, Vol. 1 pp.425-78.
- KavussiShal. Nasud, 1999. Performance Evaluation System on Behzisti Organization in Iran, thesis M.A.
- Klimoski, R., & Inks, L. (1990). "Accountability forces in performance appraisal", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 45 pp.194-208
- Kluger, A., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The Effects of Feedback Interventions on Performance: A 10) Historical Review and a Preliminary Feedback Intervention Theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119 (2), 245-248. 11)
- Krattenmaker, T. (2009) Appraising employee performance in a downsized organization Iain Mangham, The Politics of organizational change
- Larson, J.R. (1989). "The dynamic interplay between employees' feedback-seeking strategies and supervisors' delivery of performance feedback", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 14 pp.408-22
- Lawrie, J. (1990). "Prepare for a performance appraisal" Personnel Journal Vol. 69 pp. (132-136). 12)
- Lee, M., & Shin, W. (2000). Is there Any Positive Effect of Offering No Performance Appraisal Feedback? *Journal of Human Values*, 6 (1), 15. 13)
- Lindsey, J.A. (Ed.) (2005), *Performance Evaluation: A Management Basic for Librarians*, Oryx Press, Phoenix, AZ.
- Long, P. (2006), *Performance Appraisal Revisited*, Institute of Personnel Management, London.
- Longenecker, C.O., (1997). "Neglected at the top: Executives talk about executive appraisal", *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 29 pp.41-7.
- Meyer, H.H. (2001). "A solution to the performance appraisal feedback enigma", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 5 pp.68-76
- Mugenda O. M. and Mugenda A. G. (2003). Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches, Africa Centre for Technology Studies, Nairobi. 14)
- Mullins, L. (1999). "Management and organizational behavior" 5th edition ft/patience Hall 15)
- Murphy, K.R., & Cleveland, J.N. (2003), *Performance Appraisal: An Organizational Perspective*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, MA. Resource Management on Employee Relations,
- Pollit, C., and Bouckaert, C. (2004). Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, G.E. & Reed, T. (1996) "Performance appraisal participation, goal setting and feedback", *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Vol. 16, p. 29.

Taylor, P. J., & Baker, J. L. (1994). Effects of introducing a performance management system on employees' subsequent Attitudes and Efforts. *Public Personnel Management*, 28 (3), 423. 17)

Terry, G., and Franklin, S.G. (2003). *Principles of Management*, 8th ed., AITBS Publishers, Delhi India, 2003, p-386.

Waldersee, R., & Luthans, F. (1994), "The impact of positive and corrective feedback on customer service performance", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 15 pp.83-95

Wells, R.G. (2002), "Guidelines for effective and defensible performance appraisal", *Personnel Journal*, Vol. 60 pp.776-82

Wilson, J.P., & Western, S. (2001), "Performance appraisal: an obstacle to training and development?", *Career Development International*, Vol. 6 pp.93-102.

Yong, A.K.B. (1996), *Malaysian Human Resource Management*, Malaysian Institute of Management, Kuala Lumpur

Zeithaml, V.A. (2000). "Service Quality, Profitability, and the Economic worth of Customers: What we know and what we don't know". *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 28(1):67-85.

Ubeku, A. K. (1975). *Personnel Management in Nigeria*. Ethiope Publishing Corporation: University of California.