



Open Access

Gulf Journal of Advance Business Research

*FE Gulf Publishers.*<https://fegulf.com>

## PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND JOB PERFORMANCE AMONG BANK EMPLOYEES IN DELTA STATE, NIGERIA

ARUOREN, Emmanuel Ejiroghene (Ph.D)<sup>1</sup> & AGARE, Oghenerume (MSc. Scholar)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1 & 2</sup> Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences,  
Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

Volume No: 1

Issue No: 2

Page No: 140-151

Received: 20/10/23

Accepted: 10/11/23

Published: 17/11/23

Corresponding Author: ARUOREN, Emmanuel Ejiroghene (Ph.D)

Email: [aruorenemmanuel@gmail.com](mailto:aruorenemmanuel@gmail.com)

### Abstract

This study examined the link between performance appraisal and employee performance among employees of deposit money banks in Abraka, Delta State, Nigeria. A descriptive survey research design was adopted and a structured questionnaire was used to collect relevant data from 100 employees of five banks in Abraka. Findings obtained from multivariate analysis indicated that performance appraisal standard, fairness in performance appraisal process and performance appraisal feedback significantly influenced employee performance. Thus, it was recommended that the management of money deposit banks should set clear standards for performance appraisal, provide feedback during the process, and be fair to employees during performance appraisal as these will enhance the performance of employees and the organization in general.

**Keywords:** Performance Appraisal, Employee Performance, Standard, Fairness, Feedback.

### INTRODUCTION

Performance appraisal (PA) is an important human resource practice and tool which provides information to many critical human resource decisions. PA compares an individual job performance to standards or objectives developed for the individual's position. Thus, it strengthens performance management, which directly affect organizational and employee performance (Akinbowale, Lourens & Jinabhai, 2014; Tarurhor, 2017; Tarurhor, 2021). In recent years, researchers are interested in understanding the various factors that influence employee performance and outcomes (Aruoren & Ugbehene, 2023; Aruoren & Oisamoje, 2023). Kurt (2014) explains that performance appraisal is a major issue of controversy when it comes to management circles. In order for managers to achieve the organisational goals, the individual level of employee performance must be assessed. Brumbach (2015) define performance as a means of both results and behavior, which comes on its own right and will or can be judged differently from results.

Since organisations exist to achieve certain goals, the degree of success that individual employees have in reaching their individual goal is important in determining organisational effectiveness. The assessment of how successful employees have been at meeting organizational goals therefore becomes a critical thing, hence performance appraisal (DeCenzo, Robbins, & Verhulst, 2016). The exercise of performance appraisal, otherwise known as performance review is one of the most formidable activity to be carried out by the human resource department on a regular basis. If not carried out carefully and perfectly, it can cause ripples among staff and can be seen as unfair and ineffective.

The importance of an effective and efficient performance appraisal policy cannot be over emphasized in the overall performance of employees which have effect on the organization's performance as well. To appraise effectively, managers must spot problems, but management is required to provide constructive feedback, and take proper corrective actions to improve employee performance. In the absence of a structured appraisal system, management will tend to judge work performance of employees in an informal way. The human inclination to judge without a structured appraisal system can create serious ethical, motivational and legal issues in the organization. Without a structured appraisal system, there is no chance of ensuring that decisions made are fair, accurate, lawful and defensible.

Mone and London (2015) study found that unfair evaluation of employee performance makes them feel insecure or discouraged, leading to the development of poor relationship between the employer and the employee. There are gaps on how to execute the performance appraisal system to benefit both the organization and the employees. An effective performance appraisal process establishes the groundwork for excellence by linking individual employee objectives with the organisation's mission and strategic plans and outcomes.

In light of the aforementioned, this study will examine the effect of performance on employee performance in selected banks in Delta State.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Examine the effect of performance appraisal standards on employee performance.
2. Determine the effect of fairness of performance appraisal process on employee performance.
3. Examine the effect of performance appraisal feedback on employee performance.

### **Research Hypotheses**

In line with the stated objectives, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H1: There is no significant relationship between performance appraisal standards and employee performance.

H2: There is no significant relationship between fairness of performance appraisal process and employee performance.

H3: There is no significant relationship between performance appraisal feedback and employee performance.

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

Stoner (2000), states that performance appraisal can be formal and systematic, that is, conducted semi-annually or annually on a formal basis and can also be informal, conducted on a day to day basis. He goes ahead to say that appraisals are concentrated on individual characteristics such as

intelligence, decisiveness, creativity and ability to get along with others. There are behavioural aspects but employees are also appraised on how they perform their tasks. According to Armstrong (2009) the managers play the most important duty to see that performance management succeeds. Role of senior management is to manage and effectively deploy organizational resources in such a manner that they fulfil organizational objectives; there are many tools, frameworks, and techniques that assist managers to meet their obligations. Leading organisations therefore strive to put the right performance appraisal system which is value based, that helps them set and agree upon performance goals and give the desired outcomes. Performance appraisal generates data that is used to gauge the direction in which the organization is headed and it allows organisations to design, control and account for employee performance as laid out in the organisation's strategy (Henri, 2014). Armstrong and Baron (2009) indicate that performance is a multi-dimensional construct which measurement is based on several factors.

Studies carried out on performance appraisal systems indicate that there is a shift from the traditional methods of employee appraisal, where employees are engaged with questionnaires to fill, in regards to their performance. The traditional approaches of performance appraisal were required to measure their own performance based on what they are able to achieve, With reference to job description. Management would then rate staff based on the questionnaires without staff interaction. These methods of appraisal system fall into two categories, that is traditional methods (individual traits) and modern methods (evaluation of work results) (Atkinson, Waterhouse, & Wells, 1997).

According to Rasch (2016), performance appraisal has a positive and negative impact. Employees who receive a good score on his/her appraisal are generally motivated to perform well and maintain his or her performance. Positive feedback on appraisals give employees a feeling of worth and value, especially when accompanied by salary increase. If a supervisor gives an employee a poor score on his or her appraisal, the employee may feel a loss of motivation in the workplace. Consequently, this can impact on the employee's performance (Cook and Crossman, 2014). Performance appraisal is important for employees at all level throughout the organisation. The parameters, the characteristics and the standards for evaluation may be different but the fundamentals of performance appraisal are the same. But performance appraisal is more effectively used as the tool of managing employee performance (Anderson, 2016). According to Tsai and Wang (2013), researchers have found out that employee's concept of fair evaluations affect their performance, their behaviour, even their job satisfaction. Organisations must devise a practical framework for ensuring that performance evaluations are perceived to be fair by employees. The usefulness and fairness of performance appraisal are still debatable to this day.

## METHODS

The descriptive survey research design was adopted in this study, in which the research population consisted of 140 employees of five money deposit banks located in Abraka, Delta State, Nigeria. Since the population was not large, total enumeration sampling technique was employed for the study (Banerjee & Chaudhury, 2010; Tarurhor & Olatunji, 2022; Tarurhor & Tarurhor, 2022, Tarurhor, 2023).

Table 1  
*Number of Employees in each Bank*

S/N	Selected Banks	Sample
1	First Bank Plc, Abraka	28
2	Zenith Bank, Abraka	33
3	Unity Bank, Abraka	23
4	Fidelity Bank Plc, Abraka	25
5	EcoBank Plc, Abraka	31
Total		140

Source: Branch Manager

### Measurement of Variables

The study variables were measured using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. Section 1 measured socio-demographic variables such as gender, age, marital status, and tenure, while section 2 contains twelve items and respondents were required to indicate the extent of their agreement with these statements using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 5- strongly agree, to 1- strongly disagree.

## RESULTS

### Response Rate

As shown in Table 2.0, 140 copies of questionnaires were distributed to respondents, however 100 completed and useful copies were retrieved yielding a response rate of 71.43 percent.

Table 2  
*Questionnaire Retrieval Analysis*

S/N	Sampled Banks	No. Questionnaires Shared		No. Questionnaires Retrieved	
		Frequency	Percent (%)	Frequency	Percent (%)
1	First Bank Plc, Abraka	28	20.00	20	14.29
2	Zenith Bank, Abraka	33	23.57	21	15.00
3	Unity Bank, Abraka	23	16.43	15	10.71
4	Fidelity Bank Plc, Abraka	25	17.86	20	14.29
5	EcoBank Plc, Abraka	31	22.14	24	17.14
Total		140	100.00	100	71.43

Source: Field Survey

### Respondents' Socio-Demographic Profile

Table 3.0 shows the demographic profile of the respondents. In terms of gender, 62 respondents were males, while 38 respondents were females. This indicates that most of the respondents were males. As regards respondent's age, 27 respondents were between 18 to 28 years, 43 respondents were between 29 to 38 years, 20 respondents were between 39 to 48 years, while 10 respondents were over 49 years. This shows that most respondents were between 29 and 38 years. In terms of marital status, 57 respondents were married, 42 respondents were single, while the remaining 1 was widowed. Thus indicating that most respondents were married. Furthermore, 10 respondents were O'Level (SSCE/GCE) holders, 28 respondents were OND/NCE holders, 36 respondents were HND/BSc/BA holders, while 26 respondents were postgraduate holders. This signals that most respondents were graduates with HND or BSc or BA degrees. Additionally, 12 respondents have worked for less than 5 years, 23 respondents had cognate experiences of 5 to 10 years, 30

respondents had cognate experiences of 11 to 15 years, 20 respondents had cognate experience of 16 to 20 years, while 15 respondents had cognate experience of over 21 years.

Table 3  
*Socio-demographic Characteristics of Respondents*

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	62	62.00	62.00
Female	38	38.00	100.00
Total	100	100.00	
<b>Age</b>			
18 – 28 years	27	27.00	27.00
29 – 38 years	43	43.00	70.00
39 – 48 years	20	20.00	90.00
Above 49 years	10	10.00	100.00
Total	100	100.00	
<b>Marital Status</b>			
Married	57	57.00	57.00
Single	42	42.00	99.00
Widowed	1	1.00	100.00
Total	100	100.00	
<b>Highest Educational Qualification</b>			
O'Level (SSCE/GCE)			
OND/NCE	10	10.00	10.00
HND/BSc/BA	36	36.00	46.00
Postgraduate	28	28.00	74.00
Total	26	26.00	100.00
	100	100.00	
<b>Tenure</b>			
< 5 years	12	12.00	12.00
5 – 10 years	23	23.00	35.00
11 – 15 years	30	30.00	65.00
16 – 20 years	20	20.00	85.00
Above 21 years	15	15.00	100.00
Total	100	100.00	

Source: Researchers' Compilation

### Testing of Hypotheses

The statistical tool used in testing the hypothesis is the Chi-Square ( $X^2$ ) Test Statistics. It is used when we wish to compare an actual observed distribution with the hypothesized distribution responses. The difference between the actual observed response and the hypothesized response is then tested. The calculated Chi-Square Test Statistics is given as:

$$\chi^2_{\text{cal}} = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e \quad (1)$$

Where,  $\chi^2$  = Chi-square,  $f_o$  = Observed frequency;  $f_e$  = Expected frequency; and  $f_e = (\text{column total} \times \text{row total}) / \text{grand total}$

The hypothesis test was conducted at 95% confidence level (i.e., 0.05 level of significance). This critical value which is read off from the  $\chi^2$  table at the degree of freedom (V). Where, Degree of freedom (V) = (r-1) (c -1); r = number of rows and c = number of columns.

Having derived the value of degree of freedom, the critical value obtained is compared with the calculated value. Thus, the decision rule is:

- i. If the Chi-square value is greater than the critical value, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected.

ii. If the Chi-square value is less than the critical value, the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted.

### Hypothesis One

Hypothesis 1 (H1) proposed that 'there is no significant relationship between the performance appraisal standard and employee performance. Tables 4, 5, and 6 shows the observed frequency, expected frequency, and the calculated chi-square value for testing H1.

Table 4

#### *Observed Frequency*

Statement	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
1	83	17	0	0	0	100
2	61	38	0	0	1	100
3	54	40	4	0	2	100
4	61	34	3	1	1	100
Total	259	129	7	1	4	Grand Total = 400

Source: Field Survey

Table 5

#### *Expected Frequency*

Variables	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
Frequency	64.75	32.25	1.75	0.25	1.00	100

Source: Field Survey

Table 6

#### *Calculated Chi-Square Table*

Statement	Variables	F <sub>o</sub>	F <sub>e</sub>	F <sub>o</sub> - F <sub>e</sub>	(F <sub>o</sub> - F <sub>e</sub> ) <sup>2</sup>	(F <sub>o</sub> - F <sub>e</sub> ) <sup>2</sup> /F <sub>e</sub>
1	SA	83	64.75	18.25	333.06	5.14
	A	17	32.25	-15.25	232.56	7.21
	U	0	1.75	-1.75	3.06	1.75
	D	0	0.25	-0.25	0.06	0.25
	SD	0	1	-1	1	1
		100	100			15.35
2	SA	61	64.75	-3.75	14.06	0.22
	A	38	32.25	5.75	33.06	1.03
	U	0	1.75	-1.75	3.06	1.75
	D	0	0.25	-0.25	0.06	0.25
	SD	1	1	0	0	0
		100	100			3.25
3	SA	54	64.75	-10.75	111.56	1.78
	A	40	32.25	7.75	60.06	1.86
	U	4	1.75	2.25	5.06	2.89
	D	0	0.25	-0.25	0.06	0.25
	SD	2	1	1	1	1
		100	100			7.78
4	SA	61	64.75	-3.75	14.06	0.22
	A	34	32.25	1.75	3.06	0.09
	U	3	1.75	1.25	1.56	0.89
	D	1	0.25	0.75	0.56	2.25
	SD	1	1	0	0	0
		100	100			3.45
Total						29.83
Calculated						

Source: Field Survey

**Decision rule:** At 95% confidence level, 0.05 level of significance and degree of freedom 12 [(4-1) (5-1)], the calculated Chi-square value is greater than the critical (table) value, that is 29.83 >

21.03. Thus the null hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) is rejected, while the alternative which states that 'performance appraisal standard has a significant relationship on employee performance' was accepted.

#### Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis 2 (H<sub>2</sub>) proposed that 'there is no significant relationship between fairness of performance appraisal process and employee performance. Tables 7, 8, and 9 shows the observed frequency, expected frequency, and the calculated chi-square value for testing H<sub>2</sub>.

Table 7

#### *Observed Frequency*

Statement	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
1	85	13	0	2	0	100
2	50	38	3	4	5	100
3	63	30	5	1	1	100
4	62	27	7	2	2	100
Total	260	108	15	9	8	Grand Total = 400

Source: Field Survey, 2022

Table 8

#### *Expected Frequency*

Variables	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
Frequency	65.00	67.00	3.75	2.25	2.00	100

Source: Field Survey

Table 9

#### *Calculated Chi-Square Table*

Statement	Variables	F <sub>o</sub>	F <sub>e</sub>	F <sub>o</sub> - F <sub>e</sub>	(F <sub>o</sub> - F <sub>e</sub> ) <sup>2</sup>	(F <sub>o</sub> - F <sub>e</sub> ) <sup>2</sup> /F <sub>e</sub>
1	SA	85	65	20	400	6.15
	A	13	27	-14	196	7.26
	U	0	3.75	-3.73	14.06	3.75
	D	2	2.25	-0.25	0.06	0.03
	SD	0	2	-2	4	2
		100	100			19.19
2	SA	50	65	-15	225	3.46
	A	38	27	11	121	4.48
	U	3	3.75	-0.75	0.56	0.15
	D	4	2.25	1.75	3.06	1.36
	SD	5	2	3	9	4.5
		100	100			13.95
3	SA	63	65	-2	4	0.06
	A	30	27	3	9	0.33
	U	5	3.75	1.25	1.56	0.42
	D	1	2.25	-1.25	1.56	0.69
	SD	1	2	-1	1	0.5
		100	100			2
4	SA	62	65	-3	9	0.14
	A	27	27	0	0	0
	U	7	3.75	3.25	10.56	2.82
	D	2	2.25	-0.25	0.06	0.03
	SD	2	2	0	0	0
		100	100			2.99
<b>Total</b>						<b>38.13</b>
<b>Calculated</b>						

Source: Field Survey

**Decision rule:** At 95% confidence level, 0.05 level of significance and degree of freedom 12, the calculated Chi-square value is greater than the critical (table) value that is  $38.13 > 21.03$ . Thus

the null hypothesis (H2) was rejected, while the alternative which states that ‘there is a significant relationship between fairness of performance appraisal process and employee performance’ was accepted.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis 3 (H3) proposed that ‘there is no significant relationship between performance appraisal feedback and employee performance. Tables 10, 11, and 12 shows the observed frequency, expected frequency, and the calculated chi-square value for testing H3.

Table 10

*Observed Frequency*

Statement	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
1	80	20	0	0	0	100
2	60	39	0	0	1	100
3	51	43	4	0	2	100
4	60	35	3	1	1	100
Total	251	137	7	1	4	Grand Total = 400

Source: Field Survey

Table 11

*Expected Frequency*

Variables	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
Frequency	62.75	34.25	1.75	0.25	1.00	100

Source: Field Survey

Table 12

*Calculated Chi-Square Table*

Statement	Variables	F <sub>o</sub>	F <sub>e</sub>	F <sub>o</sub> - F <sub>e</sub>	(F <sub>o</sub> - F <sub>e</sub> ) <sup>2</sup>	(F <sub>o</sub> - F <sub>e</sub> ) <sup>2</sup> /F <sub>e</sub>
1	SA	80	62.75	17.25	297.56	4.74
	A	20	34.25	-14.25	-28.5	-0.83
	U	0	1.75	-1.75	3.06	1.75
	D	0	0.25	-0.25	0.06	0.25
	SD	0	1	-1	1	1
		100	100			14.35
2	SA	60	62.75	-3.75	14.06	0.22
	A	39	34.25	5.75	33.06	1.03
	U	0	1.75	-1.75	3.06	1.75
	D	0	0.25	-0.25	0.06	0.25
	SD	1	1	0	0	0
		100	100			3.25
3	SA	51	62.75	-10.75	111.56	1.78
	A	43	34.25	7.75	60.06	1.86
	U	4	1.75	2.25	5.06	2.89
	D	0	0.25	-0.25	0.06	0.25
	SD	2	1	1	1	1
		100	100			6.78
4	SA	60	62.75	-3.75	14.06	0.22
	A	35	34.25	1.75	3.06	0.09
	U	3	1.75	1.25	1.56	0.89
	D	1	0.25	0.75	0.56	2.25
	SD	1	1	0	0	0
		100	100			2.45
<b>Total</b>						<b>26.69</b>
<b>Calculated</b>						

Source: Field Survey

**Decision rule: Decision rule:** At 95% confidence level, 0.05 level of significance and degree of freedom 12, the calculated Chi-square value is greater than the critical (table) value that is 26.69 > 21.03. Thus the null hypothesis (H3) was rejected, while the alternative which states that

'There is a significant relationship between performance appraisal feedback and employee performance' was accepted. Table 13 shows a summary of the results of hypothesis testing.

Table 13

*Summary of Hypotheses Testing*

Hypotheses	Chi-Square Calculated	Critical Value	Degree of Freedom	Decision
H1: There is no significant relationship between performance appraisal standard and employee performance	29.83	21.03	12	Since the calculated $X^2$ 29.83 > 21.03, the null hypothesis is rejected
H2: There is no significant relationship between fairness of performance appraisal process and employee performance	38.13	21.03	12	Since the calculated $X^2$ 38.13 > 21.03, the null hypothesis is rejected.
H3: There is no significant relationship between performance appraisal feedback and employee performance	26.69	21.03	12	Since the calculated $X^2$ 26.69 > 21.03, the null hypothesis is rejected

Source: Researchers' Compilation

**Discussion of Findings**

The results from the test of hypothesis one shows that performance appraisal standard has a significant effect on employee performance. Thus, identifying performance appraisal as a pillar upon which employee performance of any business is built. Organizations and enterprises must therefore employ performance appraisal to stimulate employee performance in order to boost employee performance. The finding is in agreement with Kim and Holzer (2016) who reported that the developmental use of performance appraisal, employee participation in performance standard setting, the quality of the relationship they have with their supervisors, and employee perceived empowerment are positively associated with employee acceptance of performance appraisal.

Also, the test of hypothesis two shows that there is a significant relationship between fairness of performance appraisal process and employee performance, this is evident with the calculated Chi-Square ( $X^2$ ) value of 38.13 which greater that critical Chi-Square ( $X^2$ ) value of 21.03 at 0.05% confidence interval. This finding agrees with that of Anderson (2016), performance appraisal is important for employees at all level throughout the organisation. The parameters, the characteristics and the standards for evaluation may be different but the fundamentals of performance appraisal are the same and is more effectively used as the tool of managing employee performance.

Again, from the test of hypothesis three shows that there is a significant relationship between performance appraisal feedback and employee performance, this is evident with the calculated Chi-Square ( $X^2$ ) value of 26.69 which greater that critical Chi-Square ( $X^2$ ) value of 21.03 at 0.05% confidence interval. This finding is in agreement with the result of Tsai and Wang (2013), that employee's concept of fair evaluations affect their performance, their behavior, even their job satisfaction. Hence, organisations must devise a practical framework for ensuring that performance evaluations are perceived to be fair by employees.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings from the analysis carried out in this study, it is evident that performance appraisal standard, fairness of performance appraisal process and performance appraisal feedback has a strong effect on employee performance. Thus, performance appraisal has a deep effect on the performance of employees that can improve the productivity of the employee and therefore enhance the organizational performance in general.

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Companies should engage in setting a healthy performance appraisal standard in order to get a boost in employees' performance and productivity.
2. Biased appraisals can affect employees' performance, as such organizations should ensure fairness in the performance appraisal process.
3. Management should employ an adequate feedback mechanism as this can enhance employee performance.

## References

- Akinbowale, M.A., Lourens, M.E., & Jinabhai, D. C. (2014). Employee performance measurement and performance appraisal policy in an organization. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(9), 342-347.
- Anderson, J. R. (2016). *Measuring Human Capital: Performance Appraisal Effectiveness*, Kansas City: Missouri: Human Resource Track Midwest Academy of Management.
- Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (2005). *Managing Performance: Performance Management in Action*. CIPD, London.
- Armstrong, M. (2009). *Armstrong's handbook of performance management: an evidence based guide to delivering high performance*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Aruoren, E. E., & Ugbehene, J. (2023). Relationship between Workplace Incivility and Employee Performance. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(6), 927 – 942. DOI:10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i6/17191
- Aruoren, E.E., & Oisamoje, M.D. (2023). Workplace happiness and Employees' Outcomes in the Banking Sector in Nigeria. *Himalayan Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 4(1), 75-82.
- Atkinson, A.A., Waterhouse, J.H., & Wells, R.B. (1997). A Stakeholder Approach to Strategic Performance Measurement. *Sloan Management Review*, 38, 25-37.
- Brumbach, G. (2003). Blending the We/Me in Performance Management Team. *Team Performance Management*, 9(7/8), 167-173. DOI: [10.1108/13527590310507417](https://doi.org/10.1108/13527590310507417)
- Cook, J., & Crossman, A. (2004). Satisfaction with performance appraisal systems: A study of role perceptions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(5), 526-541. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940410543605>
- DeCenzo, D. A., Robbins, S. P., & Verhulst, S. L. (2016). *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Henri, J. F. (2014). Performance management and organizational effectiveness. bridging the gap. *Managerial Finance*, 30(6), 93-123. DOI: [10.1108/03074350410769137](https://doi.org/10.1108/03074350410769137)

- Kim, T., & Holzer, M. (2016). Public employees and performance appraisal: a study of antecedents to employees' perception of the process. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(1), 31-56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X14549673>
- Mone, E. M. (2010). *Employee Engagement through Effective Performance Management: A practical guide for managers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rasch, L. (2016). Employee performance appraisal and the 95/5 Rule. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28(5), 407- 414. DOI: 10.1080/10668920490444436
- Stoner, A. F. (2000). Human Resource Strategy. *Business Journal Publication*, 28-29.
- Tarurhor, E. M. (2017). Work stress and employees' performance amongst staff of Delta State University, Abraka: The moderating role of career development. *Ilorin Journal of Management Sciences*, 4(1), 1-12.
- Tarurhor, E. M. (2021). Mediation of government policies on compensation strategy and employee performance: a structural equation model approach. *ABAC Journal*, 41(2), 243-258.
- Tarurhor, E. M. (2023). Does game theory ameliorate conflict management and organizational productivity? *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences*, 5(6), 165-176.
- Tarurhor, E. M., & Olatunji, E. A. A. (2022). business dynamics and manufacturing firms performance in Delta state, Nigeria. *Management and Human Resource Research Journal*, 11(3), 1-11.
- Tarurhor, E. M., & Tarurhor, L. E. (2022). Covid-19 Pandemic and non-financial performance of hospitality industries in Delta State. *Himalayan Economics and Business Management*, 3(1), 1-13.
- Tsai, C. J. (2013). Exploring the factors associated with employee perceived appraisal accuracy: A study of Chinese state owned. *International Journal of Human Resource Enterprise*