International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

EMPLOYEES' SATISFACTION WITH PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL
(A Case Study of Rwanda Education Board)

Dr Kerosi Josaphat Bosire[1]. Mukamuhinda Odette[2], Jesse david Kabagambe[3]

Département of Finance, University of Kigali [1, 3]
, Department of Human Resource Management IGNOU[2]
kerosijb@gmail.com , omukamuhinda@yahoo.fr , jziine@yahoo.co.uk

ABSTRACT

This study titled "Employees' Satisfaction with Performance Appraisal" investigated employees' reactions to satisfaction with the existing performance appraisal system as applied in Rwanda Education Board by utilizing 4Likert's scale. The study variables included Job Analysis, Performance Measures, Performance Feedback, Performance Ratings and different decisions related to performance appraisal involving Trainings and Coaching, performance based Rewards, Transfer, Promotion, and Demotion. The study was undertaken for first to "present REB appraised employees' demographic characteristics" with regards to their Gender, Age, and Marital status, level of education and Working experiences; second to "find out various in reactions of REB's employees to the performance appraisal done"; third to "examine the accuracy of REB's PA decisions". From a population of 74 employees, a sample of 62 individual units representing technical and professional employees of REB was involved. Questionnaire (SAQ) was used for data collection and data thus collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The Cronbach's coefficient alpha was calculated to measure internal consistency that is, how closely related a set of items are as a group. The coefficient of determination was also computed to examine the accuracy of REB's PA decisions. The analyses were performed using SPSS program. The main findings that came out of this case study were that the majority of respondents were male, in group age of (31-40) years, holds bachelor degree, had working experiences ranging between 6-10 years and reported to be married. Employees were found to be substantially satisfied with promotion, demotion, transfer, job analysis and performance measures; and relatively satisfied with performance related feedback, ratings, training, and reward. The majority of REB employees perform what they are not supposed to do (which are out of their attributions), and decisions of reward, promotion, demotion, transfer are based on what employees have been achieved; and the latter is totally different from what they have employed to do.

Keywords: Employee Satisfaction, Performance appraisal, likert scale,

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The success of every organization depends largely on the availability and quality of well-motivated and satisfied human resource. Organizations are now more focused on the need to get more from their employees if they are to achieve organizational objectives. The tool used is the performance appraisal. It measures employees' skills, knowledge, and attitudes and determines specific decisions for personnel's' improved performance and satisfaction.

Performance appraisal evaluates employee's job performance in terms of its requirements - a process by which employees' estimation, judgment of value and excellence are determined

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

and ranked for the purpose of both employees and management's performance and satisfaction. Therefore, on one side, performance appraisal (PA) determines reasons why some employees shall receive merits, be trained, promoted and counseled, and why others will be transferred, etc, (Mamoria & Gankar, 2002). On the other side, it enables management to monitor performance standards, agree on expectations and objectives, delegate responsibilities and tasks, and even take decisions. For that reason, PA should be fair, comprehensive and agreed upon by both parties in order to attain a high level of understanding, acceptance and satisfaction. As was well said "satisfied employee commits his or her effort to perform well (Kazmier & Leonard, 1977), and these could not be accomplished unless an employee recognizes accuracy in PA processes and decisions.

The Problem

There is a variety of Performance Appraisal (PA) systems available such as 360 degree appraisal, Results-Oriented Appraisal (MBO) and Traditional Performance Rating (i.e. Critical Incident Method, Forced Choice Technique, Forced Distribution Procedure, Paired-comparison System, Rank-order Procedure, etc). It is the duty of the organizations' management to find an appropriate PA for adoption given their unique environment.

It is assumed that the PA tools should be effectively designed, implemented and administrated properly by the organization management. The raters and retirees must both accept it.

Additionally, the PA results generally do not adequately reflect the ability of employees. This could be attributed to the subjective nature of the PA criteria, the irrelevance of the criteria used to appraise the performance of the employees, lack of skills and knowledge of the appraisers, the subjectivity, favoritism and bias of the appraisers, lack of continuous documentation and inability to provide feedback as to the results of the PA.

Moreover, there is more need to harmonize appraisal process and formats in cases where different institutions are merged and then come up with a suitable consolidated PA system which is fair, honest and participative for both raters and ratees in order to satisfy the employees and achieve the institution's goal and objectives.

Since REB is a product of merged of previously autonomous institutions, it is necessary to determine how the performance appraisal used by REB management affects the employees' satisfaction.

Studies Objectives

The research attempted to determine how employees are satisfied with PA system. Satisfaction was measured basing on their reactions on both PA planning, feedback and decisions as prescribed in the conceptual framework for the study in chapter II. To be more specific, the study was undertaken in order:

(i) To present the REB appraised employees' demographic characteristics.
(ii) To assess various reactions of REB's appraised employees from the performance appraisal done.
(iii) To examine the accuracy (fairness) of REB's decisions taken to employees' appraisals.

Scope of the Study: This research is about "Employees' satisfaction with performance appraisal. It undertakes a case of Rwanda Education Board (REB). REB headquarters is located at Remera. The study focused on the last three years (July 2010- July 2012) performance evaluation; where REB could draw out a guide tool to orient, sharpen and retain its employees even though they possess diverse attitudes and level of perception acknowledged from their previous years' experiences.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Needs and Process of Performance Appraisal

Performance Appraisal (PA) began as a simple method of income justification and nowadays seems both inevitable and universal (North, 2005). The business climate has changed. It seems that no organization is protected to the consequence of competition. The result of this is a justified obsession with quality and

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

productivity. It is therefore more important than ever to accurately measure job performances so that decisions can be taken fairly and accurately implemented to solve performance problems quickly.

In this view, appraisal is done to evaluate personnel capabilities and judge their value, excellent qualities, and behavior in relation to their job performance. It is in view of determining employees' accomplishments, to improve their performance, and to help organizations manage the world dynamics (Winston & Creamer, 1997). It is not only in monitoring staff's competences, but also ensuring company's core success and external demands" (Ubeda & Santos, 2007, p.110).

Contrary, most of employees have considered PA as a stressful tool. At worst they have seen it as a figurative whip in the hands of their supervisors (Davis, 1999) who sometimes rate to their own sets of likes, dislikes, and expectations (Ivancevich, 2001). On the other side, managers also do not like to sit on the chair of judgment of others. It is more worth when in so doing they risk offending someone. They argue to maintain a continuing enthusiastic environment with their subordinates. Even though, managers and employees could have many reasons to drop the appraisal, it is a mistake to discontinue it (Kennedy, 1999). Appraisal is a key factor in achieving a good return on organizations' "intellectual capital" (Simmons, 2002), reduces role ambiguity (Petttijohn et al, 2001), secures employees' commitment, improvement and satisfaction (Harrison & Goulding, 1997), determines pay and other financial compensation (Murphy & Cleveland, 1997), and is the basis of other decisions such as promotion, demotion, transfer, dismissal, etc.

Additionally, Appraisal is important as it helps employees become aware of how their day-to-day performance matches the organization goals (Coutts and Schneider, 2004, p.67) and motivates them to work harder and thus increase their productivity (Mound, 2001).

Performance Appraisal: Planning

In an effective organization, work is planned in advance. The planning takes attention of various aspects as they impact on how effectively the system actually measures employees' contributions in work performances (Buford and Lindner, 2002). This includes specifying elements and standards that the employee is expected to accomplish during the appraisal period. Therefore, these elements should be measurable, understandable, verifiable, equitable, and achievable.

Sometimes, organizations fail to update their documents and performance measures are set based on existing organizational documents describing jobs regardless of the changes occurring in their working environment, work policies, labor laws, and etc. As a result, there is no compliance between the work implementation and work planning realities. This increases employees' fear and keeps them in the dark, asking themselves on what standards they are being judged (swan, 1999). Thus, involving them in the planning process is essential. They become aware of what needs to be done, why is it needed to be done, and what is expected from them.

Therefore, describing and specifying jobs (job analysis) defines employees' expectations and track accomplishments (Fago, 2006), and ultimately drives actions of employees (Blanchar & Onton, 2005) with regard to measures established. So, it is the responsibility of organizations to clarify the working conditions, tools and equipment to be used, knowledge and skills needed, and relationships with other positions (Mary, Nuernberger, et al, 2010).

Performance Appraisal: Feedback

A meaningful performance appraisal is a two-way process that benefits both the employee and manager. For employees, appraisal is the time to find out how the manager thinks they are performing in the job. For a manager, appraisal is a good time to find out how employees think they are performing on the job.

The feedback is given to employees' input (Jaworski & Kohli, 1991), either verbally, in writing, or both to appraise the quality of work done (Towne, 2006). Therefore, it should be specific, factual, unemotional, and directed at performance (Sirota & Mischkind, 2006) with view of providing information on employees'

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

actual performance, contrasted with their expectations (Alvero et al., 2001; Van De Vliert, 2004), and emphasizing comments concerning improvements.

In addition, feedback is either given formally or informally and providing it on time enables employees identify their present status and their future prospects (Lam, et. al., 2002). The frequency of feedback brings employees' happiness and feel more satisfied and accept recommendations as they know management is interested in what they do (Sirota & Mischkind, 2006).

Performance Appraisal Decisions

Performance appraisal is a motivational tool (Wilson & Westerns, 2001) which is now still serving a numbers of organizational purposes such as assisting in pay promotion, and termination decisions, identifying training needs & development opportunities (Man, B. G., 2002). The reason behind that is in keeping on with organizational success and growth.

However, PA as motivational tool incites employees' to have feelings of satisfaction - attitude and feelings employees have about their work (Armstrong, 2006) explaining the extent to which they are content (Statt, 2004) – and perform on their best capabilities. For most of time, the stimulus lies between the amount and type of rewards provided to employees and the amount and type of rewards they expected to receive (Probst & Brubaker, 2001).

Moreover, rewarding does not only focus on financial compensation (Dewhurst et al., 2010). Some other means like praising employees help them to keep on their performance. This refers to the treatment of the employees by their managers in such a manner that the employees feel considered as useful and capable.

Promotions are obviously the easiest situations to deal with as most employees are happy to be provided with a promotion and are generally eager to accept. In particular, an employer should ensure that the promotion is provided in writing with the specific terms and expectations of the new position laid out, acceptance of which is a condition of the promotion.

Demotion is a loss of prestige and status as well as a substantial change to the essential terms of an employment contract that warrants a finding that an employee has been constructively dismissed. Therefore, in the absence of previous written warnings that; without improvement of the employee's performance in his present position - with specifics as to what needs to be improved, and a failure of the employee to do so within a reasonable time - demotions in general provide an opportunity for an employee to claim constructive dismissal particularly where, as is usually the case, there is a remuneration reduction as part of the demotion.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study was based on both descriptive and qualitative research techniques. Respondents were requested to describe their satisfaction toward performance appraisal in Rwanda Education Board. The reason for selection of these research techniques is their ability to provide complex descriptions of how people experience appraisal systems, processes and decisions. These methods are effective in identifying tangible and intangible factors.

Study Population

The population of the study is technical/professional employees of REB who participated as ratees in the performance appraisal process at least in the three consecutive years. The researcher established this requirement because "promotion" is among the research variables and the Labor law of Rwanda regulates horizontal promotion for those received appraisal for three consecutive years.

Per now, REB would have a total workforce of 242, but, it has only 166 employees of which 120 are technical/professional employees. The number of employees who were appraised within the period of study (July 2010-July 2012) were 74 staff members. Hence, the study concerns only a population of 74 employees defined as being technical employees.

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

Sampling

A sample of 62 employees was drawn from a population of 74 workforces. In working out the sample size we have made certain parameter estimates. For this study the confidence level was set at 95% and the margin of acceptance error at 5%. This was Based on the *Slovin's formula.*

Instrumentation and procedures

A survey instrument was established to collect data in this study from eligible employees defined as technical and professional officers. All participants were supposed to think about performance appraisal administered to them for three consecutive years and then carefully respond, in their role as apprasee, to different structured statements.

Demographic questionnaire in which respondents were asked their gender, age, education level, marital status, and their working experiences in the organization. PA planning, processes, and decisions which were further evaluated using 4 Likert scales, where "1" indicated strongly agree with the statement, and "4" referred to strongly disagree with the statement.

Data Collection Methods

To choose the research respondents from the whole sample population, the researcher first randomly selected the 1st item from the sampled population list and then calculated the sampling interval named **"k",** using modified systematic random sampling method $(\frac{N}{n} = k)$, an integer which was served as the constant difference between any two consecutive random units. The **N** stands for total targeted population which was 74 employees; **n** is the Sample size which was 62 employees; and then **k** calculated was equals to 1.2; a constant served to select the research respondents by picking the every consecutive $\mathbf{k^{th}}$ which is 1 from the list starting from the 1st item selected in the sample size. As long as the **k** found was a decimal number, also considering that targeted population (74) minus sample size (62) gives twelve (12); and given that 62 divided by 12 gives almost Five (5), a researcher decided to take every consecutive $\mathbf{k^{th}}$ (1) item and jump every **fifth item** chosen in the list till the whole sample size of 62 is obtained.

Data Analysis

Analysis is the application of reasoning to understand and interpret the data that have been collected (Zkmund, 2003:73

The first objective aimed at presenting the REB appraised employees' demographic characteristics with regards to Gender, Age, and Marital status, level of education and Working experiences. Descriptive statistics describing the characteristics of the population involving frequencies and percentages were determined and used to interpret respondents' demographic data.

The second objective was aimed at analyzing various reactions of REB employees from PA. The variation was measured basing on the REB technical appraised employees' views on PA planning, feedback and PA related decisions. These include job Analysis, performance measures, performance feedback, coaching and trainings, rating performance, performance based rewards, transfer, promotion and demotion.

The employees' views were measured on a four point scale with 1= strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree; and, 4 = strongly disagree. Descriptive statistics including means and standard deviation were determined and represented in tables to depict the variables tendency in a precise way that exactly maintains the accuracy to which data values were measured. . To aid in the interpretation, the researcher established an interpretive scale based on 4 Likert scales (see table 3.1) below:

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

Table 3 1: Interpretive Scale

Scale	Mean Scale	Interpretation
1	1.00 – 1.75	Strongly Agree (SA)
2	1.76 – 2.50	Agree (A)
3	2.51 – 3.25	Disagree (D)
4	3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Disagree (SD).

an score Moreover, overall for each subscale was determined in order to detect the influence between subsets. The Cronbach's coefficient alpha $\alpha = \frac{N.\bar{c}}{\bar{v} + (N-1).\bar{c}}$ was calculated to measure internal consistency that is, how closely related a set of items are as a group. Acceptable limits of alpha were set at a minimum of 0.70. Here ***N*** is equal to the number of items, ***c-bar*** is the average inter-item covariance among the items and ***v-bar*** equals the average variance. The scale used to describe the internal consistency is that of (Cronbach, 1951) as cited by (George & Mallery, 2003), and is as in (table 3.2 below):

Table 3 2: Cronbach's alpha interpretive scale

Cronbach's alpha	Internal consistency
$\alpha \geq 0.90$	Excellent
$0.90 > \alpha \geq 0.80$	Good
$0.80 > \alpha \geq 0.7$	Acceptable
$0.70 > \alpha \geq 0.60$	Questionable
$0.60 > \alpha \geq 0.50$	Poor
$0.50 > \alpha$	Unacceptable

Furthermore, the KMO and Bartlett's test of adequacy for subscale variables was also used to test variance between variables and was set at a minimum of 0.50. The associated probability requirement was set at P<0.001. A check of communalities was performed for only those subscales not fulfilling one or both of the above requirements.

The third objectives aimed at examining the accuracy of REB's decisions taken to eemployees' appraisals. The coefficient of determination, denoted by $R^2 = \frac{SS(\text{Re}\,gr)}{\sum y_i^{\,2}}$ was used for this purpose and ranges from zero to one. The interpretation of the magnitude of findings was done based on the descriptors developed by Davis (1971) as cited in (Walsh, 2003) as follows:

Table 3 3 : Descriptors of Correlation coefficients

Correlation coefficients	Descriptors
0.70 or higher	Very strong association
0.50 - 0.69	Substantial association

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

0.30 - 0.49	Moderate association
0.10 – 2.90	Low association
0.01 - 0.09	Negligible association.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

This aimed at presenting respondents' demographic characteristics with regards to their Gender, Age, and Marital status, level of education and Working experiences. Data analysis showed that Fifty eight percent (58%, n= 36) of the respondents were male. The remaining forty two percent (42%, n =26) of the respondents were female (see Table 4.1.). This shows clearly that REB has no problem about technical employees' gender balance.

Table 4. 1: Gender of respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	26	41.9
Male	36	58.1
Total	**62**	**100.0**

Source: *primary data,2014*

Regarding the ages of respondents, the largest group (n=34, 54.8%) was in the 31-40 years age group. The second largest group (n=22, 35.5%) indicated their ages as above the 40 years. A very small proportion (n=6, 9.7%) indicated their ages as fitting between 21-30 years (see Table 4.2.). The researcher noticed that, the age group of REB' technical staff shows that, it (REB) has a strong team who may serve for long before being retired and again who if appraised well can push the Institution to success and growth.

Table 4. 2: Age Group of Respondents

Age Group	Frequency	Percent
21-30	6	9.7
31-40	34	54.8
above 40	22	35.5
Total	**62**	**100.0**

Source:primary data,2014

Eighty Seven percent (87%, n= 54) of the respondents were married whereas thirteen percent (13%, n=6) reported not to be married (either Single or divorced or widowed) (see table 4.3.). This gives a good picture to REB by having more than half of staff members being married. It comes much easier to manage problem if someone is family taker.

Table 4. 3: Marital Status of respondents

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Married	54	87.1
Single	6	12.9
Total	**62**	**100.0**

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

Concerning respondents Qualifications, the majority (n=49, 79%) reported as holding a Bachelors degree and a small number, 10% (n=6) and 11% (n=7) said that they possessed Diploma and Master Degree respectively (see table 4.4 below). This explains that REB does not have any problem related to the staff level of qualifications.

Table 4. 4: Qualification of respondents

Qualification	Frequency	Percent
High school	0	0
Diploma	6	9.7
Bachelor	49	79.0
Post Graduate	7	11.3
Total	**62**	**100.0**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

Fifty five Percent (55 %, n=33) had work experience of between 6-10 years. Thirty percent (30%, n=18), had work experience of above ten (10) years and finally the small number (n=9) representing 15% had between one year and five years of experience (see table 4.5).

Table 4. 5: Working Experience of Respondents

Work Experience	Frequency	Percent
Year 1-5	17	27.4
6-10	29	46.8
above 10	16	25.8
Total	**62**	**100.0**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

Assessing Reactions of REB's technical Appraised Employees from the PA Done.

The assessment was done for both independent and dependant variables involving job Analysis, performance measures, performance feedback, coaching and trainings, rating performance, performance based rewards, transfer, promotion and demotion. Using the factor analysis specifically; the principal components factor analysis to determine if the subset items produce factor loadings indicating that they can be considered to be part of a single construct. For the appropriateness of the factor analysis test, the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was used to estimate the reliability of the scale. Acceptable limits of alpha were set at a minimum of 0.70. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's test of adequacy for subscale variables was also used to test variance between variables and set at a minimum overall MSA of 0.50. The probability associated with the Bartlett test has to satisfy the requirement of $P<0.001$. A check of communalities was performed for only those subscales not fulfilling one or both of the above requirements.

Job Analysis:-For Job analysis, the following questions were asked and answered by respondents: (1) I have a job that has clear purpose, (2) I'm assigned understandable responsibilities, (3) Working condition is supporting, and (4) I have the required equipments and materials to perform my Job. The items with which they most agreed were "I have a job that has clear purpose" ($\mu = 1.90$) and "the working condition supports my work" ($\mu = 1.97$).

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

Table 4. 6: KMO and Bartlett's test for the subset (job analysis) adequacy

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.639
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	**Approx. Chi-Square**	154.014
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Source: *primary data,2014*

The KMO and Bartlett's test was determined and found to be 0.63, p=.000 <0.001 (See table 4.6).
The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient **α** was determined and found to be 0.83 which gave the research a go ahead to determine the factor analysis for this subset.

Table 4. 7: Factor Loading for Items Representing REB employees' Views on Job Analysis

Item	Factor Loading
Job with a clear purpose	0.81
Job with clear responsibility	0.85
Supporting working condition	0.87
Required equipment & materials	0.81

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*
Note*:* **REB**= *Rwanda Education Board*

The factor loadings determined ranged from a high of 0.85 to a low of 0.57 indicating that the four items could be verified to measure a single construct (See Table 4.7).

Table 4. 8: REB technical employees' views on Job Analysis

Item	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Category
Job with a clear purpose	1.90	.433	A
Job with clear responsibility	2.21	.681	A
Supporting working condition	1.97	.361	A
Required equipment & materials	2.32	.566	A
Overall Score	**2.10**	**.510**	**A**

Source: *Primary data*

Since the four items in the "Job Analysis" scale were determined to measure a single construct, the researcher computed an overall score for the items in this scale. The overall score was determined and found to be μ=2.10 (SD = 0.51) which was classified in the "Agree" response category (See Table 4.8).

Performance Measures: For performance measures subset, the following questions were asked and answered by respondents: (1) I agree with PA expectations; (2) PA process is participatory (3) PA measures are clear; and (4) PA measures what I really do. Respondents "Agreed" (item scores between 1.76 and 2.50). The items on which the respondents agreed most were in the order: 1) I agree with PA expectations with mean μ = 1.98, PA measures are clear with mean μ = 2.26 and "PA measures what I

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

really do with mean μ = 2.48. The item with which respondents disagreed was "PA process is participatory" with mean μ = 2.53.

Table 4. 9: KMO and Bartlett's test for the subset (performance measures) adequacy

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.658
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	**Approx. Chi-Square**	27.761
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

KMO and Bartlett's test of adequacy for this set was determined and found to be 0.65, P=.000<0.001(see table 4.9).

The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient **α** was found to be 0.62**.** This gave the researcher an idea to perform first a test of communality among variables before proceeding. The test was done using Principal Component Analysis with the extraction method; the communalities ranged from a high of 0.62 to a low of 0.12 (See Table 4.10).

Table 4. 10 : Variance between variables of the subset "Performance Measures"

Communalities

	Initial	**Extraction**
I agree with performance expectations	1,000	.628
PA process is participative	1,000	**.122**
PA measures are clear	1,000	.611
PA measures what i really do	1,000	.506

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

Since, the item "PA process is participatory" did not fulfill the minimum requirement of (0.50), the researcher decided to remove this item in the scale and then proceed with factor analysis.

Table 4. 11: Factor Loading for Items Representing REB employees' Views on Performance measures

Item	**Factor Loading**
I agree with PA expectations	0.79
PA measures are clear	0.78
PA measures what i really do (reversed coded)	0.69

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The factor analysis for this subset was done and factor loaded from a high of 0.85 to a low of 0.57 indicating that the only three items could be verified to measure a single construct (See Table 4.11).

'

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

Table 4. 12: REB employees' views on the "Performance measures" subscale

Item	Mean	Std. Dev.	Response Category
I agree with PA expectations	1.98	.587	A
PA measures are clear	2.26	.599	A
PA measures what I really do	2.48	.646	A
Overall Score	**2.24**	**.610**	**A**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The researcher computed an overall score for only three items in this scale. The overall score was μ=2.24 (SD = .61) which falls in the "Agree" response category (See Table 4.12).

Performance feedback: For the performance feedback subset, the following questions were asked and answered by respondents: (1) Feedback is timely; (2) Feedback is given in the best manner (3) I have the chance to comment on the feedback; and (4) Never receive performance feedback. Respondents "Agreed" (item scores between 1.76 and 2.50) items as follows: "Feedback is timely" (μ = 2.39), Feedback is given in the best manner (μ = 2.26), I have the chance to comment on the feedback (μ = 2.16) and "Never received performance feedback" (μ = 2.90) with a reverse coding.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's test of adequacy for set of variables was determined to be 0.79 and their associated probability P=.000<0.001 (see table 4.13) satisfied the requirement.

Table 4. 13: KMO and Bartlett's test for the subset (performance feedback) adequacy)

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.795
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	**Approx. Chi-Square**	134.336
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient **α** was determined and found to be 0.80 which gave the researcher a go ahead to determine the factor analysis for this subset.

Table 4. 14: Factor Loading for Items Representing REB employees' Views on performance feedback

Item	Factor Loading
Job with a clear purpose	.79
Job with clear responsibility	.53
Supporting working condition	.78
Required equipment & materials	.69

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

The factor loadings determined fell within the range of a high 0.79 to a low of 0.53 indicating that the four items could be verified to measure a single construct (See Table 4.14).

Table 4. 15: REB employees' views on performance feedback subscale

Item	Mean(μ)	Std. Dev.	Response Category
Feedback is timely	2.39	.686	A
Feedback is given in the best manner	2.26	.599	A
I have the chance to comment on the feedback	2.16	.549	A
Never receive performance feedback (reverse corded)	2.90	.970	A
Overall Score	**2.43**	**.701**	**A**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The overall score was (mean) μ=2.43 (SD = .70) which falls in the "Agree" response category (See Table 4.15).

Rewarding Performance

For the performance Related Rewards subset, the following questions were asked and answered by respondents: (1) I have been given intangible rewards; (2) I have been given compensation fairly (3) I have received benefits reasonably; and (4) I have received required incentives. Respondents disagreed (item scores between 2.50 and 3.25) with "I have been given compensation fairly" with mean (μ = 2.24) and agreed (item scores between 1.75 and 2.50) with all three remaining items, that is to say: "I have been given intangible rewards" with mean (μ = 2.24), "I have received benefits reasonably" with mean (μ = 2.35) and "I have received required incentives" with mean (μ = 2.48).

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's test of adequacy for set of variables determined to be 0.75 and their associated probability P=.000<0.001 (see table 4.16) satisfied the requirement.

Table 4. 16: KMO and Bartlett's test for the subset (performance related rewards) adequacy

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.725
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	**Approx. Chi-Square**	94.588
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

Here, the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient (α**)** determined was found to be 0.67**.** It did not met the minimum requirement of α=0.70. This gave the researcher an idea to perform first a test of communality among variables before proceeding.

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

Table4. 17: Variance between variables of the subset" performance related rewards"

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
I have been given intangible rewards.	1.000	.645
I have been given compensation fairly	1.000	.534
I have received benefits reasonably	1.000	.666
I have received required incentives	1.000	.560

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The test was done using Principal component analysis with the extraction method; the communalities ranged from a high of .66 to a low of .53 (See Table 4.17) which satisfied the requirement (minimum of 0.50).

Table 4. 18: Principal Component Analysis "reward subset"

	Component	
	1	2
I have been given intangible rewards.	.742	.309
I have been given compensation fairly	.372	.629
I have received benefits reasonably	.766	-.283
I have received required incentives	.310	.681

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 2 components extracted.

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

As the test of communalities did not show the matter, the researcher decided to rotate component with Kaiser Normalization rotation method. The results showed that the variables overload on two components (see table 4.18).

Table 4. 19 : Factor Loading for Items Representing REB employees' Views on Performance related rewards

Item	Factor loading
I have been given intangible rewards.	**.80**
I have been given compensation fairly	**.72**[b]
I have received my benefits reasonably	**.81**
I have received required incentives	**.74**[b]

[b] **Varimax with Kaiser Normalization rotation method, 2nd component.**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

Then, factor loading on two components was determined and showed in table 4.19.

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

Table 4. 20: REB technical employees' views on PA related Rewards

Item	Mean(μ)	Std. Dev.	Response Category
I have been given intangible rewards.	2.24	.592	A
I have been given compensation fairly	2.53	.695	D
I have received my benefits reasonably	2.34	.626	A
I have received required incentives	2.48	.784	A
Overall Score	**2.40**	**.674**	**A**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The researcher computed an overall score for the items in this scale which was calculated as the mean of the ratings assigned to the individual items. The overall score was (mean) μ=2.40, (SD = .67) and falls in the "Agree" response category (See table 4.20).

Coaching & Trainings

For the coaching and trainings subset, the following questions were asked and answered by respondents: (1) I have been given time to improve unsatisfactory performance; (2) I have been given supporting documents for job fulfillment (3) I have been given guidance to improve performance; and (4) I have been given supporting training to improve performance. Respondents agreed (item scores between 1.75 and 2.50) with all four items with mean (μ = 2.44; 1.98; 2.40 and 2.29) respectively.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's test of adequacy for set of variables determined to be 0.56 and their associated probability satisfied the requirement of P<0.001 (see table 4.21).

Table 4. 21: KMO and Bartlett's test for the subset (coaching & trainings) adequacy

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.563
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	**Approx. Chi-Square**	64.509
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

Here, the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient **α** was determined to be 0.71.

Table 4. 22: Factor Loading for Items Representing REB employees' Views on coaching &trainings

Item	Factor loading
I have been given time to improve unsatisfactory performance	**.80**[b]
I have been given supporting documents for job fulfillment	**.76**[b]
I have been given guidance to improve performance	**.86**
I have been given supporting training to improve performance	**.84**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

The researcher performed the factor analysis by rotating components and found that variables overlapped on two components, and ranged from 0.66 to 0.82 (table 4.22 above). Further an overall score for this subset was computed (see table 4.23).

Table 4. 23: REB employees' views on PA coaching & trainings

Item	Mean(μ)	Std. Dev.	Response Category
I have been given time to improve unsatisfactory performance	2.44	.692	A
I have been given supporting documents for job fulfillment	1.98	.587	A
I have been given guidance to improve performance	2.40	.735	A
I have been given supporting training to improve performance	2.29	.637	A
Overall Score	**2.28**	**.662**	**A**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The overall score computed was (mean) μ=2.28 (SD = .66) and this falls in the "Agree" response category.

Performance Ratings

For the performance ratings subset, the following questions were asked and answered by respondents: (i) Ratings were fair; (ii) Ratings were higher (iii) Ratings were attributed sentimentally; and (iv) Rating system should be changed. Respondents agreed (item scores between 2.51 and 3.25) with the 2nd, 3rd and 4th items with mean μ = 2.68; 2.85; and 2.85 reversed coded respectively. They only disagreed (item scores between 1.75 and 2.50) with "ratings were fair" (μ = 2.48) reverse coded.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's test of adequacy for set of variables was determined to be .73; and their associated probability satisfies the requirements P=.000<0.001 (table 4.24 below).

Table 4. 24: KMO and Bartlett's test for the subset (PA ratings) adequacy

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.725
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	**Approx. Chi-Square**	94.588
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient **α** determined to be 0.82. This satisfied the requirement of α =0.70 and gave the researcher a go ahead to determine the factor analysis for this subset.

Table 4. 25: Factor Loading for Items Representing REB employees' Views on performance ratings

Item	Factor loading
Ratings were fair	**.88**
Ratings were higher	**.86**
Ratings were sentimental	**.89**
Rating system should be changed	**.83**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

The factor loadings determined ranged from a high of .89 to a low of .83 indicating that the four items could be verified to measure a single construct (See Table 4.25 above).

Table 4. 26: REB employees' views on performance ratings

Item	Mean(μ)	Std. Dev.	Response Category
Ratings were fair(reverse coded)	2.48	.646	D
Ratings were higher(reverse coded)	2.68	.621	A
Ratings were sentimental(reverse coded)	2.85	.846	A
Rating system should be changed(reverse coded)	2.85	.765	A
Overall Score	**2.72**	**.719**	**A**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The overall score was computed to be μ=2.72 (SD = .72) and falls in the "Agree" response category with a reverse cording (See table 4.26).

Transfer Decision

For the performance related transfer decision subset, the following questions were asked and answered by respondents: (1) I have been transferred to another job; (2) I have been assigned to a less suitable work (3) Had a less level of job security; and (4) Obtain a less level of support. Respondents agreed (item scores between 1.75 and 2.50) with all items (μ = 1.95; 2.13; and 1.95) respectively except the item "Had a less level of job security" disagreed (scores between 2.51 and 3.25) with (μ = 2.85).

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's test of adequacy for set of variables was determined to be .63 and their associated probability satisfied the requirement of P<0.001 (see table 4.28).

Table 4. 27: KMO and Bartlett's test for the subset (PA ratings) adequacy

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.635
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	**Approx. Chi-Square**	64.588
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient **α** was found to be **.69** and this gave the researcher a questionable reliability between subscale variables. The researcher decided to test communality between variables and found to be ranging from a high of .93 to a low of .25 (See Table 4.28 below).

Table 4. 28: Variance between variables for the subset "performance ratings"

	Initial	Extraction
I have been assigned to a less suitable work	1.000	.806
I have been transferred to another job	1.000	.929
Had a less level of job security	1.000	.251
Obtained a less level of support	1.000	.929

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

	Initial	Extraction
I have been assigned to a less suitable work	1.000	.806
I have been transferred to another job	1.000	.929
Had a less level of job security	1.000	.251
Obtained a less level of support	1.000	.929

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Source: *Author*. *Data Analysis, 2012*

Only the item "Had a less level of job security" did not fulfill the requirement (see table 4.28 above) the researcher removed it from the list and further calculated factor loadings and this ranged from a high of 0.96 to a low of 0.90 (see table 4.29 below).

Table 4. 29: Factor Loading for Items Representing REB employees' Views on transfer

Item	Factor loading
I have been assigned to a less suitable work	.90
I have been transferred to another job	.96
Obtained less level of support	.96

Source: *Author*. *Data Analysis, 2012*

The overall score for the three items was computed and found to be 2.01 (SD = .542) and this falls in the "Agree" response category with a reverse cording (See table 4.30 below).

Table 4. 30: REB employees' views on PA Transfer decision

Item	Mean(μ)	Std. Dev.	Response Category
I have been transferred to another job	1.95	.493	A
I have been assigned to a less suitable work	2.13	.640	A
Obtained a less level of support	1.95	.493	A
Overall Score	**2.01**	**.542**	**A**

Source: *Author*. *Data Analysis, 2012*

Demotion decision

For the performance related demotion decision subset, the following questions were asked and answered by respondents: (1) I have been placed in lower level position; (2) I have been assigned to a less challenging job (3) Had fewer opportunity to utilize my skills; and (4) I have gotten less pay. Respondents disagreed (item scores between 2.51 and 3.25) with all items with mean (μ = 2.25; 2.79; 2.95 and 2.84) respectively.

Table 4. 31: KMO and Bartlett's test for the subset (job analysis) adequacy

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.755
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	**Approx. Chi-Square**	285.543
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Source: *Author*. *Data Analysis, 2012*

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

The KMO and Bartlett's test was determined and found to be **.76** (See table 4.31 above), the associated probability satisfied the requirement P<0.001. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient **α** was found to be **.93.**

Table 4. 32: Factor Loading for Items Representing REB employees' Views on demotion

Item	Factor loading
I have Gotten less pay	.98
I Had fewer opportunity to utilize my skills	.91
I have been assigned to a less challenging job	.95
I have been placed in lower level position	.76

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

This gave the researcher a go ahead to determine the factor analysis for this subset. The factor loadings determined ranged from a high of .98 to a low of .76 indicating that the four items could be verified to measure a single construct (See Table 4.32 above).

Table 4. 33: REB employees' views on PA demotion decision

Item	Mean(μ)	Std. Dev.	Response Category
I have been placed in lower level position	2.51	.670	D
I have been assigned to a less challenging job	2.79	.871	D
Had fewer opportunity to utilize my skills	2.95	.818	D
I have gotten less pay	2.84	.853	D
Overall Score	**2,77**	**.803**	**D**

Source: *Author. Data Analysis, 2012*

The overall score was computed and found to be of mean, μ= 2.77 (SD = .80) and this falls in the "desagree" response category with a reverse cording (See table 4.33).

Promotion Decision

For promotion decision subset, the following questions were asked and answered by respondents: (1) I have been placed in higher level position; (2) I have assigned a high challenging job (3) Had more opportunity to utilize my skills; and (4) I have gotten more pay. Respondents disagreed (item scores between 2.51 and 3.25) with all items with mean (μ = 2.29; 2.82; 2.69 and 1.95 respectively), the last question had a reverse coding.

Table 4. 34: KMO and Bartlett's test for the subset (promotion) adequacy

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.601
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	**Approx. Chi-Square**	104.600
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Source: *Author.: primary data,2014*

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

The KMO and Bartlett's test determined was found to be .60 (See table 4.34 above). The probability P=.000<0.001 associated with the Bartlett test satisfied the requirement P=<0.001. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient **α** determined to be 0.71.

Table 4. 35: Factor Loading for Items Representing REB employees' Views on promotion

Item	Factor loading
I have been placed in higher level position	.92
I have been assigned a high challenging job	.93
I had more opportunity to utilize my skills	.52
I have gotten more pay	.54

Source: *Author. Primary Data, 2014*

This gave the research a go ahead to determine the factor analysis for this subset. The factor loadings determined ranged from a high of .93 to a low of .52 indicating that the four items could be verified to measure a single construct (See Table 4.35 above).

Table 4. 36: Summary of REB employees' views on PA promotion decision

Source: *Author. Primary,2014*

Item	Mean(μ)	Std. Dev.	Response Category
I have been placed in higher level position	2.98	.779	D
I have been assigned a high challenging job	2.82	.840	D
I had more opportunity to utilize my skills	2.68	.621	D
I have gotten more pay (reverse coded)	1.95	.493	D
Overall Score	**2.61**	**.683**	**D**

The overall score was determined and found to be mean =2.61 (SD = .80) (See table 4.36 above), and this falls in the "disagree" response category (with reverse corded meaning).

However, in order to determine how REB technical appraised employees agree with the PA planning, feedback and decisions, the researcher summarized the above findings of all subscales in the following table 4.37.

Table 4. 37: Reaction of Technical Employees from PA done

Subscale	Mean(μ)	Std. Dev.	Response Category
Job Analysis	2.10	.510	A
Performance measures	2.24	.610	A
Performance feedback	2.43	.701	A
Performance ratings(Reverse Coded)	2.72	.719	A
Rewards	2.40	.674	A
Transfer	2.01	.542	A
Coaching and training	2.28	.662	A
Promotion	2.61	.683	D
Demotion	2,77	,803	D

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

Survey scale: 1= strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree; and, 4 = strongly disagree.
Response category: 1.00 – 1.75 =Strongly Agree (SA); 1.76 – 2.50= Agree (A); 2.51 – 3.25 = Disagree (D); and3.26 – 4.00= Strongly Disagree (SD).
Source: *Author. Primary, 2014*

The findings clearly showed that respondents agreed with the process involved in analyzing jobs i.e. Job description and job specification, setting PA measures, providing feedback, and rating, rewarding, transferring, training, promoting and demoting employees. Both promotion and demotion were negatively structured in the survey. This makes their disagree responses (D) in agree (A) category. Additionally, the acceptance of PA feedback, rewards, PA measures, and trainings scales is closer to the lower limit of disagree scale. Therefore, their process is not entirely satisfactory.

Accuracy of REB's PA Decisions

This objective aimed at examining the accuracy of REB's PA decisions. The contribution of independent variables; of job analysis, job measures, and performance feedback and performance ratings was determined using the coefficient of determination, denoted by $R^{2,}$ with regression analysis. The interpretation of the magnitude of findings was done basing on Davis (1971) descriptors as cited in (Walsh, 2003) and given in table 3.2. The following section presents the contribution of these variables to dependent variables, of rewarding performance, transfer, promotion and demotion, and coaching and training.

First, the variation in dependent variable "reward" (table 4.38 below) was explained by its linear relationship with the independent variables of job analysis, PA measures, PA feedback and PA ratings respectively at 13% (r^2 = 0.134) , 47% (r^2 = 0.466); 11% (r^2 = 0.110); and 48% (r^2 = 0.478). This means that reward has a low association (10-29%) with both job analysis and performance feedback, and a moderate association (30-49) with performance measures and ratings.

However, the employees are rewarded based on the scores/ratings obtained and performance measures set at the beginning of the year. Rewards do not reflect what was expected from the jobholder, i.e. the employees' attributions and responsibilities.

Table 4. 38: Correlation Coefficients for dependent variable "Reward"

Model	$(r)^a$	(r^2)	(ar^2)	(e)	F	Sig.
1	.366	.134	.073	.669	2.200	.080
2	.683	.466	.429	.593	12.443	.000
3	.332	.110	.064	.758	2.389	.078
4	.691	.478	.441	.586	13.025	.000

$(r)^a$=regression coefficient, (r^2)= R Square, (ar^2)= Adjusted R Square, and (e)= Std. Error of the Estimate
1: ((Constant) [a] : Job Analysis
2. (Constant) [a] : PA measures
3. (Constant) [a] : PA feedback
4. ((Constant) [a] : PA ratings
Dependent Variable: Rewards
Source: *Primary ,2014*

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

Therefore, performance measures do not match with both jobholder attributions and performance feedback given to employees; hence, REB's employees perform what they are not supposed to do (which are out of their attributions) and reward is given according to what has been achieved.

Second, the variation in dependent variable "transfer" (table 4.39 below) was explained by its linear relationship with the independent variables of job analysis, PA measures, PA feedback and PA ratings respectively at 18 % (r^2 =0.181); 25% (r^2 =0.247) ; 64% (r^2 =0.639). This means that transfer has a low association (10-29%) with job analysis, performance measures and ratings, and a substantial association (50-69%) with performance feedback.

Table 4. 39: Correlation Coefficients for dependent variable "Transfer"

Model	(r)[a]	(r^2)	(ar^2)	(e)	F	Sig.
1	.425	.181	.123	.462	3.148	.021
2	.497	.247	.194	.443	4.677	.002
3	.799	.639	.613	.307	25.171	.000
4	.394	.156	.096	.469	2.624	.044

(r)[a]=regression coefficient, (r^2)= R Square, (ar^2)= Adjusted R Square, and (e)= Std. Error of the Estimate

1: (Constant) [a] : Job Analysis
2. (Constant) [a] : PA feedback
3. (Constant) [a] : PA measures
4. (Constant) [a] : PA ratings

Source: *Primary data 2014*

However, employees are transferred or rotated based on their performance feedback without considering their job attributions or performance measures set for their appraisals. Therefore, employees perform what they are not supposed to do and are transferred/rotated based on what has been achieved rather than on what was supposed to be done.

Third, the variation in dependent variable "promotion" (table 4.40) was explained by its linear relationship with the independent variables of job analysis, PA measures, PA feedback and PA ratings respectively at 23 % (r^2 =0.231); 23% (r^2 =0.233) ; 50% (r^2 =0.502), and 84% (r^2 =0.844). This means that promotion has a low association (10-29%) with job analysis and performance measures, a substantial association (50-69%) with performance feedback, and a very strong association (70-100%) with performance ratings.

Table 4. 40: Correlation Coefficients for dependent variable "Promotion"

Model	(r)[a]	(r^2)	(ar^2)	(e)	F	Sig.
1	.481	.231	.177	.706	4.283	.004
2	.483	.233	.193	.699	5.872	.001
3	.709	.502	.468	.568	14.390	.000
4	.919	.844	.836	.315	104.430	.000

(r)[a]=regression coefficient, (r^2)= R Square, (ar^2)= Adjusted R Square, and (e)= Std. Error of the Estimate

Source: *Primary, 2014*

International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management
29th Aug 2014. Vol.28 No.1

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

However, employees are promoted based on rates and performance feedback given to them regardless to their job measures and attributions. Therefore, employees perform what they are not supposed to do and promotion is based on what has been achieved rather than on what was supposed to be achieved.

Fourth, the variation in dependent variable "demotion" (table 4.41) was explained by its linear relationship with the independent variables of job analysis, PA measures, PA feedback and PA ratings respectively at 8 % (r^2 =0.089); 86% (r^2 =0.860) ; 14% (r^2 =0.135), and 86% (r^2 =0.858). This means that demotion has a low association (10-29%) with job analysis and performance feedback, and a very strong association (70-100%) with performance measures and ratings.

However, the employees are demoted based on the scores/ratings obtained and performance measures set at the beginning of the year. Demotion does not reflect what was expected from the jobholder, i.e. the employees' attributions.

Table 4. 41: Correlation Coefficients for dependent variable "Demotion"

Model	$(r)^a$	(r^2)	(ar^2)	(e)	F	Sig.
1	.298	.089	.025	.661	1.392	.248
2	.367	.135	.074	.644	2.224	.078
3	.927	.860	.850	.260	87.277	.000
4	.927	.858	.849	.261	86.413	.000

$(r)^a$=regression coefficient, (r^2)= R Square, (ar^2)= Adjusted R Square, and (e)= Std. Error of the Estimate

1: $(Constant)^a$: Job Analysis
2. $(Constant)^a$: PA feedback
3. $(Constant)^a$: PA measures
4. $(Constant)^a$: PA ratings

Therefore, performance measures do not match with both jobholder's attributions and performance feedback given to employees. Hence, REB's technical employees perform what they are not supposed to do (which is out of their attributions), and demotion is decided in accordance with what has been achieved.

Lastly, the variation in the dependent variable "training" (table 4.42 below) was explained by its linear relationship with the independent variables of job analysis, PA feedback, PA measures and PA ratings respectively at 21 % (r^2 =0.209); 26% (r^2 =0.263) ; 10% (r^2 =0.102), and 18% (r^2 =0.181). This means that training has a low association (10-29%) with all independent variables of job analysis, PA feedback, PA measures, and PA ratings.

Table 4. 42: Correlation Coefficients for dependent variable "Training"

Model	$(r)^a$	(r^2)	(ar^2)	(e)	F	Sig.
1	.457	.209	.154	.540	3.766	.009
2	.513	.263	.212	.521	5.091	.001
3	.319	.102	.038	.625	1.611	.184
4	.426	.181	.124	.549	3.152	.021

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

(r)[a]=regression coefficient, (r^2)= R Square, (ar^2)= Adjusted R Square, and (e)= Std. Error of the Estimate

Therefore, training does not match with employees 'attributions, measures and feedback for their performance and rate scores obtained. Hence, training is baseless or sentimental.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Based on the findings of the study, the researcher concludes that: The majority of REB technical appraised employees are male, in group age of (31-40), holds bachelor degrees, has working experiences ranging between 6-10 years, and they are married.
2. The REB's technical employees found to be moderately satisfied with promotion, demotion, transfer, job analysis and performance measures; and little bit satisfied with feedback, rates, trainings, and rewards provided to them.
3. The REB's training decisions taken for technical staffs are baseless or sentimental. Employees are trained regardless of their job attributions, feedback and ratings provided for their performance.
4. The majority of REB employees perform what they are not supposed to do (which is out of their attributions), and decisions of reward, promotion, demotion, transfer are based on what employees have achieved; and the latter is totally different from what they are employed for.
5. Informed by the above findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are set out for the satisfactory performance appraisal system that closes the gap between what employees expect from the system, and what they get.

- First, REB management has to define jobs' attributions and communicate them to concerned employees.
- Second, REB management has to ensure that every staff understands his or her responsibilities. This means the employees' job attributions.
- Third, REB management has to ensure that performance measures are set in agreement of both supervisors and employees, and that they match with the employees' attributions;
- Fourth, REB management has to be certain that relevant feedbacks are provided to employees to overcome their weaknesses and improve their strengths so as to enable them to achieve the desired performance
- Fifth, REB management has to be sure that the employees' ratings are based on their achievements, measured on performance measures, and that they are in harmony with employees' attributions.
- Sixth, REB management has to be sure that PA decisions of reward, promotion, demotion, transfer and training are based on the employees' ability and taken with regards to the feedbacks provided to them during the appraisal period and that they are not conflicting with performance measures and attributions.
- Lastly, the researcher recommends that further research investigate for example the harmonized performance appraisal system relevant for REB employees' satisfaction.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, S. (1999). The Emerging Effectiveness for Human Resource Management: An Exploratory Study with Performance Appraisal. The Journal of Management Development. 18, 6, 543-556.

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

2. Armstrong, M. (2006). A Handbook of Human resource Management Practice, Tenth Edition, Kogan Page Publishing, London, , p. 264
3. Blanchar, C., & Onton, J. (2005). Performance measures in times of change. Employment Relations Today, 32(1): 25-34.
4. Boswell, W.R. & Boudreau, J.W. (2002) Separating the development and evaluative performance appraisal uses. Journal of Business and Psychology. Vol 16, pp391-412.
5. Buford, J.A., Jr., & Lindner, J.R. (2002). Human resource management in local government: Concepts and applications for students and practitioners. Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern.
6. Cocanougher, B. A., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1978), "Bars performance rating for sales force personnel", Journal of Marketing, 42, 87-95.
7. Coens, T. and Jenkins, M. (2000). Abolishing Performance Appraisals. San Francisco, CA, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.Coens & Jenkins, 2002.
8. Coutts and Schneider, 2004, p.67. Coutts, L.M. and Schneider, F.W. (2004). Police officer performance appraisal.
9. Fago, J. (2006). Frequently asked human resources questions. *Illinois Banker*, 91(4): 8-9.
10. George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
11. Hall. Ivancevich, J. M. (2001). Human Resource Management (8th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill
12. Jawahar, I. M. (2006). Correlates of satisfaction with performance appraisal feedback. Journal of Labor Research, 27(2): 213-236.
13. Jaworski, B. J., & Kohli, A. K. (1991). Supervisory feedback: Alternative types and their impact on salespeople's performance and satisfaction. Journal of Marketing Research, 28, 190-201.
14. Kazmier and Leonard k. (1992). Principle of management. New Delhi. Tata Mac Graw-Hill Book Co
15. Longenecker, C.O. and Goff, S.J. (1992). Performance Appraisal Effectiveness: A Matter of Perspective. Advanced Management Journal. 57, 2, 18-23.
16. Macky, K. & Jonhson, G. (2000). The Strategic Management of Human Resource in New Zealand. Auckland, New Zealand. Irwin/McGraw-Hall.
17. Mamoria, C.B. & Gankar, S.V. (2002). Personnel Management. 22nd Edition. Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
18. Man, B. G., (2002). Performance Appraisal Stems productivity and motivation. A case study. Public Personnel Management.
19. Mary Nuernberger, et al, (2010). Guide for Writing job descriptions, UC Santa Cruz.
20. McGregor D. (1960). The Human Side of Enterprise. New York. McGraw-Hill
21. Mitchell, K D. (2000) "Knowledge management: the next big thing." Public Manager, 29 (2), 57-60.
22. Murphy, K.R & Cleveland, J.N. (1995) Understanding Performance Appraisal; Social, organizational and goal based perspectives. California, Sage Publications.
23. Probst, T. M.& Brubaker, T. L. (2001). The effects of job insecurity on employee safety outcomes: Cross-sectional and longitudinal explorations. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6 (2), 139-159.
24. Roberson, Q. M., & Stewart, M. M. (2006). Understanding the motivational effects of procedural and informational justice in feedback processes. British Journal of Psychology, 97, 281-298.
25. Sirota, D., & Mischkind, L. A. (2006). Stop demotivating your employees! Harvard Management Update, 11(1): 3-6.
26. Spicer, D.P. and Ahmad, R., (2006) 'Cognitive Processing Models in Performance Appraisal: Cognitive Mapping Evidence from the Malaysian

ISSN 2304-0777 www.jitbm.com

Public Sector', Human Resource Management Journal, 16 (2) pp 214-230

27. Statt, D. (2004). The Routledge Dictionary of Business Management, Third edition, Routledge Publishing, Detroit, p. 78
28. Vance, C.M., McClaine, S.R., Boje, D.M. and Stage, H.D. (1992). An examination of the transferability of traditional performance appraisal principles across cultural boundaries. Management International Review, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 313-326.
29. Wilson & Westerns, (2001). Performance Apprasal. An Obstacle to training and development. Career development International.
30. Zkmund, William G., 2003. Business research methods. 7th edition. USA. Thomson-South Western