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ABSTRACT
This paper proposes implementation strategy of an effective performance management system capable of ensuring workers productivity. Multichoice Nigeria was the organization under focus; the study population comprises all the 617 staff of the organisation. Simple random sampling technique was used to draw fifty (50) respondents from the population space. Structured questionnaire was used as instrument of data collection while frequency distribution and percentages were used in analyzing the data. Major findings showed that most employees were unaware of the prevailing model of performance management system in the organization. Employees feel that the company’s performance management system has failed to give a proper assessment of their contribution to the organization. Workers are generally not satisfied with the staff performance review system of Multichoice limited. This study recommends the adoption of a 360 degree system of performance management for its ability to facilitate prompt achievement of the company objective and enhance productivity
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1. INTRODUCTION
Performance management (PM); one of the most significant human resource management (HRM) practices and a widely discussed area in management and organizational theory, has received remarkable attention among practitioners and academics over the years. Continuous interest in PM and associated themes - employee appraisal, performance assessment, and performance evaluation could be due probably to the fact that no function in the subject matter of human capital management seems so difficult to objectively and effectively implement and yet so crucial to individual development, employee productivity, and sustained organizational growth, than appraising and managing people performance. (Banjoko, 2005).

In actual sense, the mere mention of performance management elicits negative perception from all parties involved. For instance, supervisors dread being the ones to broker negative feedback and dealing with discontented employees. Employees on their part often feel unappreciated, unmotivated and are concerned about the overall fairness of the performance management process.

In spite of all the pain associated with this process, majority of organizations continue to embark on PM as a cardinal HRM function and thus, heightening its role in modern organisations. In addition, Interest in performance management is further popularised by the fact that the business landscape is increasingly dynamic brought about by increasing legislation, technological changes, and changes in workforce composition, diversification and hyper-competition (Price, 2011). Due to these competitive pressures, business firms are forced to show greater concern in developing the competency of their workforce to ensure productivity and commitment. Thus, Performance management is constantly being considered one of such HRM programs needed to ensure optimal success.

In the corporate context, performance is defined as the extent to which an organizational member contributes to achieving the goals of the firm and according to Boxall and Purcell(2003), Performance management is the process of creating a work environment or setting in which people are enabled to perform to the best of their abilities. It is the main vehicle by which managers communicate what is required from employees and give feedback on how well they are achieving job goals (Armstrong, 2009).

A performance management system is needed to ensure the firm meets its obligations to customers, shareholders and employees. It brings together many of the elements that make up the practice of people management, learning and development. Performance management
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establishes shared understanding of what is to be achieved and provides an approach to leading and developing people that will ensure it is achieved; as such it is an essential element of a managers’ role and will support meaningful relationship with individuals and teams.

The Human Resource (HR) unit in Multichoice Nigeria (MCN) Limited (A digital pay Television broadcasting firm) is saddled with the responsibility of carrying out continuous performance evaluation and management processes for the entire organisation. Even though a system of assessing workers performance in the company is in place, implementation processes are usually not in congruent with the grand purpose and objectives of the organization. Consequently, issues bordering on lack of acceptability, lack of employees confidence in the PM process and outcome, and betrayal of trust between management and workers are commonly identifiable grey areas. Given these problems, the basic philosophy of establishing PM system as a HR function in MCN is altogether defeated. Hence, the methodology of PM system in MCN needs a total overhaul to enable the company brace up to the challenges of ever increasing business dynamism. How this change can be accomplished is the reason for this study.

Without effective performance management, there is little accountability for acceptable standard of performance. Furthermore, documentation and consistency would be non-existent and most employees would never get any feedback about their performance, positive or negative. Poorly designed and implemented performance measurement system discourages effective participation and acceptability by all parties concerned, encourages distrust between management and staff, and leads to misunderstanding between the raters and ratees (Mayer & Davis, 1999). However, when implemented judiciously, an effective PM program can increase productivity, boost morale and help in retention of highly committed workforce (Price, 2011; Boxall & Purcell. 2003). Consequently, implementing an effective planning and management of employee performance system is essential for MCN business success.

It may be argued that most employees seem to be unaware of what constitute the performance indicators being rated in MCN, and the extent to which these performance parameters actually contribute to work performance is unclear. Equally worrisome, is the lack of openness and poor feedback mechanism in the process of evaluating employees’ performance. For instance, even after an assessment is carried out, no feasible mechanism is in place to address variance between expected and actual workplace behaviour. Thus, one can easily conclude that the performance management system in the company has been ineffective; and can adversely affect MCN’s productivity leading to dwindling morale. Thus, exploring the ways of implementing highly effective and successful performance management systems in MCN is quite timely and has become the overall aim of this research.

1.1 Aims and Objectives of the Study

The overall purpose of this study was to propose the implementation processes of an effective performance management system necessary to enhance higher productivity in Multichoice Nigeria Limited. However, the specific objectives are as follows: To

i. Examine the nature of performance management systems in Multichoice Nigeria Limited.
ii. Determine the level of employee’s awareness and acceptability of the processes of performance management systems in Multichoice Nigeria Limited.
iii. Identify the factors that hinder effective performance management systems in Multichoice Nigeria Limited.
iv. Describe the processes of implementing effective and successful performance management systems to enhance employee productivity.

1.2 Research Questions

In order to achieve the study objectives and therefore provide solution to the problems highlighted in this study, the following questions are relevant.

i. What constitute the nature of performance management systems in Multichoice Nigeria Limited?
ii. To what extent are employees aware and accept the processes of performance management systems in Multichoice Nigeria Limited?
iii. What factors hinder effectiveness of performance management systems in Multichoice Nigeria Limited?
iv. What are the necessary steps involved in implementing effective and successful
performance management systems to enhance employee productivity?

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The fundamental concept of performance management as used in the context of this study anchors on motivation theory, particularly, goal-setting and expectancy theories. According to Robbins and Judge (2009), Goal-setting theory suggests that the process of setting goals and targets allows one to be focused to provide a sense of direction and enables one to achieve one’s aim with less or without distraction. It also builds self-confidence and improves performance as one recognizes the ability and competence in achieving set goals. Proximal goals strengthen performance because they allow clear and frequent sell evaluations of progress than distant goals (Rousseau 2007). Goals represent concretized or focused needs. In other words, if one intends to do something, there is the need to plan how to go about it. In line with the above thought, Kuvaas (2006) argues that not only does the assignment of specific goals result in positive performance but that, assuming goal acceptance, and persistently handling the challenges involve in it arouse morale and increases expected performance.

Vroom’s Expectancy Theory proposes that individuals change their behaviour according to their anticipated satisfaction in achieving certain goals. Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert (2011) note that productivity is likely to improve when clearly perceived and usable relationships exist between people’s performance and outcome, and the outcome is seen as a means of satisfying needs. These theories are relevant to the study because they clarify the issue that set goals and expectations would produce better self-regulated performance because employees are likely to be committed to attaining the goals of the organisation.

A significant amount of literature exists on performance management systems and its role in achieving individual and organizational objectives. However, the term performance management, according to Armstrong & Baron, (1998) was not recognized as an effective management technique and process until the late 1980s. Before this period, the idea of appraising performance revolved largely around an annual review of objectives between the manager and subordinate; a method described by (Atkinson & Shaw, 2006) as backwards-focused in approach and non-strategic in focus.

The concept of performance management however, adopts a futuristic and strategic approach and is applied to all employees in order to maximise their current performance and future potential (Price, 2011). Consequently, Performance management system has evolved and has gained wider acceptability in industrial organizations and non-government institutions. Its success as a strategic human resource tool has lately found application in the public sector.

Notwithstanding the widespread application and remarkable attention the concept has received over the years, it is noteworthy that authors differ in their understanding and definition of the concept of Performance Management. For instance, Fowler, (1990:143) gave one of the simplest views by defining performance management as ”the organization of work to achieve the best possible results”. From this definition, performance management is not visualized as a strategic system comprising different components but as the totality of day to day activities of managers.

In line with Fowler’s narrow view of PM, the Institute of Personnel Management in 1992 produced similar definition as ‘a strategy which relates to every activity of the organization set in the context of its human resources policies, culture, and style and communication systems.’ Though the characteristic of a system is embedded in the above definition, it is instructive that PM is an ongoing process of employee performance evaluation aimed at helping the organization and its people achieve predetermined goals.

Accordingly, Luthans, (2003) provides a somewhat appreciable definition and therefore, argues that performance management is more than just an annual review. It encompasses the entire process of employee performance evaluation and feedback and includes goal setting and coaching. It also includes the creation of development plans to address current performance shortfall as well as maximize future performance and career potential. In Luthans’ (2003) point of view, PM measures the strengths and weaknesses of the employees and on the basis of the objective so that the appropriate corrective action such as training can be undertaken.

Boswell and Boudreau (2000) defined performance management as a formal, structured system, of measuring and evaluating an employee job related behaviour and outcome to discover how and why the employee is presently performing on the job and how the employee can perform more effectively in the future so that the employee, the organization and society benefits altogether. Armstrong (2001) agreed with Boswell and
Boudreau (2000) and defined performance management as a means of getting better results from a whole organisation by understanding and managing within an agreed framework, performance of planned goals, standards and competence requirements.

Boswell and Boudreau (2000) and Armstrong’s (2001) definitions are very important, because they comprises all important components needed for an effective performance management system. It involves creating a shared vision of the purpose and aims of the organisation, helping individuals understand and recognise their part in contributing to them, and in so doing enhance the performance of both the individual and the organisation.

The most appropriate definition in the context of the research is that, performance management represents a strategic and integrated approach to delivering organizational success by improving the performance capabilities of both individuals and teams. (Armstrong & Baron, 1998). This is the most widely accepted conceptual, operational and organisational definition found useful in researching performance management. This has also been adopted as the working definition of this study.

2.1 Objectives and Benefits of Performance Management
Performance management is argued to play a key role in developing human capital, and effective Performance Management systems help organizations to better leverage their human capital and optimize workforce and organizational performance (Freeman 2002). Boxall and Purcell,(2003), share similar opinion with Freeman but added that Performance management assists managers to establish the true causes of problems that limit the subordinates’ performance and to develop a plan of action which when implemented removes the causes or at least minimizes the effect on the job output.

According to Luthans (2003), performance management system of any organization aims at achieving three primary purposes. First, performance management provides an opportunity for the manager and his subordinate to have a comprehensive review of performance in the light of objectives set. This may help the manager identity and discuss areas of strengths and weaknesses noticed from the subordinate’s performance. Second, it encourages the manager to think analytically about his subordinates as individual human beings. Third, it provides an opportunity for the individual employee to realize his/her own potential and what he/she needs to address in order to develop his/her present and future potentials.

Atkinson and Shaw (2006) argue that the main objectives of PM is to provide direction and control of employee work behavior, distribute organizational reward equitably, improve work productivity, and develop workers capabilities on the job and prepare employees for strategic future roles. In their view, Malcolm and Jackson (2002) observe that effective performance management system provides information that facilitates discussions about such subjects as promotions, pay increases, training, lay-offs and transfers. The authors argue further that performance management serves to stimulate and guide employee development as an indispensable HRM function.

According to Wellins, Bernthal & Phelps (2006), four different benefits accrue to the organisation for establishing and implementing workable performance management system. These are targeted training approach based on identified needs, future employee promotion decisions, effective bases for reward decisions and improved motivation and retention of employees.

Performance management has several benefits to the employees in the organisation; it takes into account the past performance of the employees and focuses on the improvement of their future performances. In addition, it gives the staff the opportunity to express their ideas and contribute their expectations for the realisation of the strategic goals of the company (Roberts, 2003). From motivational perspective, participatory performance management systems boost the intrinsic morale of employees and enhance their growth and development in the company. Thus, employees can discover ahead what is expected from them and what the consequences of their non performance would be.

By rating the performance of employees, their contributions towards achievement of organisations goals are evaluated and highlighted. Besides, enhancing employee motivation, Performance evaluation is about involvement in the ‘big picture’ in terms of responsibility, encouragement, recognition for positive effort and effective delivery (Malcolm & Jackson, 2002). Thus, Performance management system is a motivation for the employee who performs well in the present to go on doing so now and in the future (Derven 1990).

2.2 Challenges of Implementing Effective Performance Management System
Banjoko, (2005) outlines the main challenges in Performance management process: -Determining the evaluation criteria. Identification of the performance criteria is one of the biggest problems faced by the top management. For the purpose of evaluation, the criteria selected should be in quantifiable or measurable terms. Similarly, managers should have the required expertise and the knowledge to decide performance criteria accurately. They should have the experience and the training necessary to carry out the evaluation process objectively.

Another challenge according Banjoko, (2005) involves errors in rating and evaluation. Many errors based on the personal bias like stereotyping, halo effect (i.e. one trait influencing the evaluator’s rating for all other traits) etc. may creep in the appraisal process. Therefore the rater should exercise objectivity and fairness in evaluating and rating the performance of the employees. In addition to the challenges given by Banjoko,(2005), Obisi,(2011) argued that the appraisal process may face resistance from the employees because of the fear of negative ratings. Therefore, the employees should be communicated and clearly explained the purpose as well as the process of appraisal. The standards should be clearly communicated and every employee should be made aware of what exactly is expected from him/her them.

Fajana, (2006) noted that inputs contributed by employees during assessment process enhance acceptability of performance assessment outcome. Ogundele (2005) and Robbins and Judge, (2009) were of the opinion that lack of acceptability of performance management in organizations is due to lack of openness, poor feedback mechanism, bias assessment, poor reward structure, and defective rating criteria. Boswell and Boudreau, (2000) noted that performance management system will be successful only when the items appraised address the requirements and essential functions of the job.

Machingambi, Maphosa, Ndofirepi, Mutekwe and Wadesango, (2013) in their study of perceived challenges of implementing the performance management system in Zimbabwe. identified poor advocacy and communication about the system, lack of training on PM, shortage of resources, abuse of the system as well as lack of reward as major challenges besetting effective PM. Furthermore, Akhtar and Khattak, (2013) opined that the level of trust needed for frank and open discussion of performance results, both good and bad, is often not present in some organisations. The authors argued further that organisation with poor performance accountability culture are definitely going to find PM implementation a daunting task.

2.3 Review of Empirical Evidence

There is an enormous body of empirical evidence about performance management. To start with, effective performance management systems are among the tools for measuring and improving productivity. Productivity improvement is a matter of great concern in numerous organizations – private or public. In this context, employee performance management system has been considered a potent tool for measuring and facilitating productivity improvement (Kuvaas, 2006).

Roberts (2003) has highlighted the importance of employee participation in the performance evaluation and management process. The article summarizes the conceptual foundation of participation including its intrinsic motivational value, the expansion of available information, and the opportunity to interject employee voice. Roberts, argues that participatory performance appraisal is an essential attributes of effective performance management systems. His article also concludes that lack of training, absence of rater accountability, and resistance to honest subordinate feedback are some of the factors that impede effective performance management processes.

Akhtar and Khattak, (2013) evaluates employees’ satisfaction with the appraisal system and the appraisal ratings. Issues of employee perception of appraisals’ fairness and justice were also examined. The methodology involves the use of cross cultural sample drawn from Mexico, India, Korea, Norway, Finland and Saint Lucia, USA. The authors reported that an appraisal system having an appropriate appeal procedure, dual purpose and employees’ participation in its design generally has high level of employee acceptability and satisfaction with the system. They also suggested that an appraisal model incorporating factors of organizational justice in the context of respective cultural dimensions was essential for performance management acceptability.

Machingambi, Maphosa, Ndofirepi, Mutekwe and Wadesango (2013) adopted a qualitative survey design to examine the challenges experienced by 451 teachers when implementing the Performance Management System (PMS) in Zimbabwean high schools. The study found that lack of training on Performance Management (PM), abuse of the system by school heads, failure by school management to provide staff development programmes, lack of meaningful reward as well as

http://www.ijmsbr.com
shortage of resources were the major obstacles affecting the implementation of the system. However, Machingambi, et al (2013) study did not consider the problem of acceptability and poor feedback as part of the challenges.

Malik, Bahadar, Faqir, Hassan and Hamad, (2011) explores fairness perceptions of performance appraisal system in Pakistani civil service. Organizational justice related factors such as; procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informational were considered. Their results show that appraises’ perceive the system fair as diagnosed by four factors of justice. Moreover, high interpersonal justice and distributive justice also revealed issues with the Pakistani PM system.

Nyaoga, (2010) evaluated the effectiveness of performance appraisal system at private universities in Kenya. Their study evaluated the purpose of performance appraisal in private universities and identified relevant factors for achieving an effective performance appraisal. Adekunle, (2010) examined the relationship between open reporting system of performance evaluation and teachers’ perceived productivity in Lagos State, and suggested that teachers performance appraisal system should be based on objectivity and be devoid of prejudice and bias.

Mayer and Davis, (1999) conducted a field quasi-experiment to determine the effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management. The result of the 14-month field experiment suggests that implementation of a more acceptable performance appraisal system increased trust for top management. In their study, three proposed factors of trustworthiness (ability, benevolence, and integrity) mediated the relationship between perceptions of the appraisal system and trust for management.

Adopting a cross-sectional survey, Akinyele (2010) evaluates the effectiveness of performance appraisal system at private universities in Nigeria. The study evaluated the purpose of performance appraisal in private universities and identifies relevant factors for achieving an effective performance appraisal. He established that performance appraisal system is the only tangible metric by which an organization can know the level of performance of its employees. The author recommends training of the members of staff involved in the rating/appraising process and multi-rating systems.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design
The study adopted survey design. According to Sekaran, (2001) survey design describes the methodology used to investigate population by selecting samples to analyze and discover occurrences. It also describes the variables of interest while allowing generalization to be made from large population when representative samples are drawn (Behling, 2005). Using a survey design enables the researchers to adopt both quantitative and qualitative procedure for data collection and interpretation. In addition, Survey design was used for its economy, ease of data collection and interpretation through structured questionnaire, and ability to understand the characteristics of the population under study.

3.2 Population of the Study
A population is the whole set of individual and other conceivable elements which form the subject of study in a particular survey (Dixon-Ogbechi, 2002; Asika, 1999). Therefore the population of this study consisted of all managers of Multichoice Nigeria (MCN) Limited; operators of the popular Digital Satellite Television (DSTV) network in Africa. Accessible record from the official webpage of the company shows that total population size of employees at the time of this study was 120 staff excluding channel partners’ staff members.

3.3 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size
The sample for the study comprised of fifty (50) employees ranging from top management to lower level management. The sampling technique used was simple random sampling. This technique allows every member of the population equal chance of being represented in the survey. The simple random sampling was facilitated by using the list of names of managers collected from the HR department, and this method was chosen to give a fair distribution and representation amongst all the eight departments in the company.

The distribution of sample among the three major groups of employees in the company was as demonstrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Research Instrument and Validation
Structured questionnaire was adopted as the appropriate research instrument for the survey. The questionnaire was designed in such a way that it would facilitate the
desired responses from the participants bearing in mind the objectives of the study. The questionnaire addressed both the socio demographic characteristics of the respondents, and ten (10) simple but relevant questions drawn from each research question. The questionnaire adopted a multiple scaling structure, thus while some items were presented in 5-point Likert scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree, others were simply ‘Yes and No’ scale questions. In addition, there were two open ended questions to give respondents opportunity to be more expressive in their response. The open ended questions were to facilitate the qualitative analysis of data and to complement the quantitative findings.

To ensure reliability and scale validity of the instrument, the questionnaire items and its scale were checked and approved by experts who are knowledgeable in the subject before administering to the target population. To further ensure the reliability of the instrument used in this study, a pilot survey was carried out on 10 respondents bearing similar characteristics with that of the surveyed population. Thereafter, the instrument was adjusted accordingly as it also gave a reason for the inclusion of the two open ended questions.

3.5 Sources and Procedure for Data Collection
Data were collected for the study through two sources: primary and secondary sources. Primary source enables the collection of primary data and it consisted of the use of questionnaire to get first hand information. Secondary sources assisted in the collection of secondary data, and it consisted of textbooks, publication, and electronic journals articles. To facilitate the collection of primary data, administration and collection of copies of questionnaires was carried out at the point of duty of respondents within the company premises.

3.6 Method of Data Analysis
Data collected from the field was processed individually on the basis of the stated research questions. Tables and frequency distribution and charts were constructed to facilitate lucid presentation of facts. The processing and analysis of data was facilitated by the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
In terms of socio-demographic characteristics of respondents, Table 1 (see appendix for all tables) shows that 27 male and 23 female respondents participated in the study adding up to 50 respondents. From the 27 male respondents, 7(25.9%) were below the age of 30 years, 18(66.7%) were between the ages of 30-40, 1(3.7%) respondent was between age 41-50, and another 1(3.7%) was above 51 years old. Similarly, Out of the 23 female participants in this study, 13(56.5%) were below the age of 30, 10(43.5%) and were between the ages of 30-40. Other age groupings had no female respondent. This implies that the study was made up of more female than male respondents, and majority of respondents (both male and female) were between 30-40 years. Table 2 shows cross tabulation of the respondents’ educational qualification and length of work experience. It is clear from the table that graduates with either HND, B.Sc or B.A degree constituted the highest number (31) of respondents in the study while OND/NCE certificate holders made up the least number (6) of participants in the study, an indication of the fact that the study was carried out among highly educated groups of people who were expected to make meaningful contributions to solving the problem at hand. Similarly, 35(70.0%) respondents had between 1-5 years working experience, 13(26.0%) had between 6-10 years of work experience with the organization, and only 2(4.0%) respondents has work with the organization between 11-15 years. Thus, majority of respondents has a good number of years of working experience necessary to understand the subject matter of the study and to contribute meaningfully.

Regarding extent of employee’s awareness of prevailing performance evaluation system in the organization, Table 3 indicate that 13(26.0%) of respondents claimed that at induction, they were informed about the performance appraisal model used in the Organization. On the other hand, a huge number of respondents 37(74.0%) refuted the claim. This suggests that most employees were unaware of the prevailing system of performance management in the organization. In addition, it can be observed in Table 4 that majority of respondents 17(34.0%) believed that performance assessment and management practices in the organization is objective and fair. In like manner, 8(16.0%) claimed that it is simple, 6(12.0%) opined that it is complicated, another 6(12.0%) adjudged it as subjective, 5(10.0%) were indifferent, 5(10.0%) and 3(6.0%) claimed that it’s efficient and inefficient respectively. From the result it can be inferred that PM in Multichioce is objective and fair. From Table 5, 29(58.0%) argued that Performance management system in the company does not give a proper assessment of workers’ contribution to the organization. Meanwhile, 21(42.0%) agreed that it actually does.
disagreed, and 2(4.0%) strongly disagreed. The response shows no clear cut decision pointer considering the percentage of indifferent responses. Table 7 shows that 8(16%) respondents strongly agreed and 19(38.0%) agreed that employees are provided performance based feedback and counseling. In the same vein, 15(30.0%) were indifferent, 7(14.0%) disagreed, and 1(2.0%) strongly disagreed. On Table 8, 22(44.0%) respondents are of the opinion that they are generally satisfied with the staff performance review system in their organization, while 28(56.0%) respondents had opposing opinion.

From the data so far analysed, results seems to point to the fact that most employees are unaware of the prevailing system of performance management in the organization. Thus, the nature and workings of performance appraisal seems not very clear to those whose performance it was meant to evaluate in the first place. This simply means that management of the organization has responsibility to communicate and educate employees on how its performance evaluation model operates. It is one thing to have a fantastic model of evaluating and managing staff performance and another for workers to understand its modus operandi.

In addition, findings reveal that even though workers rated the operating performance evaluation system as fair and objective in its appraisal, most employees feel that the company’s performance management system has failed to give a proper assessment of their contributions to the organization. This suggests that issues of unacceptability, distrust, and misfit between PM and organization strategic goal is still prevalent.

Findings also shows that workers are generally not satisfied with the staff performance review system of Multichoice limited. This may be as a result of poor communication of the processes and feedback as well. The findings from the qualitative responses seem to further buttress this view. Respondents also suggested several obstacles to effective performance management system. This ranges from unquantifiable goals and unrealistic performance standard, to lack of proper monitoring of performance, and defective rating criteria that neither align with the actual job description nor contribute to overall organizational objectives. It is also established in this study that workers need to be aware of the actual model of PM system operational in the organization. This would facilitate acceptability, and ensures trust in management. This position finds support in the works of Dhiraj & Shweta (2013), Mayer & Davis (1999), Malik et al. (2011). For instance, Dhiraj & Shweta (2013) found that employees that are aware and understands the operating mechanism of their company’s performance evaluation system tend to accept the outcome as objective and as actual contribution of their performance to the organisation.

Other challenges besetting effective performance management as shown in this study include: biased and subjective judgments, ignoring staff suggestions and contributions, poor/non-existence of feedback communication mechanism, lack of post evaluation counseling and training, poor reward and incentive structure, and staff promotion and training based on subjective factors instead performance evaluation outcome.

5. CONCLUSION

The significance of performance management, being a crucial HR strategy can hardly be overemphasized for employee productivity organizational success. Unfortunately, some organizations fail in their effort to implement effective performance management system. Consequently, the effects are observed in retarded work progress, declining commitment and dwindling productivity. This study concludes that employee performance management is an important tool to evaluate performance, recognized good performance and valuable employees, and at the same time identify skills that beg for redevelopment.

Similarly, the study concludes that the organisation must device effective means of communicating performance evaluation outcome to employees. This will increase faith in the system, increase acceptability, objectivity, and trust and improve productivity. More importantly, the implementation of a 360 degree feedback PM system is recommended as a very reliable and highly beneficial technique for the organisation. This finding is supported by Akhtar & Khattak.(2013), Luthans,(2003). Luthans,(2003), argued that the 360 degree feedback PM system is reputable in firms operating in a highly competitive sector requiring highly competent and skilful workforce such as the organisation of focus in this study.

The study also concludes that the firm needs to be watchful of several factors which may impede the successful implementation of the recommended PM system. Accordingly, the obstacle includes unquantifiable goals and unrealistic performance standard, lack of proper monitoring of performance, and defective rating criteria, biased and subjective
judgments, ignoring staff suggestions and contributions, poor/non-existence of feedback communication mechanism, lack of post evaluation counseling and training, poor reward and incentive structure. The above findings substantiate those of (Luthans, 2003; Malik et al 2011).

6. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, it is suggested that the firm should implement effective performance management systems based on performance objective and feedback processes. This has proven to be a good option based on the field analysis as well as literature review undertaken in this study. However, its success for the company would depend on the judicious implementation of the following programmes:

- Determining the overall objective of the company and jointly set specific and quantifiable objectives/targets for all staff.
- Putting in place mechanism for monitoring ongoing work performance and correcting deviation where noticeable.
- Putting in place reliable appraisal mechanism and ensure that employees understand how performance is to be measured.
- Determining relevant and key performance indices. This has to be in agreement with staff job description, and must show how these indices contribute towards achieving the overall goal of the firm.
- Training managers and supervisors on how to carry out reliable, unbiased and objective evaluation of workers performance.
- Putting in place communication process where performance appraisal outcome is continuously made known as feedback to workers.
- Making recommendation for promotion and other incentives based on good performance that meet or exceed targets.
- Providing counselling /skill development for staff whose performance falls short of expected standard.
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### APPENDIX

**TABULAR RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS**

Table 1: Age of the Respondents classified by their Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent's Sex</th>
<th>Age of Respondent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 30yrs</td>
<td>30-40yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 2: Educational Qualification of Respondent classified by their Length of Work Experience in the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' Years of Experience in the Company</th>
<th>OND/NCE</th>
<th>HND/B.Sc/B.A</th>
<th>M.Sc/MBA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5yrs</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perent (%)</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perent (%)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perent (%)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015
Question 1: Were you informed about the Performance Appraisal model, used in the Organization during your induction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Question 2: How do you find the Performance assessment and management practices in this Organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective/Fair</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

QUESTION 3: In your opinion, does the Performance management system in this company give a proper assessment of your contribution to the organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Field Survey, 2015

QUESTION 4: To what extent do you agree with the statement that staff input and suggestion are highly encouraged during performance assessment process in your department.

Table 6: Respondents’ opinion on question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

QUESTION 5: To what extent do you agree with the statement that employees are provided performance based feedback and counseling in this organization.

Table 7: Respondents’ opinion on question 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

QUESTION 6: Overall are you satisfied with the staff performance review system of this organization?

Table 8: Respondents’ opinion on question 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015