

INFLUENCE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY AMONG COUNTY GOVERNMENTS IN KENYA

^{1*} **Colleen Bosibori Mayaka**
bosiboricolleen@yahoo.com

^{2**} **Dr. Oluoch Oluoch (Ph. D)**
oluochjoluoch@gmail.com

¹ *MBA student, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya*

² *Lecturer, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya*

Abstract: *It has been argued that performance appraisal is an important component in measuring and improving organizational performance and consequently employee productivity. However, it has also been argued that when the appraisal is done devoid of proper appraisal criteria, feedback and a reward system; staff morale, motivation and productivity may be significantly negatively affected. However, the extent to which the performance appraisal as exercised by the County Governments influence the aspect of employee productivity had not been studied exhaustively and thus, this study elaborated the situation. This study thus sought to determine the influence of performance appraisal on employee productivity at the County Governments.*

Significance: *This study is of significant to the County Governments management with information about the state and aspects of proper and effective performance appraisal and how performance appraisal will help improve employee productivity.*

Theories: *Expectancy theory, theory of planned behaviour and the Hertzberg's two-factor theory anchored the study and utilized a descriptive research design to target the 1199 staff from five County Governments, which included: Homabay, Bomet, Kericho, Nyamira and Kisii Counties.*

Findings: *The results show that: performance appraisal criteria ($\beta=.373$, $t=3.943$, $p<0.001$); performance appraisal feedback ($\beta=.153$, $t=1.086$, $p<0.004$); performance appraisal rewarding ($\beta=.304$, $t=1.747$, $p<0.001$); performance appraisal training ($\beta=.332$, $t=3.947$, $p<0.001$) had significant positive influence on employee productivity in County Governments. The study therefore recommends that: The County Governments' management through their human resource departments should devise new performance appraisals that factor in best practice and best fit criteria that are canvassed and agreed upon by majority of employees.*

Keywords: *employee productivity, performance appraisal criteria, performance appraisal rewards*

I. INTRODUCTION

To achieve organizational outcomes every organization must be deeply concerned about the performance attributed to employees. Singh, Kochar, and Yuksel (2010) assert that such organizational performance and organization success can be accredited significantly to performance appraisal.

Performance criteria basically create the platform for assessing the employees' performance and their input towards desirable organization goals. It comprises of the required outputs expected from employees. Dattner (2010) further asserts that performance criteria must be associated with goals, pertinent to offered roles, precise and measurable, within the control of employees and understood and acknowledged by participants.

The Kenyan situation is no different as a study done by Gichuhi, Abaja, and Ochieng (2013) which sought to establish the aspects of performance appraisal and how they impact employee productivity in Kenya; found out that aspects of feedback and appraisal criteria had a positive effect on employee productivity. However, the study did not comprehensively measure the aspect of productivity as it only looked at general output of employees but not the produced volume against the target set as this study did. Finally, the study while looking at feedback, rewards and criteria missed the important element of training which this study included.

Further, the spectacle of performance appraisal has had certain salient problems with Blau (2015) in a study done in Kenya, mentioning that performance appraisal has created employee apathy with many of them being scared of the actions inherent in the assessment. Blau (2015) mentions that the possible reason for this could be lack of proper rewards after completion of the appraisal. Further, criticism has been presented with notable literature suggesting that there exist very few significant studies that looks at performance appraisal and its reward system and its subsequent impact on employee productivity. On productivity, it is important to note that productivity or output of an organization is contingent on how proper the performance of said employee is appraised and assessed. Dzinkowski (2010) defined productivity as value, quality and volume of the main product or service which is provided by an organization. Basically, productivity is what emanates from the elements of production. There is thus need to consider the influence of performance appraisal and its elements of rewarding, appraisal criteria and appraisal feedback on employee productivity.

Employee Performance Appraisal

According to Gikonyo (2017) performance appraisal significantly influenced productivity. The relationship was that with a given system of appraisal, individuals would be demoralized and therefore less productive. The available evidence supported this suggestion but could not be conclusive given that there were several employee performance appraisal methods. However, the important thing was that the method used could have influence on an individual employee and the results should be acceptable to the individual. Without this, there would be danger that any performance appraisal could have negative effects on the productivity. From the study by Chebet (2015) county Governments needed to understand and implement strategies that would enhance the productivity of employees in order to get desired results from them. This was becoming more challenging and difficult due to competitive nature of organizational environment. Although when the National government of Kenya was devolved into County governments, most people left their original place of work and sought employment in the County Government, the challenge was that 20% of the jobs in the County Government were basically on contract and 80% are on permanent basis. Therefore, this study discussed on the ways that the County government would have to adopt in order to retain their employees on job and ensure good performance.

Employee Productivity

On the study by Elliot (2009), it revealed that employee productivity is basically related to performance in terms of individual goals. Performance measurement is one of the most difficult topics for managers. Measuring performance is the same as performance appraisal. Performance appraisal gives an evaluation of how an individual employee is performing and gives an understanding into what such an employee would have to do to raise their effectiveness. Some employers fix employee compensation on the basis of their scores in

performance measures. There many aspects that are considered during such exercises. The most recognizable is suggested to be the rate of completion of assigned tasks, the accuracy and deliverability of such tasks. According to Coole (2012) such measures are difficult and often inaccurate. In such circumstances, depending on them for anything could be biased to the employee. Hirt (2011) described productivity as the level of an individual's work achievement after having put effort. They believe that productivity is an individual experience. However, certain environmental factors will have an essential bearing on performance. According to Hirt (2011), ascertained the individuals work as attempted by various evaluations gives the organization certain benefits. Evaluations and assessments could also have a negative effect on the individual. The managers should also seek the kind of organizational culture where people associate their interests with that of the corporation, find dignity and satisfaction in their work, with consequent effects on increased productivity, morale and pride in being part of the organization (Martyn, 2012).

Performance Appraisal and Employee Productivity

According to the study by Kane and Lawler (2009) competent appraisal of individual performance in an organization improves the overall effectiveness of the entity. Kane and Lawler (2009) indicated that, the three major functional areas of performance appraisal systems are administrative, informative, and motivational. Appraisals affect the administrative activities by facilitating an orderly means of determining the increment of compensation, and of delegating authority and responsibility to the most able individuals. The motivational role entails creating a learning experience that motivates employees to improve their performance. When effectively used, performance appraisals assist employees and managers to establish goals for the period before the next appraisal. Appraisees, appraisers or managers, and organizations get benefits from effective performance appraisals (Jocelyn, Kimanichege, & Musiega, 2013). Appraisees benefit in various ways; for instance, they discover what is expected of them and are able to set goals. They also gain a better insight of their weaknesses and strengths and can adjust behaviour accordingly. In addition, appraisals generate a constructive forum for providing feedback to employees about individual behaviour, and for allowing employees to provide input to their managers. Finally, appraisees are given assistance in preparing plans to improve behaviour, and are capable of getting a better grasp on the goals and priorities of the organization.

The County Governments

In August 2010, the people of Kenya adopted a new constitution, The Constitution of Kenya, 2010 to replace the old constitution of independence from the colonial rule in 1963. The adoption of the new constitution brought with it many significant changes in how the people of Kenya wanted to be governed. The Constitution of Kenya, 2010 in article 6 (1), created devolved units of government known as counties, divided into 47 counties as specified in the First Schedule. These counties are funded by the national government through the exchequer so as to carry out various functions and achieve various objectives as specified in the Constitution, among them is to promote social and economic development and the provision of proximate, easily accessible services throughout Kenya. Barret, Mude, and Omiti (2007) claim that a key economic benefit of devolved governments is its ability to efficiently promote productive efficiency in the provision and use of public services and the allocation of resources. The core idea is that sub-national governments by virtue of their proximity to the beneficiaries of policy outcomes can allocate and extract resources more efficiently than central government.

This is because they have better access to local information, are more directly accountable to local constituents and can more effectively identify and articulate regional needs. Performance appraisals are meant to facilitate county governments to develop and implement Projects and plans as a performance management tool, in

pursuant to section 47 of the County Governments Act 2012. For purposes of ensuring comparability and standardization in public service, performance of public agencies is measured in accordance with the following criteria: Finance & Stewardship, Service Delivery, Non-financial and Dynamic/Qualitative criteria strategic objectives are drawn from the Integrated Development Plan of the County. How far the appraisals have impacted on employee productivity has not been studied exhaustively, hence the need for the study to have been carried out.

Statement of the Problem

It has been argued initially that performance appraisal is an important component in measuring and improving organizational performance and consequently employee productivity. However, it has also been argued that when the appraisal is done devoid of proper appraisal criteria, feedback and a reward system; staff morale, motivation and productivity may be significantly negatively affected. The County Governments has shown varied performance in the last two financial years despite having a robust performance appraisal mechanism (Republic of Kenya, 2015). However, the extent to which the performance appraisal as exercised by the County Governments has influenced the aspect of employee productivity has not been studied exhaustively and thus unknown and this study will help to describe the situation. Three notable and recent studies have been done on performance appraisal and employee performance. The first study was done by Jocelyn, Kimanichege, and Musiega (2013) on the effects of performance appraisal on employee productivity of Mumias Sugar Company in Kenya. The study found out that there is a significantly positive influence of performance appraisal on organizational efficiency. However, the study did not consider the important and particular constructs of performance appraisal that are rewards, feedback and appraisal criteria and how they influence productivity as this study did.

The second study was much recently done by Zafrullah, Khan, and Irfanullah (2017) on the influence of performance appraisal on employee performance with a moderating consideration of motivation of employees working in commercial banks in Pakistan. The study found out that performance appraisal had a more significant and positive influence on motivation of staff than on performance implying that the innate wellbeing of employees was importantly impacted by the appraisal than the more mechanistic aspects of performance like profitability and market share. However, firstly, the study looked at the financial sector which is different from the County Governments which is the area of the present study. Secondly, the study looked at performance appraisal and how it influences performance but not employee productivity as this study will do. The third study was done by Gichuhi, Abaja, and Ochieng (2013) which sought to establish the aspects of performance appraisal and how they impact employee productivity in Kenya. The study found out that aspects of feedback and appraisal criteria had a positive effect on employee productivity. The above mentioned studies focused in most cases on other organizations apart from county governments. Also, all the above-mentioned studies and many others have looked at the private sector but none in the public sector and hence this study was very important. Thus, the study sought to establish the influence of performance appraisal on employee productivity at the County Governments.

Research Objectives

The objectives of this study were based on influence of performance appraisal on employee productivity in the County Governments in Kenya, with the following specific objectives;

- i. To determine the influence of performance appraisal criteria on employee productivity in the County Governments in Kenya.

- ii. To determine the influence of performance appraisal feedback on employee productivity in the County Governments in Kenya.
- iii. To determine the influence of performance appraisal rewards system on employee productivity in the County Governments in Kenya.
- iv. To determine the influence of performance appraisal training on employee productivity in the County Governments in Kenya.

Research hypotheses

H₀₁: Performance appraisal criteria do not have significant influence on employee productivity in the County Governments in Kenya.

H₀₂: Performance appraisal feedback does not have significant influence on employee productivity in the County Governments in Kenya.

H₀₃: Performance appraisal reward system does not have significant influence on employee productivity in the County Governments in Kenya.

H₀₄: Performance appraisal training does not have significant influence on employee productivity in the County Governments in Kenya

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study utilized a descriptive research design to target the 1199 staff from five County Governments, which included: Homabay, Bomet, Kericho, Nyamira and Kisii Counties. To get the sample size, stratified sampling technique was used to categorize the diverse elements of the staff and after this categorization, simple random sampling was used to get 360 respondents. Questionnaires were the data collection instruments. To determine the reliability of research instruments, the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha model was employed to a reliable figure of 0.79. Quantitative data was analysed using descriptive analysis in form of percentages, frequencies and means. Both correlation and Regression analyses as inferential statistical tools were used to test for relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable.

III. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Employee Productivity

The study sought to find out the concept of employee productivity as exercised by the County Governments. The results are as seen in table 1.

Table 1: Employee Productivity

	SA		A		N		D		SD		Mean	StD
	C	P	C	P	C	P	C	P	C	P		
I feel motivated to work hard	20	6.7%	50	16.7%	40	13.3%	115	38.3%	75	25.0%	3.79	.94
I rarely meet my productivity targets	45	15.0%	135	45.0%	40	13.3%	55	18.3%	25	8.3%	3.17	.89
I often do not surpass my performance targets	20	6.7%	155	51.7%	45	15.0%	60	20.0%	20	6.7%	3.99	.83

The presence of performance targets does not act as a driving force to enhance my productivity	40	13.3%	150	50.0%	40	13.3%	40	13.3%	30	10.0%	2.16	1.1
I seldom feel demotivated	20	6.7%	50	16.7%	40	13.3%	115	38.3%	75	25.0%	3.69	.87

Key: C-Count, P-Percent Maximum=5 Minimum=1

From Table 1 it is manifest from the responses that a 63.3% majority disagreed with the assertion that since the inception of performance appraisal, the employees of the County Governments had felt motivated to work hard. Just 23.3% agreed and the rest at 13.3% were undecided. This suggests that the production in these counties was dwindling and performance appraisal had not necessarily precipitated any improvements as far as the production volume was concerned. This result is supported in literature by Denisi (2016) noting that the performance appraisal process is the conversion of management thought into action that leads to reporting on employee performance but it does not in itself change behaviour or do the desirable work itself as there are certain other forces like resource mobilization and the like that have an impact on productivity and organization performance. Again, when the respondents were asked if they rarely met their productivity targets, 60.0% said yes, 26.7% said no and just 13.3% were neutral. This suggests that the counties had for a significant period witnessed low production. As Ishaq, Iqbal, and Zaheer (2009) had noted, a successful County Government necessitates that the organization’s administrative fundamentals have a strategy supportive structure that can be measured by performance appraisals but the appraisals in themselves can be present while the task and production accomplishments go down.

The result here offers a glimpse to the idea that there is need to relook at the performance appraisal mechanism to ensure that it finally looks at how employees can generate better performance feedback in the long run. When asked whether the employees did not surpass their performance targets, more than half at 58.3% agreed, less employees at 26.7% disagreed and only 15.0% were neutral. This gives an important indication that possibly the reason for not surpassing the performance targets might be due to the production challenges. Notably, Gortner, Mahler, and Nicholson (2013) observed that the effective process to improve productivity which sometimes does not happen is the conversion of simple strategic thought and operational processes into action comprising the following important steps: recognizing measurable, jointly determined annual objectives, mounting specific functional strategies, developing and communicating succinct policies to guide decisions and assigning resources. They noted that often this was never the case as the processes formulated were never transmuted to implementation thus dying a natural death and eventually disenfranchising the company productivity goals.

When asked if the presence of performance targets does not act as a driving force to enhance the productivity of employees, 63.3% agreed, 23.3% said no and 13.3% were neutral. This implies that productivity of the County Governments was not as it was desired because of the slow processes. Levy and Williams (2014) had mentioned that part of the reason that performance appraisal should be useful is so as to identify where challenges exist in the processes of an organization and ensure they are later rectified so that both productivity and performance can be improved. The result here seems to suggest that while the County Governments employ performance appraisal, it has not been effective enough to smoothen processes for better productivity. Finally, when asked if since the inception of performance appraisal, employees seldom felt demotivated, 63.3% disagreed, 23.3% agreed and 13.3% were neutral. This again, suggests that the production in these counties was dwindling due to demotivation and performance appraisal had not necessarily precipitated any improvements as far as the production volume was concerned. This result is supported in literature by Denisi

(2016) noting that the performance appraisal process is the conversion of management thought into action that leads to reporting on employee performance but it does not in itself change behaviour or do the desirable work itself as there are certain other forces like resource mobilization and the like that have an impact on productivity and organization performance. From the responses obtained, the idea of not surpassing the performance targets was the most significant as it had the highest mean score of 3.99 in as much as all other responses were reliable based on their means and standard deviation scores.

Performance Appraisal Criteria

The first objective sought to ascertain the influence of performance appraisal criteria on employee productivity. The result is as seen in table 2.

Table 2: Influence of Performance Appraisal Criteria on Employee Productivity

	SA		A		N		D		SD		Mean	StD
	C	P	C	P	C	P	C	P	C	P		
Performance appraisal rules are clear to employees	45	15.0%	80	26.7%	15	5.0%	95	31.7%	65	21.7%	3.38	.87
Performance appraisal procedures are clear to employees	30	10.0%	155	51.7%	15	5.0%	60	20.0%	40	13.3%	3.29	.88
Performance appraisal procedures are always discussed with employees before their implementation	71	23.3%	129	43.5%	10	3.3%	71	23.3%	19	6.7%	2.77	1.3
The performance appraisal approach has helped focus on the areas of performance	30	10.0%	165	55.0%	10	3.3%	71	23.3%	25	8.3%	2.95	.96
Performance appraisal process is fair to all employees	40	13.3%	179	60.0%	15	5.0%	40	13.3%	25	8.3%	2.60	.83

From table 2, it is clear that slightly more than half at 53.3% disagreed with the assertion that the performance appraisal rules are clear to employees. Here, just 41.7% agreed and 5.0% were neutral. This implies that a significant number of employees felt that there were insufficient rules and regulations that would lend themselves to some effective performance appraisal criteria. Notable empirical studies have been published on the significance of Performance appraisal and its criteria over time.

Najeeb (2011) studied Performance Appraisal in Pakistan and found that clear and reliable appraisal system is important in an organization and the outcomes accruing from the performance appraisal positively impacts the performance of any employee significantly. The study also highlighted that criteria is important to base the appraisal on fairness and reliability and that the criteria aspect was the single thing that rendered any appraisal valid or invalid. The result here shows that the criteria was in question and would impact negatively on employee productivity. When asked whether the rules and procedures were discussed and agreed to by the employees before they were enacted, 61.7% disagreed, 33.3% agreed and 5.0% were neutral. This implies that majority of workers felt that they needed to be part of the decision-making process to which they were not. This result appears to have a link in literature with Saeed and Shahbaz (2011) having examined employees' perception about the results of Performance appraisal and distinguished certain salient forces which do injure the fruitful application of performance appraisal. The findings show that the selected employees were cognizant of the practicality and worth of the performance appraisal but always need to be involved in the setting up of the criteria to feel involved. When asked if the performance appraisal procedures were clear to employees,

66.8% disagreed, 31.6% agreed, and 3.3% were undecided. This implies that the appraisal system criteria were not clear and a bit fuzzy.

Humble (2016) did an explanatory study to look at performance appraisal criteria in the service industry in the UK. From his findings he noted that a performance standard as a declaration of the circumstances which exist when tasks are achieved is needed. He suggested that when an organization is setting standards it would be necessary to consider standards that relate to quality, quantity, time, process and cost but that eventually what mattered is to ensure that the performance appraisal criteria were clear, consistent and effective if performance and productivity of employees were to be improved. The respondents were asked if the performance appraisal procedures were always discussed with the employees before their implementation. The result shows that 65.0% disagreed, 31.7% agreed and 3.3% were neutral. This implies that communication was an important performance appraisal criteria issue that the staffers wanted but clearly did not get. Mallaiah (2009) found out that a significant number of staff were of the opinion that performance appraisal at their organization was solely concerned with work performance and capability of taking responsibility of tasks.

The study also noted that effective performance appraisal criteria should put more emphasis on employee traits and should be acceptable to the employees if the process is to succeed. When the respondents were finally asked if generally, the performance appraisal process was fair to all employees; 73.3% disagreed, 21.7% agreed and only 5.0% were neutral. This implies that a significant number of employees felt that there were insufficient criteria that would lend themselves to some effective productivity. In agreement to this result, Najeeb (2011) found that clear and reliable appraisal system is important in an organization and the outcomes accruing from the performance appraisal positively impacts the performance of any employee significantly. The study also highlighted that criteria is important to base the appraisal on fairness and reliability and that the criteria aspect was the single thing that rendered any appraisal valid or invalid. Based on all the results mean and standard deviation, the results were significantly reliable.

Performance Appraisal Feedback

The second objective sought to establish the influence of performance appraisal feedback on employee productivity. The result is seen in Table 3.

Table 3: Influence of Performance Appraisal Feedback on Employee Productivity

Statements	SA		A		N		D		SD		Mean	StD
	C	%	C	%	C	%	C	%	C	%		
As an employee I receive constant feedback after the performance appraisal process	30	10.0%	35	11.7%	30	10.0%	145	48.3%	60	20.0%	2.78	1.7
The feedback has not been meaningful and unbiased	25	8.3%	115	55.0%	35	11.7%	40	17.3%	35	11.7%	3.25	.82
The performance appraisal feedback is clear and spells out what am doing right or wrong	60	20.0%	140	46.7%	35	11.7%	40	13.3%	25	8.3%	2.69	.83
performance appraisal feedback has enabled improvement of skills for better work productivity	50	16.7%	135	45.0%	30	10.0%	65	21.7%	20	6.7%	2.87	.94

Generally, performance appraisal feedback has not had a positive influence on productivity	25	8.3%	160	53.3%	50	16.7%	40	13.3%	25	8.3%	2.99	.74
--	----	------	-----	-------	----	-------	----	-------	----	------	------	-----

From Table 3 it is clear that when asked if as employees they received constant feedback after the performance appraisal process, the majority at 68.3% disagreed, 21.7% agreed and 10.0% were undecided. This implies that there was a problem with the way the organization gave feedback on the performance appraisal and this affected employee productivity. This could further lend credence to the assertion by Carroll and Schneier (2012) who ascertained that a major and significant condition to appraisal is to ensure that there is a transparent performance-based feedback to employees. They added that a workflow for tracking the laid down feedback sessions must be created. Further, that in the event of a mistake detected, an immediate remedial step must be undertaken, with minimum delay or loss to the company. The result here implies that there was thus a problem for the County Governments with poor feedback mechanism. When the respondents were asked if the feedback had been meaningful and unbiased, 63.3% disagreed, 25.0% agreed and 11.7% were undecided. This implies that consequent structure and all its attendant problems for the counties was skewed as it had its feedback mechanism both biased and not meaningful. In agreement Baruch (2016) noted that feedback was often haphazardly done to the extent that it had negative influences on employee performance. He argued that feedback went beyond just giving back results from appraisals but conversing with staff about areas to improve and what needs to be rectified in case of a mistake.

When the respondents were however asked whether performance appraisal feedback had enabled employees to improve their skills for better work productivity, 66.7% agreed, 21.7% disagreed and 11.7% were undecided. This gives a positive indication that whatever feedback employees received it had positively improved their competence for proper work. Denisi (2016) when discussing performance appraisal feedback argued that offering an employee with feedback is largely considered as a vital activity that may inspire and enable staff self-development which is important for the progress of the entire organization. They also argued that the frequency of feedback is vital also and can influence positively the future performance of the employee. Finally, on whether generally, performance appraisal feedback had had a positive influence on employee productivity, 61.7% disagreed, 28.3% agreed and 10.0% were undecided This implies that there was a problem with the way the counties gave feedback on the performance appraisal and this affected employee productivity. This could further lend credence to the assertion by Carroll and Schneier (2012) who ascertained that a major and significant condition to appraisal is to ensure that there is a transparent performance-based feedback to employees. They added that a workflow for tracking the laid down feedback sessions must be created. Further, that in the event of a mistake detected, an immediate remedial step must be undertaken, with minimum delay or loss to the company. The result here implies that there was thus a problem for the County Governments with poor feedback mechanism. All the results were meaningfully dependable based on the mean and standard deviation results.

Performance Appraisal Rewards System

The third objective of the study sought to determine the influence of performance appraisal rewards system on employee productivity. The result is as seen in table 4.

Table 4: Influence of Performance Appraisal Rewards System on Employee Productivity

	SA		A		N		D		SD		Mean	StD
	C	P	C	P	C	P	C	P	C	P		
Rewards are commensurate with performance	50	16.7%	155	51.7%	25	8.3%	60	20.0%	10	3.3%	2.48	.71
The rewards system makes us feel recognized	30	10.0%	155	51.7%	25	8.3%	70	23.3%	20	6.7%	2.95	1.8
Besides monetary, there is no intrinsic value we derive from non-monetary rewards	15	5.0%	65	21.7%	35	11.7%	135	45.0%	50	16.7%	2.59	.84
We look forward to the performance appraisal rewards	55	18.3%	145	48.3%	30	10.0%	40	13.3%	30	10.0%	2.49	.95
We feel motivated to work harder to attain performance targets if given the rewards	30	10.0%	145	48.3%	35	11.7%	65	21.7%	25	8.3%	2.72	1.1

Key: C-Count, P-Percent Maximum=5 Minimum=1

From the table 4, majority at 68.3% disagreed that rewards are commensurate with performance, 31.7% agreed and 5.0% were undecided. This implies that rewards could not commensurate with performance for the employees even if the performance was good in most County Governments. This is far removed from most literature that proposes its inclusion for employees. Bannister and Balkin (2010) found out that the expansion of reward management is considered in the manner of coercive where you work slower you lose your job and vice versa, remunerative which is given as a result only of hard work and normative which is basically premised on the idea that you work harder to accomplish the goals of the organization. The study also noted that employees are willing to work harder and produce more if the working hard is attendant to getting more rewards just in line with the postulations of the expectation theory. The respondents were asked if besides monetary, there is no intrinsic value we derive from non-monetary rewards. Here, 61.7% agreed, 30.0% disagreed and 8.3% were neutral. This is an indication that the main reward system where it existed was extrinsic and McBeath and Rands (2016) discussed salary administration and equitable salary relationships as a mechanism within performance appraisal. In their findings, they found that reward systems depend on proper job arrangement, intermittent salary surveys of competitive degrees, proper salary planning and employee appraisal but that often many unsuccessful companies did not give any rewards but in the event they did, they only offered money which in the long run is not as meaningful as the intrinsic kind. When thus asked if they looked forward to the performance appraisal rewards; 61.7% disagreed, 11.7% were neutral and 26.7% agreed. This is an indication that intrinsic rewards and motivation was missing in most County Governments.

Randell (2014) had reported from his descriptive survey that in the event of good performance that is both observed and rewarded, the odds of such performance being repeated are amplified, whereas poor performance is dejected or even chastised to diminish the chance of it occurring again. The study highlighted significant factors that help guarantee a fruitful reward process being: rewards can be utilized efficiently to improve interest and performance; rewards do not destabilize performance and attention; and verbal rewards create better task interest and performance. In addition, there were tangible rewards for motivation when given to persons for effecting complete works or for accomplishing particular performance ideals; rewards offered for creativity inspire widespread creativity in other jobs; reward systems must sustain the new subtleties and undercurrents of team-based companies and reward the appropriate team that has achieved the tasks as laid down; reward systems must distinguish both the significance of co-operation and the changes in personal

performance; difficulties can happen when reward systems put more emphasis on individual outcomes in as much as people have worked together in teams.

When the respondents were asked if they feel motivated to work harder if given rewards, 66.7% disagreed, 23.3% agreed and 10.0% were neutral. The information given here clearly shows that there was need for performance appraisal rewarding system to help spur employee productivity. The respondents were finally asked if generally, performance appraisal rewards had had a positive effect on employee productivity, 60.0% disagreed, 31.7% agreed and 8.3% were neutral. This implies that there were no rewards for the employees even if the performance was good in most County Governments. This is far removed from most literature that proposes its inclusion for employees.

Bannister and Balkin (2010) found out that the expansion of reward management is considered in the manner of coercive where you work slower you lose your job and vice versa, remunerative which is given as a result only of hard work and normative which is basically premised on the idea that you work harder to accomplish the goals of the organization. The study also noted that employs are willing to work harder and produce more if the working hard is attendant to getting more rewards just in line with the postulations of the expectation theory.

Performance Appraisal Training

The fourth objective sought to establish the influence of performance appraisal training on employee productivity. The result is as seen in table 5.

Table 5: Influence of Performance Appraisal Training on Employee Productivity

	SA		A		N		D		SD		Mean	StD
	C	P	C	P	C	P	C	P	C	P		
We are fully aware of training component of the performance appraisal structure	55	18.3%	135	45.0%	30	10.0%	60	20.0%	35	11.7%	2.92	.83
I am obligated to attend in-service training sessions	40	13.3%	90	30.0%	35	11.7%	125	41.7%	30	10.0%	3.67	.59
I feel the training structure is not synchronised with my training needs	45	15.0%	130	43.3%	35	11.7%	75	25.0%	30	10.0%	3.31	.93
I believe that training is an important element of performance appraisal	65	21.7%	115	38.3%	30	10.0%	65	21.7%	40	13.3%	2.87	.84
Generally, performance appraisal training has not had a positive effect on employee productivity	70	23.3%	130	43.3%	25	8.3%	50	16.7%	30	10.0%	2.90	.88

From table 5, it is clear that majority at 63.3% agreed that the employees were fully aware of training component of the performance appraisal structure. Just 31.7% were not sure and 5.0% were undecided. This is an indication that the respondents were aware of their advantage of training and how it worked to the betterment of employee productivity. Emeti (2015) agrees that inadequate skills and capabilities of the people involved in the performance appraisal have also been noted to cause problems. Besides, staffers do not always acquire the correct training and instruction to be able to do their work, which may have changed due to the

recent performance appraisal. When asked if the employees were obligated to attend in-service training sessions, majority at 51.7% disagreed, 43.3% agreed and only 5.0% were neutral. This is an indication that a significant number of staffers while noting the benefits of training felt they had sufficient skills to implement performance appraisal requirements. Degraft-Otoo (2012) notes that it is possible to have a necessary skill because it is a practical concept with limited but useful training. However, on the contrary, derisory or deficient training of human resources add significantly to an organizational challenge of fruitful implementation of productivity goals. Due to the skill shortage, it is not only problematic to recruit the dead-on talent but also to retain that talent. High executive exit sees too many key managers leave before a strategy is fully executed.

The respondents were asked if they felt that the training structure was not synchronised with their training needs. On this, 58.3% disagreed, 35.0% agreed and just 6.7% were undecided. This implies a long-standing opinion in organization management that counties need to focus on and specialize in continuous training of staff. This opinion is held by many other scholars with Sharma, Singh, Singh, and Singh (2012) finding out that in the scheme of things and comparatively, training is important for any organization even those that are struggling in terms of profitability, return on assets and equity and those that are emerging in terms of start-ups or rebranding. That being said, the study found out that training however was not very integral to performance appraisal strategy but more as an operational element to equip staff for better work. When asked whether training is an important element of performance appraisal, 60.0% agreed, 35.0% disagreed and 6.7% were neutral. This implies that despite the presence of continuous training for other reasons, manpower training and development is one of the central mechanisms through which the organization capitalizes in the workforce for higher return today, and even in the predictable future. Such training can help an organization to maintain competitive advantage (Sharma, Singh, Singh, & Singh, 2012).

Finally, the respondents were asked if generally, performance appraisal training had had a positive effect on employee productivity. Here, 66.7% of the respondents disagreed, 26.7% agreed and 6.7% were neutral. Organizational effectiveness is anchored on the well-organized and effective enactment of workforce that makeup the organization. The efficient and effective enactment of the workforce in turn, is anchored on the fruitfulness of the knowledge, skills and abilities controlled by the workforce (Emeti, 2015). Human resource training and development in many organizations is a continuous exercise. The unstoppable march of time and the perpetual glamour for social change link to make adaptability and continuing groundwork of the workforce as inevitable as the preliminary acquisition of knowledge and skills. From the responses obtained, training and skills being a continuous exercise was significant as it had the highest mean score of 3.01.

Correlation Analysis

As part of the analysis, Pearson's Correlation Analysis was done on the Independent Variables and the dependent variables. The results are as seen on Table 6.

Table 6: Correlations

		Employee productivity	Appraisal Criteria	Appraisal Training	Appraisal feedback	Appraisal rewarding
Employee productivity	Pearson Correlation	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N	300				
Appraisal Criteria	Pearson Correlation	.673**	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000				
	N	300	300			
Appraisal Training	Pearson Correlation	.638**	.418**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000			
	N	300	300	300		
Appraisal feedback	Pearson Correlation	.599	.490**	.347**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.112		
	N	300	300	300	300	
Appraisal rewarding	Pearson Correlation	.700**	.344**	.138	.257**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.087	.091	
	N	300	300	300	300	300

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Pearson correlation analysis tests for significance in the relationship connecting double or multiple variables. The measures in the case were generated from the summated scales derived from the independent and dependent variables. As referred to by Wong and Hiew (2005) the correlation coefficient value (*r*) series that shows 0.10 to 0.29 is measured as weak, the series that shows 0.30 to 0.49 is measured in the middle category and the series that shows 0.50 to 1.0 is looked at as strong. Yet, based on Field (2005) assertion, correlation coefficient must not exceed in any way the 0.8 mark so as to keep off the multicollinearity problem. Since the highest correlation coefficient is 0.700 which is below the 0.8 mark, there is no multicollinearity issue in the present study (Table 4.6). All the independent variables had a positive correlation with the dependent variable with performance appraisal rewarding having the highest correlation of ($r=0.700$, $p < 0.01$) followed by performance appraisal criteria with a correlation of ($r=0.678$ $p < 0.01$) and then performance appraisal training with a correlation of ($r=0.638$ $p < 0.01$), the least correlation was tagged to performance appraisal feedback ($r= 0.599$ $p < 0.01$). This indicates that all the variables (performance appraisal criteria, performance appraisal feedback, performance appraisal rewarding and performance appraisal training) are statistically significant at the 99% confidence interval level 2-tailed and have a positive relationship with employee productivity.

Regression Analysis

Because the measures that are used to evaluate the principal concepts in the model are quantitative scales, regression analysis can be utilized to accomplish this task. As part of the analysis, Regression Analysis was done and results are presented in Table 7, 8 and 9

Table 7: Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.772 ^a	.738	.731	.166

a. Predictors: (Constant), Performance appraisal criteria, performance appraisal feedback, performance appraisal rewarding and performance appraisal training

b. Dependent Variable: Employee productivity

From Table 7 it can be observed that the R value was .772 exhibiting a positive direction of the results. R is the correlation linking the observed and predicted scores that characterize the dependent variable. The values of R extend from -1 to 1(Wong & Hiew, 2005). The symbol of R designates the direction of the relationship (positive or negative). The total unqualified value of R designates the strength, with superior unqualified values demonstrating stronger relationships. Hence, the R value at .772 shows a stronger relationship amid observed and predicted values in a positive direction. The coefficient of determination R² value was 0.731. This shows that 73.1 per cent of the alteration in dependent variable (employee productivity) was explained and predicted by independent variables (Performance appraisal criteria, performance appraisal feedback, performance appraisal rewarding and performance appraisal training).

Table 8: ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	242.733	4	44.086	94.391	.000 ^a
	Residual	13.868	237	.674		
	Total	256.601	241			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Performance appraisal criteria, performance appraisal feedback, performance appraisal rewarding and performance appraisal training

b. Dependent Variable: Employee productivity

The F-statistics produced (F = 94.391.) was significant at 5 per cent level (Sig. F< 0.05), hence confirming the fitness of the model and consequently, there is statistically significant relationship between Performance appraisal criteria, performance appraisal feedback, performance appraisal rewarding and performance appraisal training and Employee productivity.

Table 9: Regression Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients		
1	(Constant)	2.717	.331	.267	4.573	.000
	Appraisal criteria	.355	.168	.373	3.943	.000
	Appraisal feedback	.258	.054	.153	1.086	.004
	Appraisal rewarding	.264	.065	.304	1.747	.000
	Appraisal Training	.309	.049	.332	3.947	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee productivity

From Table 9, the t-value of constant produced ($t = 4.573$) was significant at .000 per cent level (Sig. $F < 0.05$), thus confirming the fitness of the model. Consequently, there is statistically significant relationship between Performance appraisal criteria, performance appraisal training, Performance appraisal rewarding and performance appraisal feedback and Employee productivity.

Performance appraisal criteria with sig of .000 had a strong significance to Employee productivity and were thus statistically significant. This implies that performance appraisal criteria affected Employee productivity. Performance appraisal feedback with sig of .004 had a strong significance to Employee productivity and was thus statistically significant. This implies that performance appraisal feedback affects Employee productivity.

Performance appraisal rewarding with sig of .000 had a strong significance to Employee productivity and was thus statistically significant. Lastly performance appraisal training with sig of .000 had a strong significance to Employee productivity and was thus statistically significant.

$$Y = .267 + \beta_1 (.373) + \beta_2 (.153) + \beta_3 (.304) + \beta_4 (.332) + e$$

To support this results regression analysis, the summary of hypotheses is presented in Table 10 below.

Table 10: Summary of Hypotheses Testing Results

Hypotheses	Correlation Values	Conclusion
H_{0_1} : Performance appraisal criteria does not have significant influence on employee productivity in the County Governments	$r=0.700, p < 0.01$	Rejected
H_{0_2} : Performance appraisal feedback does not have significant influence on employee productivity in the County Governments	$r=0.678, p < 0.01$	Rejected
H_{0_3} : Performance appraisal rewarding does not have significant influence on employee productivity in the County Governments	$r=0.638, p < 0.01$	Rejected
H_{0_4} : Performance appraisal training does not have significant influence on employee productivity in the County Governments	$r=0.599, p < 0.01$	Rejected

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Influence of performance appraisal criteria on employee productivity

The first hypothesis stated that Performance appraisal criteria does not have significant influence on employee productivity. On this Performance appraisal criteria had a correlation of ($r=0.700$, $p< 0.01$) and regression results ($\beta=.373$, $t=3.943$, $p<0.001$). This is an indication that performance appraisal criteria had a statistically significant effect on employee productivity.

Influence of performance appraisal feedback on employee productivity

The second hypothesis stated that Performance appraisal feedback does not have significant influence on employee productivity. On this Performance appraisal feedback had a correlation of ($r=0.678$, $p< 0.01$) and regression results ($\beta=.153$, $t=1.086$, $p<0.004$). This is an indication that Performance appraisal feedback had a statistically significant effect on employee productivity

Influence of performance appraisal rewards system on employee productivity

The third hypothesis stated that Performance appraisal rewarding does not have significant influence on employee productivity. On this, Performance appraisal rewarding had a correlation of ($r= 0.638$, $p< 0.01$) and regression results ($\beta=.304$, $t=1.747$, $p<0.001$). This is an indication that Performance appraisal rewarding had a statistically significant effect on employee productivity.

Influence of performance appraisal training on employee productivity

The fourth hypothesis stated that performance appraisal training does not have significant influence on employee productivity. On this Performance appraisal training had a correlation of ($r= 0.599$, $p< 0.01$) and regression results ($\beta=.332$, $t=3.947$, $p<0.001$). This is an indication that Performance appraisal training had a statistically significant effect on employee productivity.

V. CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

Based on the objectives and findings of the study, the conclusions are as follows;

Based on the first objective, the County Governments did not have a set of rules and procedures that effectively ran the performance appraisal process and the rules and procedures were also not discussed and agreed to by the employees before they were enacted. Also, the performance appraisal criteria were not clear, consistent and effective and it had not worked to improve employee productivity because it was often unacceptable to employees. Finally, the performance appraisal criteria had not positively improved on employee productivity. It can therefore be concluded that lack of effective performance appraisal criteria had negatively influenced employee productivity in the County Governments Based on the second objective, it is clear that employees hadn't received constant feedback after the performance appraisal process and the feedback had always not been meaningful and unbiased. Further, however, performance appraisal feedback had enabled some employees to improve their skills for better work productivity. Finally, performance appraisal feedback had not had a positive influence on employee productivity. It can therefore be concluded that lack of effective performance appraisal feedback had negatively influenced employee productivity in the County Governments

Based on the third objective, employees did not get rewards after acceptable results from the performance appraisal and when they received them the rewards were mainly monetary which had not helped employees be motivated for better productivity. Further, the rewards were not intrinsic, in terms of job security, satisfaction and progress rewards, which had not helped employee be motivated for better productivity. The performance

appraisal rewards were important for employees to improve on productivity. Finally, performance appraisal rewards had not had a positive effect on employee productivity. It can therefore be concluded that lack of intrinsic performance appraisal rewards had negatively influenced employee productivity in the County Governments. Based on the fourth objective, the performance appraisal structure in the company had a significant training element but the counties had not significantly employed significant in-service training sessions that allowed employees to know what was needed to get a better result from the performance appraisal. Also, the training was not clearly structured with a curriculum which had thus not helped employees understand the demands of the performance appraisal. Moreover, training is important as an element in performance appraisal if employees are to improve the employee productivity but performance appraisal training had not had a positive effect on employee productivity. It can therefore be concluded that lack of effective performance appraisal training had negatively influenced employee productivity in the County Governments.

Recommendations of the Study

Based on the objectives and conclusions, this study recommends;

The County Governments' management through their human resource departments should devise new performance appraisals that factor in best practice and best criteria fit that are canvassed and agreed to by majority of employees.

The County Governments' management should ensure that employees receive consistent feedback, preferably within a month after filling in their performance appraisal forms.

The County Governments' management should devise a workable structure of both extrinsic but more intrinsic rewarding system for better performance. This study recommends that a select committee in every county be formed to get a good rewarding policy.

The County Governments' management should initiate quarterly training programs to improve employee competence for better work. The employees themselves should also on their own get professional training in their areas of work.

The National Government through the Ministry of Labour should revise the central principle of how performance appraisals are done to ensure the processes helps to harness the full potential of employees in counties.

Suggestion for further Research

This study suggests that additional research be done on barriers to employee productivity and how they impact on the County Governments' quality service delivery.

References

- Bannister, B., & Balkin, D. (2010). Performance evaluation and compensation feedback messages: An integrated model. Journal of Occupational Psychology, Vol. 63.*
- Barret, C., Mude, A., & Omiti, J. (2007). Decentralization and the Social Economics of Development: Lessons from Kenya. Nairobi: CAB International.*
- Baruch, Y. (2016). Self-performance appraisal vs direct-management appraisal: a case of congruence. Journal of Psychology, Vol. II: Issue 10, Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management.*
- Blau, G. (2015). Testing the Longitudinal Impact of Work Variables and Performance Appraisal. London, UK: British Psychological Society.*

- Carroll, S., & Schneier, C. (2012). *Performance Appraisal and Review Systems: The Identification, Measurement and Development of Performance in Organizations*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Chebet, J. (2015). *Determinants of employees' performance in the county governments of Kenya: A case of Bungoma County*. Nairobi, Kenya: University of Nairobi.
- Coole, A. (2012). *Theory and Practice of Management*. Boston, USA: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Dattner, B. (2010). Performance appraisal and performance. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 2, 34-45.
- Degraft-Otoo, E. (2012). *The Influence of Training on Employee Performance at Accra Polytechnic*. Accra, Ghana: Institute of Distance Learning, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.
- Denisi, A. (2016). *Cognitive Processes in Performance Appraisal: A Research Agenda with Implications for Practice*. London: Routledge Publishing Ltd.
- Dzinkowski, R. (2010). The value of intellectual capital. *The Journal of Organizational Strategy*, 21(4), 3-4.
- Elliot, A. (2009). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A meditational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 230-245.
- Emeti, C. (2015). *The Influence of Training on the Growth of Paint Manufacturing Firms in Nigeria*. *European Journal of Organization and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 66-74.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS, 2nd Edition*. London: Sage.
- Gichuhi, A., Abaja, P., & Ochieng, I. (2013). Effect of performance appraisal on employee productivity: a case of supermarkets in Nakuru Town, Kenya. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 2(11), 42 - 58.
- Gikonyo, F. (2017). *Factors affecting employees productivity in county governments in Kenya: A case study of the County Government of Laikipia*. Nairobi: University of Africa.
- Gortner, F., Mahler, J., & Nicholson, B. (2013). *Organizational Theory: An assessment of performance management in the organization*. *Journal of Organization Ethics*, 3(4), 345-456.
- Hirt, F. (2011). *Business: A changing world, 8th Edition*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Humble, J. (2016). *Improving Business Results*. London: McGraw Hill.
- Ishaq, H., Iqbal, M., & Zaheer, A. (2009). Effectiveness of performance appraisal: its outcome and detriments in Pakistan organizations. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(3), 479-485.
- Jocelyn, M., Kimanichege, G., & Musiega, D. (2013). Effects of performance appraisal on employee productivity: A case study of Mumias Sugar Company Limited. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 2(9), 51-57.
- Kane, J., & Lawler, E. (2009). Performance appraisal effectiveness: its assessment and determinants. In B. Staw, *Research in organizational behaviour* (pp. 425-478). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Khan, G., Khan, A., & Khan, A. (2011). Effect of training on organizational performance. *Global Journal of Management and Organizational Research*, 11(7).
- Levy, P., & Williams, J. (2014). The social context of performance appraisal: A review and framework for the future. *Journal of Management*, 30, 881-905.
- Mallaiah, T. (2009). Management of employee expectations, performance and satisfaction in university library: An empirical study. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, Vol. 36.

- Martyn, D. (2012). Ground Rules for Good Research. Philadelphia: Open University Press.*
- McBeath, G., & Rands, D. (2016). Salary administration. Business Books.*
- Morris, T., & Wood, S. (1991). Testing the survey method: continuity change in British industrial relations. Work Employment and Society, Vol. 5, No. 2, 259-282.*
- Najeeb, M. (2011). Performance Appraisal in Habib Bank Limited. Retrieved from Scribd.com: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/53151871/Performance-Appraisal-in-Habib-Bank-Limited>*
- Randell, G. (2014). Employee appraisal. In K. Sission, Personnel Management: A Comprehensive Guide to Theory and Practice in Britain (pp. 221-252). Blackwell: Oxford.*
- Republic of Kenya. (2015). Report of the Auditor General on the Financial Statements of County Government of Nyamira for the Year Ended 30 June 2015. Nairobi, Kenya: Office of the Auditor General.*
- Saeed, K., & Shahbaz, N. (2011). Employees perceptions about the effectiveness of performance appraisals: The case of Pakistan. SIU Journal of Management and Human Relations, 52, 1099-1113.*
- Sharma, S., Singh, S., Singh, P., & Singh, P. (2012). Performance appraisal and career development. VSRD International Journal of Business and Management Research, 2(1), 8-16.*
- Singh, V., Kochar, B., & Yuksel, S. (2010). An Empirical Study on the efficiency of performance appraisal system in Oil and Natural Gas Commission (ONGC). India Isletme Arastirmalari Dergisi, 2(2), 65-78.*
- Wong, C., & Hiew, P. (2005). Diffusion of mobile entertainment in Malaysia: drivers and barriers. Journal of Enformatika, Vol.5.*
- Zafrullah, K., Khan, A., & Irfanullah, K. (2017). Impact of performance appraisal on employee's performance including the moderating role of motivation: A survey of commercial banks in Dera Ismail Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Universal Journal of Industrial and Business Management, 5(1), 1-9.*