

**THE ASSESSMENT OF EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL
PRACTICE IN CASE OF WOLKITE UNIVERSITY TEACHING
SPECIALIZED HOSPITAL**



**WOLKITE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT**

**A RESEARCH ESSAY SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUEREMENTS FOR BACHILOR OF ART DEGREE IN MANAGEMENT**

SUBMITTED BY: BEENIYAM BISHAW

ID: 0237/14

ADVISOR: WULETAW F. (MBA)

Wolkite, Ethiopia

April, 2025

**WOLKITE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND
ECONOMICS UNDER GRADUATE STUDIES DEPARTMENT OF
MANAGEMENT**

**THE ASSESSMENT OF EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL
PRACTICE IN CASE OF WOLKITE UNIVERSITY TEACHING
SPECIALIZED HOSPITAL**

BY:-BEENIYAM BISHAW

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

_____	_____	_____
ADVISOR	SIGNATURE	DATE
_____	_____	_____
EXAMINER	SIGNATURE	DATE
_____	_____	_____
EXAMINER	SIGNATURE	DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and for most, I want to thank God, secondly I would be glad to extend my deepest gratitude and appreciations to my senior advisor WULETAW FENTE(MBA) , for his unreserved effort in providing me all the necessary and supervision at all steps of the work. His critical comment and encouragement have contributed a lot to the successful completion of the study. Finally, I would like to extend my sincerer indebtedness to all my family members for their moral and financial support.

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted in WKU specialized hospital on the assessment of performance appraisal practice. The main objective of this study was to identify the problems that being faced by the hospital on the evaluation system. For the purpose of this study, primary data was collected through questionnaire and interview, and secondary data was collected from the internet, books, and documents of the organization. The researchers also use a simple random sampling technique to collect data from employees. The collected data was processed and organized in a descriptive manner and organized using table and percentage with relevant discussion.

LIST OF TABLE

Table 4.1 General characteristics of the respondent.....	16
Table 4.1.1 Sex and age structure of the respondents	16
Table 4.1.2 Educational status and service year of employees in the bank	17
Table 4.2 Understanding of employees and officials on performance appraisal	18
Table 4.3 Employee toward performance appraisal	19
Table 4.4 Feeling of employees towards the evaluation system of the bank	19
Table 4.5 the criteria used to evaluate employees in the bank	20
Table 4.6 Employee participation and feedback from the bank regarding the appraisal	21
Table 4.7 Method of performance appraisal system	21
Table 4.8 The appraisal method that the bank used	22
Table 4.9 What employees get if they carry out their task properly	23
Table 4.10 Problems of performance appraisal	23
Table 4.11 Reasons for problems identified	24

Table Content	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	I
ABSTRACT	II
LIST OF TABLE	III
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2. Statement of the problem	2
1.3 Research question	2
1.4. Objective of the study	2
1.4.1. General objective	2
1.4.2. Specific objectives	3
1.5. Significance of the study	3
1.6. Scope of the study	3
1.7. Limitation of the study	3
1.8. Organization of the paper	4
CHAPTER TWO	5
REVIEW RELATED LITERATURE	5
2.1 Theoretical Review	5
2.1.1. Purpose of performance appraisal	5
2.1.2. The role of appraisal in managing performance	7
2.2. Performance Appraisal Methods	7
2.3 Potential problems in performance evaluation	9
2.3.1. Opposition to evaluation	9
2.3.2. System Design and operating problems	9
2.3.3. Rater problem	9
2.4. Role of supervision in appraising performance	10
2.5. Eliminating rates errors	11
CHAPTER THREE	14
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	14
3.1. Research Design	14
3.2. Data sources	14
3.3. Study Area	14
3.4. Sampling technique	14
3.5. Sample Size determination	15
3.6. Instruments of data collection	15
3.7. Data processing and analysis	15
CHAPTER FOUR	16
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS	16
CHAPTER FIVE	26
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	26
5.1. SUMMARY	26
5.2. Conclusion	27
5.3. Recommendations	29
Reference	32
Appendix I	33
Appendix II	35

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

The history of performance appraisal is quite brief. Its roots in the early 20th c can be traced to Taylors pioneering time and motion studies. But this is not very helpful. For the same may be said about almost everything in the field of modern human resource management. As a distinct and formal management procedure used in the evaluation of work performance, appraisal really dates from the time of Second World War not more than 60 years ago. It begins as simple methods of income justification.

(Http.... [www.performance appraisal.com](http://www.performanceappraisal.com)).

Performance appraisal is the process of determining and evaluating to an employee how he or she is performing on the job as establishing a plan of improvement when probably conducted performance appraisal is. Not only employees know how well they are performing but also influence their future level of effort and task direction (Bayers, 2009:289).

Performance appraisal is defined as the process of identifying, evaluating, and developing the work performance of the employee in the organization. So that organizational goals and objectives are effectively achieved while at the same time, benefiting employees in terms of recognition, recovering, feedback, and offering career guidance (Lanbury,1998).

The term performance assessment, performance evaluation, performance management are also used to describe the process the focus of performance appraisal is measuring and improving the actual performance of the employee and also the future performance of the employees (Swanpoel et al,2009)

Different organizations used performance appraisal to evaluate employee's performance. But according to some employees suggestion there have been problems regarding to performance appraisal practice. So this study tried to assess those problems in WKU specialized hospital.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Performance appraisal systems were important tools to help organizations work better by motivating employees, guiding their growth, and connecting their goals to the organization's objectives (Armstrong, 2010). When done well, these systems were meant to be fair, clear, and reliable, helping employees feel valued and focused on success. However, many government-run organizations, including public hospitals, often failed to use these systems properly. Common issues included mistakes in evaluations, unfair treatment, and biased judgments. These problems lowered employee morale and hurt overall performance.

WKU Specialized Hospital, a public hospital, was a clear example of this challenge. Even though performance appraisals were meant to improve productivity and fairness, the hospital faced repeated criticism over its appraisal process. Employees reported problems such as: Unfair ratings (e.g., managers rated everyone similarly, regardless of actual performance). Focusing only on recent work while ignoring longer-term efforts. Discrimination based on age, gender, or background. Inconsistent standards (some managers rated too harshly, others too leniently). These flaws made employees distrust the appraisal process, reduced their motivation, and prevented the hospital from achieving its goals for quality care and efficiency. This research aimed to explore how these appraisal problems at WKU Specialized Hospital led to unhappy employees and poor results for the organization. The study also suggested practical steps to fix the appraisal system, aligning it with fair and effective human resource practices.

1.3 Research question

So the study would try to answer the following basic questions.

1. What methods does the organization use to evaluate its employees?
2. What are the major problems that affect performance appraisal?
3. What will be the possible solutions of existing performance appraisal problems?

1.4. Objective of the study

1.4.1. General objective

The general objective of the study is to assess the problem related to performance appraisal at WKU Specialized Hospital.

1.4.2. Specific objectives

The specific objectives of the study are:

- I. To identify the criteria used for evaluating performance appraisal.
- II. To identify the major problems that affect performance appraisal.
- III. To suggest possible solutions to the existing appraisal problems.

1.5. Significance of the study

It gives the following importance

- I. It used as reference for other researchers who intend to further investigation.
- II. It helps managers of the organization to recognize the factors affecting performance appraisal and take corrective measures.
- III. The study could help the student researchers to acquire more insight and Experience of conducting research.
- IV. It may serve as a lesson for other organizations that are practicing similar work.

1.6. Scope of the study

Assessing all about performance appraisal will be unmanageable so, the paper deals with the criteria of the evaluation, the major problems and employees attitude towards performance appraisal. Due to time and budget constraints the study will be conducted in a single organization i.e. WKU specialized hospital.

1.7. Limitation of the study

- I. Low return of questionnaires
- II. The employees of the hospital were not voluntary to share information
- III. The employees carelessly filled the questionnaire.

1.8. Organization of the paper

This section gives structure of every chapter with in paper. The research paper also organized into five chapters:

The study encompasses five chapters the first chapter contains background of the study, statement of the problem, research objective, research question, scope of the study, limitation of the study and organization of the paper. The second chapter contains the literature review and the third chapter contains research methodology and the fourth chapter contains data analysis and interpretation and the last fifth chapter contains Summary, conclusion and recommendation.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Theoretical Review

Performance appraisal is the process of determining and communicating to an employee how he or she is performing on the job and, establishing a plan of improvement when properly conducted performance appraisals not only let employees know how well they are performing but also influence their future level of effort and task direction. Effort should be enhanced if the employee should be classified through the establishment of a plan for improvement (Byars, 2009; 289).

According to Aguinis (2007) performance means both behaviors and results. Behaviors originate from the performer and convert performance from concept to action. These definitions of performance lead to the conclusion that when managing the performance of teams and individuals both input (behavior) and output (results) need to be considered. Performance appraisal is the process of measuring what employees contribute to the organization. (Greg and Kenneth, 2009).

A more comprehensive definition of performance appraisal is a formal, structured system of measuring and evaluating on employee's job related behavior and outcomes to discover how and why the employee is presently performing on the job and how the employee can perform effectively in the future so that the employee, organization and society so all benefit. Performance appraisal is defined as evaluating an employee current or past performance relative to his/ her performance standards. The appraisal system therefore involves.

- ❖ Setting work standard
- ❖ Assessing the employee's actual performance
- ❖ Providing feedback to the employees with aim of motivating that person to eliminate performance do faience's or to continue to perform above (Desler,1999:312).

2.1.1. Purpose of performance appraisal

Performance appraisal of employees serves useful purposes they are

- I. A scientifically done appraisal provides vital information which can greatly help in making and enforcing decisions regarding promotions, pay increases termination and transfers. It permits each individual to be considered on the same basis as everyone else. It reduces the chances of nepotism, mutates individuals to

put in their best. A sound performance appraisal system can be of great use to a man power planner when confronted with the task of preparing a succession planning scheme.

- II. Systematize performance appraisal provides information on which performance comparison can be made.
- III. A good performance appraisal system helps in employer's development. The weakness once identified can be removed either by providing necessary training or through proper placement.
- IV. Appraisal result may be used to counsel with each employee about his future development this can be accomplished when the supervisor reports on the evaluation and tells each individual how he is doing and how he can improve.
- V. Performance appraisal provides a basis for the development guide for each reason. This guide should include identification of the individual position for which he seems best qualified, the limitations or training needs derived from a comparison of appraisal results with position requirements and recommendations for training to fill out the person's competence a schedule showing the development program should also be provided. This schedule will disclose when the candidate can be promoted to the next higher position with promise of successfully carrying out his duties (Hendry, 1995:161).

A) Administrative Purpose Helps us make administrative decisions relating to promotions, transfers, demotions, firings, layoffs, and compensation (merit pay increases). However, relying on performance appraisal information for promoting an employee does not guarantee in selecting suitable employees of the higher position. Because, performance appraisal data only show the current job performance of an employee but do provide some predictive information.

B) Development Purpose most organizations use performance appraisal information to determine employees needs for training and development which is essential for providing training and development to employees.

C) Motivation Purpose it can be used to determine employee's recognition, reward, bonus, growth and development. To improve the employees' performance and achieve their target goals, organizations use pay-for-performance programs (e.g., merit pay, incentives, bonus rewards).

D) Feedback Purpose is used as a means of communicating to employees how they are doing and suggesting needed changes in behaviors, attitude, skills, or knowledge. This type of feedback clarifies for employees the job expectations held by the manager.

2.1.2. The role of appraisal in managing performance

Many experts feel that traditional appraisal doesn't improve performance and may actually backfire. They argue that most performance appraisal systems neither motivate employees nor guide their development; furthermore, they cause conflict between supervisor and subordinate and lead to dysfunctional behaviors. The traits measured are often personal in nature, and who likes the idea of being evaluated on his/her honesty, integrity, team work, compassion, cooperation, objectively. In fact, traditional can be useless or counterproductive. Researchers in Korea recently found that even discussion and goals were clearly set and career issues discussed, few of the reviews had a positive impact on the employees' subsequent job performance. In a study of almost 300 Managers from Middle Western U.S. companies, 32% rated their performance appraisal as very effective, while only 4% rated them. Effective to a large extent. Another survey of 181 manufacturing and service organizations conducted that 11% had stopped using annual appraisals, while 25% more planned to discontinue them within two years. Some argue for dumping appraisals entirely. For example, quality management expert like W. Edwards Deming basically argues as follows: they say the organization is a system of interrelated parts, and that an employee's performance is more a function of factors like training, communication tools, and supervision than of his or her own motivation. Furthermore, performance appraisal can have unanticipated consequences. Forced distribution appraisal in particular can undermine team work. These experts were therefore very skeptical about traditional appraisal methods. (Dessler, 2004; 265).

2.2. Performance Appraisal Methods

According to Gilley, Quatro & Dixon (2009), there is a wide range of methods that can be used separately or in combination to appraise performance including:

- ✧ **Rating scales:** these approaches involve the predetermination of a number of factors against which performance will be evaluated and the identification of a quantity measure of performance for each one.
- ✧ **Performance-based:** the manager rates specific job-related requirements associated with an employee's position. Identifying where an employee falls on a below expectations to exceeds expectations scale is a quick way to accurately assess performance. It involves filling out a standard rating-scale form, making the process fairly fast and simple. The job-related requirements that are measured must be the same for all employees who hold the same position, to be fair and equitable.

- ✧ **Behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS):** Similar to standard rating scales but based on factors that reflect behaviors identified as necessary for the achievement of high performance in the job in question.
- ✧ **Ranking and forced distribution methods:** These seek to compare the performance achievement between all the employees being considered. In its simplest form, ranking seeks to provide a list of all employees from the highest performer to the lowest performer. Forced distribution seeks to categorize all employees into performance bands based on set proportions in each band.
- ✧ **Critical incidents:** Assessing performance using this approach requires the boss to identify important events (critical incidents) that demonstrate effective and ineffective performance by the individual. These would then form the basis of the discussion about performance during the appraisal review.
- ✧ **Essay approach/Narrative:** This approach simply presents the boss with a blank sheet of paper and requires them to describe in their own words the performance of the subordinate. This would then be discussed with the individual during the appraisal meeting. This can be a very subjective means of evaluation, with the writer often discussing more personality based traits of the individual versus measurable job skills. It can be used as a way to soften the blow of a less than favorable appraisal. The effectiveness of a narrative is directly related to the writing skills of the manager. If used alone, it does not allow for a rating comparison of several employees.
- ✧ **Management by objectives:** This approach involves the identification of key tasks, projects and other objectives that the individual has to achieve during the review period. At the end of that period the achievement of each objective would be used to identify the performance implications.
- ✧ **Top-down:** Several management-level members rate the performance of an employee.
- ✧ **Upward:** The employee rates the performance and effectiveness of the manager.
- ✧ **Peer review:** Peers and team members rate the employee's performance. Care must be taken in choosing unbiased peers, and the manager must decide how much weight is given to each peer's feedback in order to reach a fair result. This method can be used when a manager has limited contact with the employee.
- ✧ **Self-assessment:** Employees rate their own performance. A self-assessment can be implemented into all Performance Appraisal methods.
- ✧ **360-degree review:** This method relies on feedback gathered from people throughout an organization, and at varying professional levels, who have worked with the employee. This includes the manager, peers, and customers (both internal and external).

- ✧ **Continuous feedback:** The appraisal process is conducted more than once per year (usually 24 times). This allows for constant monitoring, communication, feedback, and modification of performance and goals.
- ✧ **Follow-up reviews:** Continuation of the appraisal process when training/development opportunities are scheduled, short-term goals are evaluated, and progress is discussed. These are often conducted within several weeks of the main appraisal meeting.

2.3 Potential problems in performance evaluation

2.3.1. Opposition to evaluation

Most employees are worry of performance evaluation perhaps the most common fear is of subjectivity on the part of the rather subjective bias and favoritism are real problems that create opposition to most performance evaluation systems these fears are hidden, however, and other more general arguments are provided (Invancevich, 1998:294).

2.3.2. System Design and operating problems

Performance evaluation systems break down because they are poorly designed. The design can be blamed if the criteria for evaluation are poor, the technique used is cumbersome, or the system is more form than substance. If the criteria used focus solely on activities rather than output (results) or on personality traits rather than performance the evaluation may not be received (Invancevich, 1998:294).

2.3.3. Rater problem

The following are common problems with performance appraisal measures: rater errors and bias, situational influences, and change over time.

- **Rater errors** Research suggests that raters commit a number of errors when they rate employee performance. Rating error occur when raters provide assessments that follow an adverse pattern or when the rater does not properly account for factors that might influence assessments.
- **Rater Bias** Substantial problems occur when rater errors operate in such a way that people with certain characteristics are consistently rated lower than others. Consistently providing lower ratings to people with certain characteristics, such as women and minorities is known as rater bias (Greg and Brown 2009).

- **Halo error:** A rating error that occurs when raters allow a general impression to influence ratings on specific dimensions of performance.
- **Central tendency error:** a rating error that occurs when raters give almost all employees scores in the middle of the scale (Greg and Brown 2009).
- **Contrast error:** a rating error that occurs when raters unknowingly allow comparisons among employees to influence ratings (Greg and Brown 2009).
- **Similar to me:** is the error that the raters make when he/she judge those who are similar to him/her more highly than those who are not (Noe et al 2008).
- **Horns error:** works in the opposite direction to halo error: one negative aspect results in the rater assigning low ratings to all the other aspects (Noe et al 2008).
- **Recency error:** a rating error that occurs when raters place too much emphasis on performance observed right before the measure is taken.
- **Primacy error:** a rating error that occurs when raters place too much emphasis on performance observed at the beginning of the measurement period (Greg and Brown 2009).
- **Changes over time** another complexity with measurement is that performance may not be consistent across time. Performance can vary over time because of differences in motivation. For example, an incentive like bonus may motivate employees to achieve high performance for a short period. Measuring this shortterm achievement may result in an assessment that is quite different from an assessment that reflects typical performance on most days (Greg and Brown 2009).
- **Frame of reference training:** training that focuses on building consistency in the way different raters observe and evaluate behaviors and outcomes (Greg and Brown 2009).
- **Situational influence** Factors that affect performance but that are outside the control of the employee being rated. Research suggests that subjective ratings are frequently contaminated and deficient because raters fail to account for situational influences. However, it is at least possible for raters to adjust subjective evaluations to control for situational factors. Situational influences present a greater problem for objective, outcome-oriented performance measures (Greg and Brown 2009).

2.4. Role of supervision in appraising performance

The immediate Supervisors rating are the heart of most appraisals. This makes sense. The supervisor should be and usually is in the best position to be and evaluate the

subordinate's performance. And is responsible for that person's performance traditionally the person directs supervisors his or her performance however other options are critically available and are increasingly used.

Peer Appraisal

With more firms using self-management teams, peer to team appraisal. The appraisal of an employee by his or her peers is becoming more popular. For example, an employee chooses an appraisal chairperson each year. That person then selects one supervisor and their other peers to evaluate the employee work.

Rating committee

Many employers use rating committees. These committees usually contain the employer's immediate supervisors and three or four other supervisors. Using multiple others can be beneficial while there may be discrepancy in ratings by individual supervisors, the composite ratings tend to be more reliable, fair and valid such ratings have higher inter-rater reliability or consistency than do ratings obtained from several peers.

Self-rating

Should employee's appraise themselves the basic problem of course is the employees usually rate themselves higher than they are rated by supervisors or peers. In one study, for instance, it was found that when asked to rate their own job performances, 40% of employees usually rate themselves in the top 10% (one of the best). While virtually all remaining employees rated themselves either in the top 25% (well above average) or at least in the top 50% (above average) usually no more than 1% or 2% will place themselves in below average category.

Appraisal by subordinates

More firms today let subordinates appraise their supervisor's performance as a

Process, some call upward feedback. The process helps top manager diagnose

Management style, identify potential people problem and take corrective action with

Individual manager's as required (Dessler, 1999:258).

2.5. Eliminating rating errors

Behavior based rating scales were originally designed to help eliminate the kinds of rating errors just described but when such scales didn't demonstrate more on the rating process. In other words more recent efforts to improve performance evaluations in organizations have centered on helping raters to more accurately observe, recall and report behaviors.

Rater training

One popular way to improve manager's ability to conduct effective performance appraisals is through rater training programs many types of programs exist differing in focus, cost and direction the two most popular types of one training programs designed to eliminate common rating errors such as halo error and training programs designed to improve the supervisors' observation and recording skills.

Programs dealing with errors do seek to eliminate many of these from ratings. In addition, even short relatively inexpensive programs are effective at accomplishing this goal. However, there is much loose evidence that this kind of training actually increases the accuracy of appraisals programs focused on observation and recording skills may offer greater improvement in accuracy than those that simply focus on errors.

Avoiding problems with employees

For the evaluation system to work well the employees must understand it and feel that it is a fair way to evaluate performance in addition they must believe that the system is used correctly for making decision concerning pay increases and promotions. Thus for a performance evaluation system to work well, it should be as simple as possible unnecessary complexity in rating forms of other evaluation procedures can lead to dissatisfaction among employees the system should also be implemented in a way that fully informs employees about how it is going to be used (Ivancevich, 1998:287).

The feedback interview

An effective performance evaluation system involves two way communications. That is there must be active communication between the supervisor and the subordinate about performance. Evaluation should not be viewed simply as once a year completion of rating forms on the contrary. It is a continuing process.

To help with the communication the supervisor should hold an evaluation interview with each subordinate in order to discuss his or her appraisal and to set objectives for the upcoming appraisal period. In addition, experts advise that actions concerning the employee's development salary should not be discussed during this interview. Thus although most organizations with formal evaluation systems give employees feedback many are not doing in the best way possible.

Normal major describes three generally used approaches to these interview situations tell and sell tell and listen and problem solving research on when indicates that tell and sell 14 approach is best for new and experienced employees and that the problem solving approach which encourages employees participation is useful for more experienced employees especially these with strong work ethics although these types of interview differ items of the supervisors behavior, effective evaluation feedback sessions share a number of characteristics annual discussions of performance should include.

- I. Review of overall progress
- II. Discussions of problems that were encountered
- III. Agreement about how performance can be improved
- IV. Discussion of how current performance fits with long range career goals.
- V. Specific action plans for the coming year how to reach short and long term objectives (Ivancevich, 1998:288).

Employee performance

- ✓ Development
- ✓ Productivity
- ✓ Advancement
- ✓ Discipline
- ✓ Pay raise
- ✓ Termination
- ✓ Organizational result Goal meets or not meets

Obviously other dimensions of performances might be appropriate in certain jobs, but those listed are common to most. However, they are general each jobs have specific job criteria which are jobs performance dimensions that identify the elements most important in a job. (Jackson; 2008:89)

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This was a descriptive study that assessed performance appraisal in WKU specialized hospital. According to C.R. Kothari (2004), the purpose of descriptive research was to accurately portray the characteristics of a particular individual or group.

3.2. Data sources

The researcher used both primary and secondary data for the study. Primary sources included hospital employees, while secondary sources consisted of written documents, the internet, and various books.

3.3. Study Area

The study area of the research is Wolkite University Specialized Hospital and the hospital is found in Central Ethiopia region Gurage Zone Gubre town. The town is found at 165.9 km from the capital city of the country. Astronomically the town is located 8o.2071' N latitude and 37o.7898'E Longitudes. The study was focus on The assessment of employee performance Appraisal Practice.

3.4. Sampling technique

Samples were made up of some of the members of employees of WKU Specialized Hospital. The selected samples were the fundamental elements of the study. The sampling design was the basic concept used to structure the data, benefiting the researcher by simplifying the process. Researchers used a simple random sampling technique. The reason behind this choice was to minimize the time required for data analysis, and the company's operations system made the process of primary data collection very difficult for the researchers.

3.5. Sample Size determination

The number of samples need for the study would be determined by the following general formula

$$\begin{aligned} N &= \frac{Z^2 \cdot p \cdot q \cdot N}{e^2 (N-1) + Z^2 \cdot P \cdot q} \\ &= \frac{(1.65)^2 (0.5) (0.5) (667)}{(0.1)^2 (667-1) + (1.65)^2 (0.5) (0.5)} \\ &= 62 \end{aligned}$$

Where, n =sample size, q = 1-p

Z=Critical evaluate at 90% confidence level (1.65)

p=population proportion (0.5)

N =total population

E=error term 0.1(precision)

3.6. Instruments of data collection

The primary data was collected using both open-ended and closed-ended questionnaires distributed to employees, as well as structured interviews with the manager to achieve the study's objectives. Secondary data was collected after verifying its accuracy before use.

3.7. Data processing and analysis

The researcher was collected the desired data using qualitative and quantitative methods. Once the data are gathered, the quantitative data were processed and analyzed using tables and percentages. Secondary data and interviews would be described in words without numerical measures.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter outlines analysis and interpretation of data collected for the study. A structured questionnaire was administered to gather primary data from employees of the hospital. The target population consisted of 62 employees, selected purposively based on their roles and accessibility. Out of the 62 questionnaires distributed, 57 were completed and returned, yielding a response rate of 85%. The collected data were systematically organized, analyzed, and interpreted using descriptive statistical methods. Results are presented in tabular form to enhance clarity and facilitate comparative analysis. The findings provide insights into key variables under investigation, which are discussed in detail in subsequent sections

This chapter summarizes the data collected from WKU Specialized Hospital through questionnaire and interview. 57 questionnaires are distributed to employees.

4.1. General characteristics of the respondents

Table 4.1.1. Sex and age structure of respondents

Number	Item		No	Percent
1	Sex	Male	33	58%
		Female	24	42%
		Total	57	100%
2	Age	<25	0	0%
		25-35	33	58%
		36-45	20	35%
		>45	4	7%
		Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

Item 1 table 4.1.1. Represent the sex composition of the respondent in WKU Specialized Hospital. Out of 57 respondents 33(58%) were males and the remaining 24(42%) were females.

Item 2 table 4.1.1 of describes the age composition of the respondents. Out of the total respondents 0% are less than 25 years, 58% were found the age group of 25-35, 35% were found 36-45 and the remaining 7% were greater than 45 years. The upper table

implies that relatively males are more dominant than females due to either educational gap or some other factors and the age structure of most employees are young. The dominance of employees aged 25–45 aligns with "prime working years," indicating a workforce in early to mid-career stages. This may reflect the hospital's focus on recruiting early-career professionals or high turnover among older staff. The under representation of older employees (7%) may signal challenges in retaining experienced staff, potentially due to retirement, burnout, or career shifts.

Table 4.1.2. Understanding of employees and officials on performance appraisal

Number	Item		No	Percent
3	Educational status	High school	0	0%
		Diploma	7	12%
		Degree	38	67%
		Other	12	21%
		Total	57	100%
4	Service year in the hospital	1-2 years	12	21%
		3-5 year	38	67%
		6-10 year	7	12%
		Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

Item 3 of table 4.1.2. Describes the level of educational status of the respondents out of 57 employees the majority 67% were educational level of degree, 0% were high school, 12% were diploma and the rest 21% were others.

Item 4 of table 4.1.2. Shows how long respondents stayed in the hospital. Out of the total 57 respondents 67% of respondents stayed in the hospital for 3-5 years, 21% of the respondents stayed in the hospital for 1-2 year and the rest 12% stayed 6-10 years.

The first data shows that 67% of respondents (38/57) hold a degree-level qualification, making it the dominant educational background among hospital employees. This suggests that the hospital prioritizes hiring individuals with higher education, which aligns with common standards in healthcare professions requiring specialized training. Notably, no respondents (0%) reported having only a high school education, implying

that roles at the hospital likely require formal post-secondary qualifications. Meanwhile, 12% (7/57) have a diploma, and 21% (12/57) fall under the others category. The significant proportion of degree holders may reflect the technical or managerial nature of roles within the hospital, though the ambiguity of the others category warrants clarification in future studies.

The second data indicates that 67% of respondents (38/57) have worked at the hospital for 3–5 years, highlighting a moderately experienced workforce. A smaller group (21%, 12/57) reported 1–2 years, which could represent newer hires or roles with higher turnover. Only 12% (7/57) have stayed longer (6–10 years), suggesting limited retention of employees beyond the 5-year mark. This distribution implies that the hospital retains a stable core of mid-tenure employees (3–5 years) but may face challenges in retaining staff for extended periods. The low percentage of long-term employees (>6 years) could reflect factors such as career advancement opportunities, burnout in high-stress roles, or shifts in organizational priorities.

Table 4.2. Understanding of employees and officials on performance appraisal

Item	Number of respondents	Per cent
High	40	70%
Medium	13	23%
Low	4	7%
Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

Table 4.2 understands of employees and officials on performance appraisal. Among 57 respondents 40(70%) have high understanding about performance appraisal which encompasses the majority of employees. A smaller proportion 13(23%) reported medium understanding, The remaining 4(7%) of respondents were low understating from the total respondents From these we conclude that the majority of the employees have good understanding about performance appraisal. The data highlights a generally positive trend in employees' comprehension of performance appraisal systems at WKU Specialized Hospital. 70% of respondents (n=40) demonstrated high understanding, indicating that the majority of employees are well-informed about how their performance is evaluated and aligned with organizational goals. This suggests that the hospital has likely implemented effective training programs, communication strategies, or appraisal frameworks that resonate with staff. However, the remaining 30% of employees reported medium (23%, n=13) or low (7%, n=4) understanding. This gap implies Communication Barriers and Experience.

Table 4.3. Employee attitude toward performance appraisal

Item	Number of respondents	Per cent
Good	47	83%
Bad	10	17%
Neither good nor bad	0	0%
Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

The above table indicates the attitude of employees toward performance appraisal. 47(83%) of the respondents replied they have good attitude toward the evaluation 0(0%) of the total respondents replied that, they have neither good nor bad attitudes towards the evaluation system. A very small number of the employees have negative attitude which accounts 10(17%) of the respondents. This implies a strongly positive attitude among employees at WKU Specialized Hospital toward the performance appraisal system. A significant majority of respondents 83% reported having a good attitude toward the evaluation process, while 17% expressed a negative attitude. Notably, no respondents (0%) remained neutral; indicating that employees hold clear opinions either supportive or critical about the appraisal system. The overwhelming approval (83%) suggests that the appraisal system is perceived as fair, transparent, or beneficial by most employees. This aligns with earlier findings showing that 70% of employees have high understanding of result-oriented appraisals, implying that clarity about the system fosters positive perceptions. A supportive attitude may also reflect successful implementation of appraisal-linked incentives (e.g., promotions, bonuses) or constructive feedback mechanisms that employee's value. The lack of neutral opinions (0%) is striking. Employees either actively support or oppose the system while small, this minority warrants attention. Potential reasons for dissatisfaction

Table 4.4. Feeling of employees towards the evaluation system of the organization

Item	Number of respondents	Per cent
Good	40	70%
Poor	14	24%
I don't know	3	6%
Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

From the above table we can understand that the total respondents 40(70%) of the respondents indicated that they have good attitude toward the evaluation system. 14(24%) of respondents have poor feeling towards the evaluation system and the remaining 3(6%) haven't any feeling toward the evaluation system of the hospital. From the above analysis we conclude that most of the employees have good feeling toward the evaluation system. A significant majority of employees 70% view the evaluation system as Good. This indicates general satisfaction with the system's structure, fairness, or outcomes, potentially reflecting alignment with employee expectations or effective implementation. Approximately 24% of respondents rated the system as Poor. This dissatisfaction could stem from perceived inequities, lack of clarity in evaluation criteria, or inadequate feedback mechanisms. A small but noteworthy subset 6% selected I don't know suggesting confusion or lack of familiarity with the evaluation process. This may indicate gaps in communication or training about how the system operates.

Table 4.5. The criteria used to evaluate employees in the organization

Item	Number of respondents	Per cent
Quality of work	10	17%
Quantity of work	8	15%
Experience in work	9	16%
Knowledge and skill	10	17%
All	20	35%
Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

A significant proportion of respondents (35%, n = 20) believe all listed criteria (quality, quantity, experience, knowledge/skills) are used to evaluate employees. This suggests a perception that the organization adopts a holistic approach to performance assessments. Quality of work and knowledge/skill are tied as the most recognized individual criteria (17% each, n = 10). Experience in work (16%, n = 9) and quantity of work (15%, n = 8) are perceived as less emphasized, though still relevant. No single criterion exceeds 20%, indicating employees do not view any one factor as disproportionately prioritized in evaluations.

Table 4.6. Employee participation and feedback from the hospital regarding the appraisal

Item		Number of respondents	Per cent
Do you participate in the appraisal	Yes	40	70%
	No	17	30%
	Total	57	100%
Had you obtained information of your evaluation on time	Yes	57	100%
	No	0	0%
	Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

A majority of employees (70%, n = 40) reported participating in the appraisal process, indicating a relatively inclusive system. This suggests that most employees are actively involved in evaluations, which may foster transparency and ownership of outcomes. 30% of respondents (n = 17) stated they do not participate in appraisals. This raises concerns about potential inequities or systemic barriers (e.g. lack of awareness). All respondents (100%, n = 57) confirmed receiving evaluation feedback on time, reflecting strong organizational adherence to procedural timelines. This aligns with modern HR best practices that prioritize timely communication to maintain trust and clarity.

Table 4.7.method of performance appraisal system

Item	Number of respondents	Per cent
Man to man comparison	14	24%
Grading method on a given level of out put	40	70%
Evaluate based on performing different tasks	3	6%
Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

A strong majority of respondents (70%, n = 40) identified the grading method based on predefined output levels as the primary appraisal method. This suggests the

organization prioritizes measurable, results-driven criteria, aligning with objective performance standards. Over a quarter of employees (24%, n = 14) reported man-to-man comparison as the appraisal method. This indicates reliance on relative rankings, which may foster competition but also risks fostering bias or resentment among employees. Only 6% (n = 3) of respondents cited evaluation based on performance across different tasks, signaling minimal emphasis on versatility, adaptability, or multi-dimensional contributions in appraisals. The prominence of output-based grading (70%) reflects a structured, transparent approach to evaluations, likely contributing to the majority's positive perception of the system. However, the persistence of man-to-man comparison (24%) introduces subjectivity, which may explain dissatisfaction among some employees.

Table 4.8. The appraisal method that the organization used

Item	Number of respondents	Per cent
Questionnaire to managers, customers or colleagues Based on employees output or achievement	7	12%
Evaluating committee	38	67%
Subordinates	12	21%
Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

A substantial majority of respondents (67%, n = 38) identified the evaluating committee as the primary appraisal method. This indicates a centralized, structured approach to evaluations, likely designed to ensure consistency and objectivity. Only 12% (n = 7) of employees reported the use of questionnaires directed at managers, customers, or colleagues based on output/achievement. This suggests minimal reliance on 360-degree feedback, which could limit holistic assessments of employee performance. A notable minority (21%, n = 12) cited subordinate evaluations as part of the appraisal process. While uncommon in traditional hierarchies, this reflects an effort to incorporate upward feedback, potentially fostering exclusivity. The prominence of evaluating committees (67%) aligns with Table 4.7's finding that 70% of employees associate appraisals with output-based grading. Committees likely enforce standardized metrics, ensuring alignment with organizational goals. However, the limited use of questionnaires (12%) may restrict opportunities for peer or client input, potentially overlooking soft skills like teamwork or customer service.

Table 4.9.what employees get if they carry out their task properly

Item	Number of respondents	Per cent
Salary increment	4	7%
Promotion	37	65%
Moral incentive	12	21%
All	4	7%
Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

A significant majority of respondents (65%, n=37) identified promotion as the reward for proper task execution. This highlights a strong organizational emphasis on career advancement as a motivational tool. The prominence of promotion suggests that employees associate task performance with upward mobility, possibly reflecting workplace cultures that prioritize hierarchical growth over immediate financial rewards. Moral incentives (e.g., recognition, praise) were the second-most cited reward (21%, n=12). This indicates that non-material acknowledgment plays a meaningful role in employee motivation, aligning with theories of intrinsic motivation and psychological satisfaction. Only 7% (n=4) of respondents associated task success with salary increments, challenging assumptions that monetary rewards are the primary motivator. This could reflect organizational constraints (e.g., fixed pay structures) or a cultural prioritization of long-term career growth over short-term financial gains. The "All" category (7%, n=4) mirrors the salary increment response rate. This overlap raises questions about survey design clarity—whether respondents interpreted "All" as a combination of incentives or an undefined catch-all category. Further methodological refinement may be needed to avoid ambiguity.

Table 4.10 problems of performance appraisal

Item	Number of respondents	Per cent
Discrimination	4	7%
Evaluate based on most recent performance	33	58%
Halo effect	20	35%
Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

The majority of respondents (58%, n=33) identified evaluation based on most recent performance as the primary problem. This underscores a systemic flaw where employees' year-round contributions are overshadowed by their most recent outcomes. Such bias risks undervaluing consistent effort and disproportionately rewarding short-term achievements. Halo effect emerged as the second-most cited issue (35%, n=20). This cognitive bias occurs when a single positive trait or achievement unduly influences the overall appraisal, leading to skewed assessments. For example, an employee's recent success might overshadow past under performance, compromising the fairness and accuracy of evaluations. Only 7% (n=4) of respondents flagged discrimination as a problem. While this figure is low, it signals potential under reporting or normalization of bias in appraisal processes. Discrimination, whether based on gender, age, or other factors, can erode trust in organizational fairness and meritocracy.

Table 4.11 Reasons for problems identified table 4.10

Item	Number of respondents	Per cent
System design problem	20	35%
Raters problem	9	16%
Problem from employees	20	35%
All	8	14%
Total	57	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2025

Both system design problems (35%, n=20) and problems originating from employees (35%, n=20) were cited as the leading causes of appraisal challenges. This parity suggests that flaws in the appraisal framework (e.g., rigid metrics, lack of holistic evaluation criteria) and employee-related factors (e.g., inconsistent performance, resistance to feedback) are perceived as equally detrimental to fair assessments. Rater problem (16%, n=9) highlights evaluator-related issues such as bias, lack of training, or inconsistent judgment. While less prominent than system or employee issues, this still reflects concerns about the human element in appraisal accuracy. The "All" category (14.06%, n=8) suggests that a minority of respondents attribute appraisal challenges to a combination of system, rater, and employee factors. However, the vague labeling of this category limits its interpretative value, raising questions about whether respondents perceived these causes as interconnected.

4.2 Result of Interview Questions

1. What does your hospital's performance appraisal background look like?

WKU Specialized Hospital's performance appraisal system is rooted in structured, output-driven methodologies, primarily using grading based on predefined performance levels. Historically, the system has relied on evaluating committees to ensure objectivity.

2. What methods are used to evaluate employees in your hospital?

The hospital employs a hybrid approach Primary Method Output based grading where employees are assessed against predefined performance metrics. Secondary Methods Evaluating committees to centralize and standardize assessments, Man-to-man comparisons introducing subjectivity, Subordinate evaluations though limited to specific roles and Minimal use of 360-degree feedback missing opportunities for peer or client input.

3. How do employees feel towards the evaluation method?

Employee sentiment is polarized most employees view the system favorably, appreciating its structure and alignment with organizational goals.

4. What problems are faced at the time of implementing performance appraisal?

Key challenges include System Design Issues like Rigid metrics and over reliance on recent performance, Human Factors like Rater biases and employee resistance, Equity Concerns like inconsistent participation.

5. How has management solved the problems faced in your organization?

- **Bias Mitigation:** Training evaluators to recognize recency bias and halo effect.
- **System Reforms:** Phasing out man-to-man comparisons and integrating 360-degree feedback.
- **Enhanced Transparency:** Clearly defining evaluation criteria and weight ages.
- **Diverse Incentives:** Introducing salary increments and moral recognition alongside promotions.
- **Inclusive Measures:** Mandating participation for all roles and addressing retention through mentor ship programs. These steps aim to balance objectivity with fairness, ensuring the appraisal system supports both organizational goals and employee growth.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1. SUMMARY

This study evaluates the performance appraisal system at Wolkite University Teaching Specialized Hospital in Ethiopia, focusing on identifying systemic challenges and proposing actionable solutions. Using a mixed-methods approach, the researcher combined primary data from 57 employees (via questionnaires and interviews) and secondary data from academic sources.

- The workforce is predominantly young (58% aged 25–35) and male (58%), with under representation of females (42%) and older employees (>45 years: 7%).
- Most employees hold degree-level qualifications (67%) and have 3–5 years of tenure (67%), indicating a moderately experienced but potentially transient workforce.
- Methods: Output-based grading (70%) and evaluating committees (67%) dominate, ensuring objectivity but limiting holistic feedback. Subjective methods like man-to-man comparisons (24%) persist, risking bias.
- Employee Perception: While 70% understood the system well and 83% viewed it positively, 24% reported dissatisfaction, citing issues like recency bias (58%) and halo effect (35%).
- Systemic flaws included overemphasis on recent performance, inconsistent criteria, and limited peer/upward feedback.
- Human factors like rater bias (16%) and employee resistance (35%) further undermined fairness.
- Promotions (65%) were the primary incentive, overshadowing salary increments (7%) and moral recognition (21%), potentially limiting engagement among employees valuing diverse rewards.
- Replace subjective methods (e.g., man-to-man comparisons) with 360-degree feedback to capture soft skills and peer input.
- Standardize evaluation criteria and ensure transparency in weightage and decision-making.

- Train evaluators to counteract recency bias, halo effect, and discrimination. Implement structured evaluations assessing year-round performance.
- Address gender disparities through targeted recruitment and mentorship.
- Retain experienced staff via flexible policies and career development programs.
- Introduce performance-linked salary increments and formal recognition programs to complement promotions.
- Mandate universal participation in appraisals and clarify processes through training.
- Conduct anonymous surveys to address grievances and improve trust.

5.2. Conclusion

- ❖ The workforce at WKU Specialized Hospital is predominantly composed of younger males (25–45 years), with significant under representation of females (42%) and older employees (>45 years, 7%). This shows demographic profile suggests potential systemic biases in recruitment, retention challenges for experienced staff, or institutional barriers that limit diversity, which may compromise the generalization of workplace policies and practices to broader populations.
- ❖ The hospital's workforce is characterized by a highly educated, mid-tenure majority, with 67% holding degree-level qualifications and 67% employed for 3–5 years. However, the low retention of long-term employees (12% beyond 6 years) and ambiguous educational diversity ("others" at 21%) suggest potential challenges in sustaining experienced talent and fully leveraging diverse skill sets, which may hinder institutional continuity and innovation.
- ❖ The hospital has successfully fostered high understanding of performance appraisals among 70% of employees, reflecting effective communication and alignment with organizational goals. However, 30% of staff (medium or low understanding) indicates persistent gaps in clarity, particularly among newer hires or role-specific groups, risking inconsistent performance expectations and engagement.
- ❖ The performance appraisal system at WKU Specialized Hospital enjoys overwhelming approval (83%) from employees, reflecting its perceived fairness and alignment with organizational goals. However, the absence of neutral opinions (0%) and the critical minority (17%) highlight a polarized workforce,

where dissatisfaction—though small—signals potential systemic flaws (e.g., perceived bias, inadequate feedback) that risk undermining trust and engagement.

- ❖ While a strong majority of employees (70%) view the evaluation system positively, significant dissatisfaction (24%) and uncertainty (6%) among a minority reveal critical gaps in fairness, clarity, or communication, which could erode trust and hinder the system's effectiveness in fostering employee growth and engagement.
- ❖ Employees perceive the hospital's performance evaluation system as balanced but ambiguous, with 35% believing it holistically integrates multiple criteria (quality, quantity, experience, knowledge/skills), yet no single factor standing out as a clear priority. This suggests a lack of transparency or consistency in communicating how evaluations are weighted, potentially leading to confusion about organizational expectations.
- ❖ While the hospital demonstrates strong procedural efficiency (100% timely feedback) and moderate inclusivity (70% employee participation in appraisals), the 30% exclusion rate from the appraisal process highlights systemic inequities, potentially disadvantaging specific roles or perpetuating disengagement among a significant minority of staff.
- ❖ The hospital's appraisal system is predominantly results-driven, with 70% of employees recognizing the structured, output-based grading method as the primary evaluation tool. However, the persistence of man-to-man comparisons (24%) introduces subjective biases, and the minimal emphasis on task versatility (6%) overlooks employees' adaptability, creating gaps in recognizing diverse contributions and fostering potential inequities.
- ❖ The hospital's appraisal system relies heavily on centralized evaluating committees (67%), ensuring consistency and objectivity but risks overlooking holistic feedback (e.g., peer, customer, or managerial input) and undervaluing soft skills like teamwork or customer service, which are critical in healthcare settings.
- ❖ The hospital's reward system is heavily skewed toward promotions (65%) as the primary incentive for proper task execution, reflecting a hierarchical culture that prioritizes career advancement over immediate financial or non-material rewards. This risks undervaluing short-term motivators like salary increments (7%) and moral recognition (21%), potentially limiting engagement among employees who prioritize diverse forms of acknowledgment.
- ❖ The appraisal system at WKU Specialized Hospital is primarily undermined by systemic cognitive biases, with 58% of employees citing overemphasis on recent performance and 35% identifying the halo effect as critical flaws. These biases distort fair assessment of year-round contributions, prioritizing short-term outcomes over consistent performance. While overt discrimination is minimally

reported (7%), its presence signals underlying risks to equity that require vigilance.

- ❖ The primary challenges in the appraisal system stem from equally critical flaws in system design (35%) and employee-related factors (35%), revealing a dual responsibility where rigid evaluation frameworks and inconsistent employee performance/resistance jointly undermine fairness. While rater biases (16%) and interconnected issues ("All" at 14%) compound these challenges, the parity between systemic and human factors underscores the need for holistic reforms addressing both structural and behavioral elements.

5.3. Recommendations

- ✧ Actively recruiting female candidates and creating mentor ship programs to address gender disparities.
- ✧ Introducing flexible work policies and career advancement opportunities to retain older, experienced employees and attract younger professionals (<25 years). This will foster a more inclusive, balanced, and sustainable workforce that better reflects the needs and perspectives of all employee groups.
- ✧ Creating clear pathways for advancement (e.g., leadership training, promotions) to retain mid-tenure employees beyond 5 years.
- ✧ Conducting exit interviews and surveys to identify causes of attrition (e.g., burnout, lack of growth) and tailoring support programs (e.g., mental health resources, flexible roles).
- ✧ Clarifying the "others" educational category to better align recruitment with the hospital's technical and managerial needs.
- ✧ Investigate and address the root causes of dissatisfaction among the 17% critical employees through:
 - ✓ **Anonymous feedback mechanisms** (e.g., surveys, focus groups) to identify specific grievances (e.g., unfair evaluations, lack of developmental feedback).
 - ✓ **Enhanced transparency** in appraisal criteria and decision-making processes to rebuild trust.
 - ✓ **Tailored interventions** (e.g., mentorship for struggling employees, bias training for evaluators) to ensure the system is equitable and perceived as supportive.
- ✧ Conduct an in-depth analysis of dissatisfaction and confusion by:
 - ✓ **Surveying the 24% "Poor" respondents** to identify systemic flaws (e.g., bias, opaque criteria, inadequate feedback).
 - ✓ **Engaging the 6% "I don't know" group** through targeted training sessions to clarify the evaluation process and its purpose.
 - ✓ **Revising communication strategies** to ensure transparency, fairness, and alignment with employee expectations.
- ✧ Clarify and standardize evaluation criteria by:

- ✓ **Publicly defining the weightage** of each criterion (e.g., quality vs. quantity) to align employee understanding with organizational priorities.
 - ✓ **Training managers** to communicate evaluation standards consistently, ensuring employees know how to focus their efforts.
 - ✓ **Reinforcing the holistic approach** through examples of how all criteria collectively drive performance outcomes.
- ✧ Investigate and address barriers to appraisal participation by:
- ✓ Conducting anonymous surveys with the **30% non-participating employees** to identify exclusion causes (e.g., role eligibility, lack of awareness, or disengagement).
 - ✓ Implementing **mandatory appraisal participation policies** for all roles, paired with training to ensure clarity on the process's purpose and benefits.
 - ✓ Establishing **feedback loops** to monitor inclusivity and adjust policies to ensure equitable access to evaluations.
- ✧ Streamline the appraisal system to enhance objectivity and inclusivity by:
- ✓ **Phasing out man-to-man comparisons** to eliminate bias and resentment, replacing them with clear, output-based metrics.
 - ✓ **Incorporating multi-task performance criteria** into the grading framework to recognize adaptability and diverse skill sets.
 - ✓ **Training evaluators** on equitable assessment practices to ensure transparency and alignment with organizational values.
- ✧ Integrate 360-degree feedback mechanisms into the appraisal process by:
- ✓ Introducing **structured questionnaires** for managers, colleagues, and customers to assess soft skills and collaborative performance.
 - ✓ Training evaluating committees to **balance standardized metrics with qualitative insights** from diverse stakeholders.
 - ✓ Piloting subordinate evaluations (21%) in leadership roles to strengthen accountability and inclusivity.
- ✧ Diversify the reward system to align with varied employee motivations by:
- ✓ Introducing **performance-linked salary increments** alongside promotions to address immediate financial needs.
 - ✓ Formalizing **moral incentive programs** (e.g., public recognition, awards) to reinforce intrinsic motivation.
 - ✓ Clarifying the "All" category in future surveys to distinguish whether employees desire combined rewards or lack clarity about existing incentives.
- ✧ Reform the appraisal process to mitigate biases and enhance fairness by:
- ✓ **Implementing structured, criteria-based evaluations** that assess performance across the entire review period, not just recent results.

- ✓ **Training evaluators to recognize and counteract the halo effect** through objective metrics and periodic calibration sessions.
 - ✓ **Establishing transparent anti-discrimination protocols** (e.g., anonymous reporting, bias audits) to address even rare instances of inequity.
- ✧ Adopt a dual-focused intervention strategy to address systemic and human factors simultaneously:
- ✓ **Revise the appraisal system design** to incorporate flexible, multi-dimensional metrics that account for diverse roles and contributions.
 - ✓ **Enhance employee engagement** through training on performance expectations and feedback receptiveness, paired with transparent communication about appraisal goals.
 - ✓ **Train evaluators** to minimize rater biases and standardize judgment criteria.
 - ✓ **Clarify survey categories** (e.g., define "All" as interconnected factors) to improve data precision in future studies.

Reference

- ✧ Aguinis, H. (2007), performance management, New jersey: PEARSON prentice Hall.
- ✧ Armstrong.M (1988). A hand book of personnel management practice.3rd Ed.London: Kogan page LTD.
- ✧ Armstrong, M. (2006). A hand book of human resource management practices (10th Edition ed.). Kogan page limited.
- ✧ Greg, L.S.& kenneth G.B(2009). Human resource management: linking strategy to practice (1 ed.). john wiley and sons, Inc.
- ✧ Gilley, A., Gilley, J. W., Quatro, S. A., & Dixon, P. (2009). The Praeger Handbook of Human.
- ✧ Ivancevich, John M. (2004) Human resource management .9th edition New delhi Tata McGraw hill.
- ✧ John. M. Ivace Vich, (1998), Human Resource Management. 7th ed.
- ✧ Lioyd.L. Bayars and Leslie W.Rle: (1998) Human Resource Management.
- ✧ Margaret Att wood and stuaredim Mock: 91999), Personnel Management.
- ✧ Mathis, R.L and Jackson J.M: (2008), Human resource management 12 ed.
- ✧ Noe, Bary, G.,Raymond A. John R.Holleneck and Patrick M.Wright (2008). Human resource.
- ✧ Management: Gaining a competitive advantage (6th Edition ed.). Mc Graw-Hill/Irwin.
- ✧ Shanun Tyson and Alford York, (2001) an introduction to Human resource management 1st ed.
- ✧ Website (www.performaceaprisal.com).
- ✧ Yukl,G and Lepsinger,R.1998.How to get the most out of 360°Feedback .Journal of training 32(12),45-50
- ✧ WEBSITE (www.performaceaprisal.com)31

A. Good ☐ B. Bad ☐ C. neither good nor bad ☐

7. How do you feel about performance system of the hospital?

A, very good ☐ B, Good ☐ C, I don't know ☐

8. What are the criteria used to evaluate employees in your hospital?

A, Quality of work ☐ B, Quantity of work ☐

C, Experience in work ☐ D, Knowledge and skill of work ☐

9. Do you participate in appraisal process? (You can choose more than one)

A, Yes ☐ B, NO ☐

10. What problems exist, if there is no performance appraisal?

A, Lack of commitment ☐ B, Reduce productivity of employees ☐

C, Incompetence with other ☐ D, others specify please _____

11. Had you obtained information of your evaluation result on time?

A, Yes ☐ B, NO ☐

12. Which method of performance appraisal system is practiced in your hospital?

A, Man to man comparison ☐

B, Grinding method on a given level of output ☐

C, Evaluate based on performing different tasks ☐

D, others specify _____

13. What type of appraisal method your hospital use to evaluate employees? (You can give more than one answer)

A, questionnaire ☐ B, Work standard ☐

C. Evaluating committee ☐ D. Subordinates ☐

Is other specify please _____

14. What is the return for you in your organization, if you have carried out your task in a good manner?

A, Salary increment ☐

B, promotion ☐

C, Moral incentive ☐

if any other specify please _____

15. What problems are there toward performance appraisal practice in your hospital?

A, Evaluate based on most recent performance ☐ B, Discrimination ☐

C, Evaluate all in one direction ☐ other specify _____

16. What is the reason for the problem arises on question No “15”

A, System Design problem ☐ B, Raters problem ☐

C, Problem from employee's ☐

If other specify please _____

Appendix II

WOLKITE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT

III. Interview Question

1. What look like your hospital performance appraisal background?
2. What methods are used to evaluate employees in your hospital?
3. How feel employees towards the evaluation method?
4. What problems are faced at the time of implementing performance appraisal?
5. How the management solved the problems faced in your organization?