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ABSTRACT

This study was carried out so as to analyze the perception of employees on the effectiveness of OPRAS in PMO-RALG, taking Dodoma and Dar es Salaam region as case studies. Specifically, the study focused on examining the operationalisation of OPRAS, the status of OPRAS and challenges facing OPRAS.

This study employed both cross sectional as well as a case study to get data about the problem. The sample mainly consisted of 80 employees who were obtained by multistage cluster sampling. Data collection method included interviews and documentation review. The data analysis was through the use of SPSS.

The results showed that most staff had negative perception on the way the OPRAS was used in human resource management. In addition, few cases of value addition were reported for sections using OPRAS such as making staff creative, confidence and productive. However, issues of delay in committing funds, low management priority on OPRAS and use of fixed salary were reported to be the major challenges facing OPRAS.

It is therefore recommended that the government should devise the regulations that will enforce the use of OPRAS. This should go hand in hand with revising the payment system of which we currently use fixed rate that is not matching with the OPRAS principles. Funds should be committed timely to make the staff responsible and hence meet their agreed objectives.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Background of the Study
Organizations have survived in the pursuit of both performance and development through the huge investment into human capital. The performance appraisal of employees is critical to the survival of the production process in the organizations (Armstrong 2008). Performance appraisal system (PAS) provides evidences of whether or not the intended results have been achieved and extend to which job holder has produced the results. The performance appraisal is very important tool as it is the basis for generating feedback information to be used by both individual employee and the managers to monitor their own performances towards the attainment of organization plans (Torington, 2008).

Although the interest in using and researching Performance Appraisal System (PAS) has increased in the past 30 to 40 years, the act of evaluating employees has existed for centuries. According to Prince (2000:184) performance appraisal traces its way back to the 3rd century AD where there is a study by a Chinese philosopher who criticized the rater who was hired by Wei dynasty whose judgment was based on like and dislike instead of merits. Appraisal on merit was possibly first used in 1800s in the cotton mills in New Lanark in Scotland as a way to evaluate and judge farm workers.

As a formal management system of evaluating work performance it is traced back to sixty years ago when Walter Dill Scott succeeded to persuade the United States Army to adopt man-to-man rating system in evaluating military officers after the 2nd world war. And in 1950 it became an established and accepted practice in many organizations in the United States (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995:3). It began simply as a system that can be used to justify income (salaries and wages) of individuals their capacity and the appraisal processes which were linked to material output.
The appraisal process begins with the establishing of performance standards, and these standards are usually articulated in such a phrase as “A full day work”. Fletcher (1994) asserts that, the expectations a manager has in terms of work performance by his or her subordinates must be clear enough so as to clearly communicate them to his/ her subordinates.

According to Ghorpade et al; (1995) performance appraisal system is inevitable in any kind of organization be private, public, local or multinational because of the following reasons; firstly performance appraisal system is a way of an organization to assess the individuals employees whether the organization gets what rightfully due from the individuals, as they were employed to perform certain tasks for the success of the organization.

Secondly, since everyone is different in their own ways hence the difference on how well and meticulous individuals can be, performance appraisal system is necessary to account for the different contributions of individuals and lastly, performance appraisal system is vital in defending the organizations action against employees especially those that are guided by the law. Performance appraisal system is the most used and common tool of performance management. This means the changes that took place in the surrounding environment (other African countries adapting the system) also led Tanzania to adapt the changes and in the case of this study that change is performance appraisal system.

Although the government and the public service at large have achieved a lot since independence but still problems in the efficiency and effectiveness of the services provided by the government and the functioning of the public sector were noticed along with complains of dissatisfaction of the public hence the implementation of the administrative reforms (URT, 2010). Performance Management system in Tanzania was geared to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery in the public sector most importantly by insuring the value for money as it is the target for most of the implemented administrative reforms. Performance appraisal system is one of the tools of performance management that seem to best ensure effectiveness
by connecting and aligning individual, team and organizations objectives and results (Armstrong, 2003).

Performance appraisal system gives a thorough consideration of the components and various aspects of performance with the attention given to how each component plays part to the desired performance outcome in the organizational, departmental, team and individual level (Chen et al, 2009). Also the changes in this performance appraisal system where in pursuit to the Public Service Management and Employment Policy of 1998 and the Public Service Act No.8 of 2002 (URT, 2005) respectively. Furthermore, it states into what employees do their work, how they do it (behavior) and the result obtained. As a whole performance appraisal in Tanzania incorporated the formal and informal measures adopted by the public sector and its entities to increase organizational, team and individual effectiveness (Mbegu, 2004).

This tool is critical to the adaptation and instituting performance culture in the Tanzanian public sector. It requires the public servants and their supervisors to develop their personal objectives based on the strategic planning process and on organizational targets regarding service delivery. To develop the individual performance plan both the supervisor and subordinates are required to agree on “performance objectives, performance targets, performance criteria and required resources in order to achieve the set targets and objectives” (Bana & Shitindi, 2009:13).

In many organizations in Tanzania (both public and private), the Open Performance Review Appraisal System (OPRAS) is the most popular and well-known tool compared to other tools of public employees performance tool. The aim of OPRAS is to bring efficiency and effectiveness of employee’s performance in which it would lead to improved services. For this to be possible performance appraisal needs to be instituted so as to make it possible to have the expected effects (Bana & Shitindi 2009). Although performance appraisal system intentions in the Tanzanian public sector have been meritorious, it still does not seem to reach the expectations (URT, 2010). This situation is explained by the fact that Performance Appraisal System has
faced challenges, which hinder it to be effectively institutionalized in the public sector (Cutler & Waine, 2005). Therefore the aim of this study was to assess employee’s perception on performance appraisal system in Public Service, and that PMO-RALG will be the case study.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
Following the enactment of the Public Service Act No.8 of 2002 and its subsequent Regulations of 2003, the public sector in Tanzania has been administering performance appraisal to its employees, first the secret appraisal and now the open performance appraisal system. The current appraisal system procedures were designed to assist both managers and subordinates in planning, managing and executing organizational goals, which will lead to effective service delivery to the public.

Open performance appraisal system in Tanzania was introduced in July 2004 and was implemented for minimum of three years all over the country to all central and local agencies of the government (URT, 2005). However, although OPRAS has been implemented since this time, very little changes can be seen especially in the public sector. The situation in the public sector is almost still the same, too many procedures, ineffective services and poor customer care as opposed to the intent of the implementing performance appraisal system reforms. Also contrary to the purpose of this system which is to provide information useful in decision making regarding transfers, promotions and demotions, it seems these decisions do not at all depend in the performance appraisal feedback. For example at one time President Jakaya Kikwete said that “most of the government employees claims are promotions, transfers and leave and those claims are due the irresponsibility of Government officials in relevant departments” (Daily News, 2 March, 2009). This state of Affair is in support with statements issued by President Office’s – Public Service Management( PO- PSM) that OPRAS is not linked to sanctions or rewards, and that performance targets are vague or too easy to meet.
Another statement from PO-PSM states that “its standardized nature and inapplicability to certain job groups; a perception that it does not link to improvements in rewards; and the difficulty of undertaking objective assessments in situations where possibilities of collusion might be prevalent.” Moreover, it is reported that OPRAS is implemented without coordination with the need for training of staff. The establishment of OPRAS has been perceived negatively by Public Servants due to the fact that there are no tangible impacts employees have earned from this tool. It is because of these diverse experience and events that the researcher will assess employees’ perception on performance appraisal system in Public Service. Therefore, as claimed earlier in this proposal, the aim of this study was to assess employees perception on performance appraisal system in Public Service in Tanzania with a case of PMO-RALG.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective
The general objective of this study was to assess employees’ perceptions on Open Performance Review and Appraisal System (OPRAS) in Tanzania Public Service

1.3.1 Specific Objectives
The specific objective of this study will include the followings;
(i) To examine the way the operationalisation of OPRAS in PMO-RALG takes place
(ii) To assess the status of OPRAS implementation in PMO-RALG
(iii) To examine existing challenges on implementing OPRAS in PMO-RALG

1.4 Research Questions
(i) How is the OPRAS operationalised?
(ii) What is the status of OPRAS implementation in PMO-RALG
(iii) What are the existing challenges on implementation of OPRAS
1.56 The Scope of the Study
The study was conducted at Dodoma and Dar Es Salaam where the selected employees and few Management members were incorporated. Researcher selected Dodoma office because PMO-RALG headquarters are based in Dodoma with larger number of staff of different cadres. Also it will be easier to a researcher to get all the necessary information because all PMO-RALG information’s are handled and communicated through the two centres of Dodoma and Dar es Salaam.

1.67 Justification /Significance of the Study
It is ideal to carry out this research now because the Government is depending much on the efforts exerted by employees in order to realize the intended objectives. Again, the study will be of great importance to the employees of PMO-RALG and the ministry responsible as it will explore the challenges being faced for the ongoing initiative of implementation of OPRAS. This will help to come up with recommended good practices that may improve the performance of the individual employees and as well as that of the organization. It will provide a foundation for further studies on performance management in the public organizations.

1.78 Definition of Concept
Performance - It can be defined as the action or process of performing a task or function (oxford Dictionary 10th Edition).


System - Can be defined as, a complex whole, a set of things working together as a mechanism or interconnecting network (oxford dictionary: 10th Edition).

Performance Appraisal - Defined as the process of identifying, evaluating and developing the work performance of employees in the organization, so that the organizational goals and objectives are more effectively achieved, while at the same
time benefiting employees in terms of recognition, receiving feedback, catering for work needs and offering career guidance (Lansbury, 1988).

**Open Performance Review and Appraisal System (OPRAS)** - defined as an open, formal, and systematic procedure designed to assist both employers and employees in planning, managing, evaluating and realizing performance improvement in the organization with the aim of achieving organizational goals. OPRAS has unique features that can be differentiated from the previous confidential appraisal system (Johnsen, 2000).

**Performance Management** - Can be defined as a systematic process for improving organizational performance by developing the performance of individuals and teams (Armstrong 2006)

**Performance Appraisal Systems** - Establishing a framework in which performance by human resources can be directed, monitored, motivated and refined, that the links in the cycle can be audited (Torrington, M 2008)

### 1.89 Conceptual Framework

Performance appraisal provides a basis for determining who is doing well and can be given increased responsibilities, who should be rewarded for high performance and who is suitable for promotion. Through performance appraisal, the manager gets to know which resources and other actions are needed to improve staff performance.

According to Bana (2009) as it depicted in figure 1, In Tanzania, Appraisal Systems before reforms were confidential that is to say rating were only done by the supervisor. Employees were not involved during rating or evaluation of employee’s performance. Employees were not satisfied and the non involvement of employees in the evaluation of their performance led to poor service delivery, lack of harmony, ad-hock activities, high turnover rates, absenteeism, nepotism, corruption practices. And as a result of the above, low productivity, unduly promotions, uneven pay structure, floodgate litigations were the order of the day.
The Government through Public Service Reforms Programs had intended to mitigate the situation and as such OPRAS were introduced in Tanzania government since 2004 with the intention of improving employees’ performance and raise morale of employees in the Public sector. Following the inception of OPRAS in the public service, public servants have different perception regarding the introduction of the OPRAS. Others have positive while others have negative feeling. Whatever the feeling or perception employees in the public service have, OPRAS has become a compulsory tool on employees performance as it is defined in Public Service Act 2002 (as amended by Act no 18 of 2007). According to Bana (2009), this model has improved Public Service Delivery in Tanzania as it is depicted below in figure 01. This tool will be related to this study.

**Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervening variable</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uneven pay structure</td>
<td>Goals setting</td>
<td>Employee Perception on OPRAS</td>
<td>Improve efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneven promotion</td>
<td>Performance standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation and Reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of harmony</td>
<td>Employees involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Filling set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Act No.8 (2002)

Moderating variable
The above figure shows how dependent and independent variables relates in assessing employees perception on the Open Performance Appraisal System in Tanzania Public Service.

The dependent variable which is employees’ perception on OPRAS depends with independent variables like goals setting, performance standards, training, employees, involvement, motivation, good industrial relations and others.

However, there are other intervening factors like uneven pay structure, uneven, promotion, corruption and lack of harmony. The moderating variable on the other hand helps to shape and guide the organizations and employees on the necessities of OPRAS.

Therefore, the expected outcomes after the implementation of OPRAS are to improve efficiency and effectiveness, increase motivation, reward and fulfilling the set goals and objectives.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature relevant to the subject matter under inquiry. The scope of the review comprises existing publications, empirical evidence and theoretical reviews. The review provides secondary data this researcher utilized in the investigation and field research.

2.2 Conceptual Definitions

2.2.1 Performance

The Oxford English dictionary defines performance as the “accomplishment, execution, carrying out, and working out of anything ordered or undertaken”. Armstrong and Baron (2005) argue that performance is a matter not only of what people achieve, but how they achieve it. Bates and Holton (1995) suggest that performance is a multidimensional construct, the measurement of which depends on
a variety of factors. Brumbach (1988) offers the most precise definition. “Performance means both behaviours and results. Behaviours are also outcomes in their own right and can be judged apart from results”.

From the definition, and interpretations above, it can be argued that performance is not just about outputs, it is also concerned with actions and behaviours demonstrated to achieve given targets. This issue will feature strongly through the research.

Armstrong (2006:142) asserts that “Performance management can be defined as a strategic and integrated approach to delivering sustained success to organizations by improving the performance of the people who work in them and by developing the capabilities of teams and individual contributors”. Further suggests that when it is used well, it will contribute to organisation success, and as such, is a vital management function. Radnor and McGuire (2004) research on a case study at Bradford Health Authority showed that effective performance management in the public sector could be considered to be closer to fiction than fact. Of all the literature reviewed on the wider subject of performance management, Radnor and McGuire (2004) are amongst the minority in conducting in-depth attitudinal surveys that aid their findings.

2.2.2 Public Sector

The Public Sector, sometimes referred to as the state sector is a part of the state that deals with either the production, delivery and allocation of goods and services by and for the government or its citizens, whether national, regional or local/municipal. Some of the examples of public sector activity include from delivering social security, administering urban planning and organizing national defenses. The part of the economy concerned with providing basic government services. The composition of the public sector varies by country, but in most countries the public sector includes such services as the police, military, public roads, public transit, primary education and healthcare for the poor. The public sector might provide services that non-payer cannot be excluded from (such as street lighting) services which benefit all of society rather than just the individual who uses the service (such as public
education), and services that encourage equal opportunity. (http://www.investorwords.com/3947/public_sector.html#ixzz1GGljsReY downloaded on 11th March, 2011).

2.2.3 Performance Review and Appraisal System (OPRAS)

The Open Performance Review and Appraisal System (OPRAS) is an open, formal, and systematic procedure designed to assist both employers and employees in planning, managing, evaluating and realizing performance improvement in the organization with the aim of achieving organizational goals.

2.2.4 Employee Motivation

It is the inner force that drives individuals to accomplish personal and organizational goals. It is the willingness to do something and is conditioned by this action’s ability to satisfy some need for the individual.

2.2.5 Effectiveness

According to Decenzo and Robbins (1993:360), Effectiveness is defined as goal accomplishment. It means doing the right things and choosing the appropriate objectives.

2.3 Theoretical Review

2.3.1 Performance Management Features

McMaster (1994) and Williams (2002) amongst others, suggest that the key sequences of performance management are as follows;

(i) Identification of strategic objectives
(ii) Setting of departmental/team goals
(iii) Activities identified/performance plan developed
(iv) Outputs agreed
(v) Monitor/review of performance through appraisal
(vi) Determine development needs
Performance management consists of all organizational processes that determine how well employees, teams and ultimately, the organization perform. Every human resource function contributes to this performance (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

Performance management is an ongoing communication process, undertaken in partnership between an employee and his or her immediate supervisor that involves establishing clear expectations and understanding about the following:

(i) The employee's essential job function.
(ii) How the employee's job contributes to the goals of the organization
(iii) What it means, in concrete terms, to do the job well
(iv) How job performance will be measured
(v) What barriers hinder performance and how they can be minimized or eliminated
(vi) How the employee and the supervisor will work together to improve the employee's performance (Robert, 2004).

Performance management is the integration of performance appraisal systems with broader Human Resource Management systems as a means of aligning employees' work behaviors with the organization's goals. Thus, a performance management system consists of the processes used to identify, encourage, measure, evaluate, improve, and reward employee performance at work.

Performance management is a continuous and much wider, more comprehensive and more natural process of management that clarifies mutual expectations, emphasizes the support role of managers who are expected to act as coaches rather than judges, and focuses on the future (Sims, 2002).

2.3.2 Performance Management in the Public Sector
According to Adcroft and Willis, (2005), performance management is an increasingly common phenomenon in the public sector. All public sector organisations will be required to scrutinize the performance of the organisation and its staff.

Performance appraisal (PA) is among the most important Human Resource (HR) practices (Boswell and Boudreau, 2002) and one of the most heavily researched topics in work psychology (Fletcher, 2002). PA has increasingly become part of effective strategic approach to integrate HR activities with business policies and may now be seen as a generic term covering a variety of activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competencies, enhance performance and distribute rewards.

Most modern organizations apply specific forms of performance appraisal aiming at providing employees with feedback about their performance in the appraisal period on one hand, and to facilitate the task of the organization’s top management in making decisions relating to promotion or demotion on the other hand. Performance appraisal is the process of evaluating appraisee’s performance during a specific period. Performance appraisal is essential and useful for both the employees and the organizations. On the employees’ level, it helps developing the skills and improving the capacities of employees. On the organizational level, it helps improving organizational planning and achieving the main goals of the organization efficiently and effectively (Armstrong, 2006 pp 500).

2.3.4 Performance Appraisal and Performance Management

It is sometimes assumed that performance appraisal is the same thing as performance management. But there are significant differences. Hereinafter we distinguish between both terms by defining each of them separately:

Performance Appraisal
Many definitions have been recorded on performance appraisal; in the following lines we exhibit some of them: (Armstrong, 2006) defines performance appraisal as formal assessment and rating of individuals by their managers at, usually, an annual review meeting. (Grote, 2002) defines performance appraisal as a formal management system that provides for the evaluation of the quality of an individual's performance in an organization. The appraisal is usually prepared by the employee's immediate supervisor. The procedure typically requires the supervisor to fill out a standardized assessment form that evaluates the individual on several different dimensions and then discusses the results of the evaluation with the employee.

Performance appraisal is a formal system of review and evaluation of individual or team task performance (Mondy and Noe, 2005). Performance appraisals provide information relevant to personnel issues such as salary increases, promotion, transfers, training programs and employee feedback (Cleveland et al, 1989).

Performance appraisal can be defined as a process aimed at determining the results of an employee's work, one of its main functions being to offer a justified compensation for his/her efforts. It can be based directly on a particular employee's work results or his/her activities or competencies and is regarded as the main component of performance management, through which it is also possible to evaluate the effectiveness of an organization (Turk and Roolah, 2007). The point of performance appraisals is to see if the people under contract are performing as well as they can, and also to assess whether they are being fairly rewarded (their remuneration, like their duties, is subject to contractual agreement (Herwig, 2003).

Performance appraisal is a process, not a form. It structures your relationship with employees while providing legal protection for your company. A good appraisal system includes observation, documentation, and communication. A performance evaluation system can provide many benefits: It can improve employee performance and morale, identify poor performers and ways they can improve, and lay the groundwork for legally defensible discipline and termination (Amy, 2007).

Methods of Appraising Performance
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Usually organizations determine the method by which the employees' performance will be measured. Although there are four general measures of output, quality, quantity, cost, and timeliness (Grote, 2002) different methods for appraising the employees' performance exist. The main methods of appraising performance are such as:

**The 360-Degree Feedback Evaluation**: The 360-degree feedback evaluation is an increasingly popular appraisal method that involves evaluation input from multiple levels within the firm as well as external sources. In this method, people all around the rated employee may provide rating, including senior managers, the employee himself or herself, supervisors, subordinates, peers, team members and internal or external customers. Unlike traditional approaches, 360-degree feedback focuses on skills needed across organizational boundaries. Also, by shifting the responsibility for evaluation to more than one person, many of the common appraisal errors can be reduced or eliminated (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

**Critical incidents**: In the critical incidents method, the manager keeps written record of both highly favorable and unfavorable actions in an employee’s performance. When a “critical incident” involving an employee occurs, the manager writes it down. A list of critical incidents is kept during the entire rating period for each employee (Mathis, 2007). With this method, the appraisal is more likely to cover the evaluation period and not focus in the last few weeks on months (Mondy et al, 2002).

**Essay**: In the essay method, the rater simply writes a brief narrative describing the employee’s performance. This method tends to focus on extreme behavior in the employee’s work rather than routine day-to-day performance. The rater is usually given a few general headings under which he is requested to categorize comments. Ratings of this type depend heavily on the evaluator’s writing ability. Because of their excellent writing skills, some supervisors can make even a marginal worker sound like a top performer. Comparing essay evaluations might be difficult because no comment criteria exist (Mondy et al, 2002).
Checklist Appraisal: A checklist appraisal contains a series of questions about an employee's performance. A supervisor answers yes or no to the questions. Thus, a checklist is merely a record of performance, not an evaluation by a supervisor. The HRM department has a key for scoring the items on the checklist; the score results in a rating of an employee's performance.

The checklist can be modified so that varying weights are assigned to the statements or words. The results can then be quantified. Usually the weights are not known by the rating supervisor because they are tabulated by someone else, such as a member of the HRM department (Sims, 2007).

Work standards: The work standards method compares each employee’s performance to a predetermined standards or expected level of output. Standards reflect the normal output of an average worker operating at a normal pace. Work standards may be applied to virtually all types of jobs, but they are most frequently used for production jobs. Several methods may be utilized in determining work standards, including time study and work sampling. An obvious advantage of using standards as appraisal criteria is objectivity. However, in order for employees to perceive that the standards are objective, they should understand clearly how the standards were set. It follows that the rationale for the any changes to the standards must also be carefully explained (Mondy et al, 2002).

Ranking: The ranking method consists of listing all employees from highest to lowest in performance (Mathis, 2007). For example, the best employee in the group is ranked highest, and the poorest is ranked lowest. This procedure is continued until all employees are ranked.

Behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS): The behaviorally anchored rating scale combines elements of traditional rating scales and critical incident method. In this method, various performance levels are shown along a scale with each described in terms of an employee’s specific job behavior. In evaluating a group of employees
Working as interviewers, for example, suppose the factor chosen for evaluation is Ability to absorb and interpret policies. On the very positive end of this factor might be this interviewer could be expected to serve as an information source concerning new and changed policies for others in the organization. On the very negative end of this factor might be even after repeated explanations, this interviewer would be unable to understand new procedures. There might several levels in between the very negative and the very positive. Rather than have the raters judge the quality of a subordinate’s performance, the rater is able to determine more objectively how frequently the employee performs in each defined level (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

**Behavioral Observation Scale (BOS):** The Behavioral Observation Scale (BOS) is another behavioral approach to assessing employee performance. Like BARS, a BOS is developed from critical incidents. However, rather than only use a sample of behaviors that reflect effective or ineffective behavior, a BOS uses substantially more behaviors to specifically define all the measures that are necessary for effective performance. A second difference between a BOS and BARS is that rather than assessing which behavior best describes an individual's performance, a BOS allows managers to rate the frequency with which the individual employee has exhibited each behavior during the rating period. The manager then averages these ratings to calculate an overall performance rating for the individual. Although the BOS approach avoids the limitations of the BARS approach, the BOS takes even more time and can be even more expensive to develop (Sims, 2007).

**Results-based System:** This theory is the past form of management by objectives. The manager and subordinates jointly agree on objectives for the next appraisal period in a result-based system. In such a system, one objective might be, to cut waste by 10 percent. At the end of the appraisal period, an evaluation focuses on how well the employee achieved this objective (Mondy and Noe, 2005). One distinct advantage of this approach is that it provides a measure of achievement against predetermined objectives. However, since performance is outcomes do not indicate how to change, the method may be less helpful in employee development.
Nevertheless, a result oriented approach remains a popular technique to evaluate employees, especially managers (Mondy et al, 2002).

**Management by Objectives:** Management by objectives (MBO) represented an advantage on previous approaches to defining tasks and providing a basis for assessment. It is applied in two distinct phases, one concerned with the setting of objectives and the other with appraisal of performance (Thomason, 1988). MBO specifies the objective goals that an individual hopes to attain within an appropriate length of time. The objectives that each manager sets are derived from the overall goals and objectives of the organization, although MBO should not be disguised means for a superior to dictate the objectives of individual manager or employee. No management tool is perfect, and certainly MBO is not appropriate for all employees or all organizations. Jobs with little or no flexibility are not compatible with MBO. For example, an assembly-line worker usually has so little job flexibility that performance standards and objectives are already determined. The MBO process seems to be most useful with managerial personnel and employees who have a fairly wide range of flexibility and control over their jobs. When imposed on a rigid and autocratic management system, MBO may fail. Extreme emphasis on penalties for not meeting objectives defeats the development and participative nature of MBO (Mathis, 2007)

### 2.3.5 Problems in Performance Appraisal

According to Neely, Kennerlry and Martinez (2004), there has been much prescription regarding the design of Performance management system, but very little consideration of whether such systems actual work. It is worth noting that Speckbacher et al (2003) have reported that 8% of 174 Germany speaking countries decided not to implement a performance management system because they could not see the advantages or positive impact especially given the effort required to implement such systems. Ideally, rating supervisors should be completely objective in their appraisals of employees. Each appraisal should directly reflect an employee's performance, not any biases of a supervisor. Of course, this is impossible to do
perfectly as most raters either intentionally or unintentionally commit errors. Raters need to be aware of these biases, so that their effect on the appraisals can be limited or eliminated. Hereinafter, the researcher discusses some of these errors:

Unclear standards: Although the graphic rating scale seems objective, it would probably result in unfair appraisals because the traits and degrees of merit are open to interpretation. For example, different supervisors would probably define good performance, fair performance, and so on, differently. The same is true of such traits as quality of work or creativity. There are several ways to rectify this problem. The best way is to develop and include descriptive phrases that define each trait, for example, by specifying on the evaluation form what is meant by such things as outstanding, superior, and good quality of work. This specificity results in appraisals that are more consistent and more easily explained (Sims, 2007).

Lack of objectivity: A potential weakness of traditional performance appraisal method is that they lack objectivity. In the rating scale method, for example, commonly used factors such as attitudes, loyalty, and personality are difficult to measure. In addition, these factors may have little to do with an employees' job performance. Some subjectivity will always exist in appraisal methods. However, employee appraisal based primarily on personal characteristics may place the evaluator and the organization in untenable positions with the employee an equal employment opportunity guidelines. The firm may be hard pressed to show that these factors are job-related (Mondy et al, 2002).

Bias: Rater bias occurs when a rater's value or prejudices distort the rating. Rater bias may be unconscious or quite intentional. If a manager has strong dislike of certain ethnic group, this bias is likely to result in distorted appraisal information for some people. Halo error occurs when a manager generalizes one positive performance feature or incident to all aspects of employee performance resulting in a higher rating (Mondy and Noe, 2005). For example, a manager may give high rating for employees who show noticeable punctuality in spite of other factors in which the appraisal is based such as quantity and quality of output.
Leniency / Strictness: Giving undeserved high rating is referred to as leniency. The behavior is often motivated by a desire to avoid controversy over the appraisal (Mondy and Noe, 2005). Some managers may rate their subordinates very high either because they want to show that the work under their responsibilities is proceeding very well or because they do not have the ability to convince their subordinates that their performances deserve this rating. Another problem which is closely connected to leniency is strictness. Strictness is rating subordinates on the lower level of the rating system. Some managers want to show the chief or head of the organization that they care for the organization that they work at. In addition, it is also a good excuse before the higher level management that the subordinates under their supervision are not performing their tasks as well as they should and thus the overall performance of the department is unsatisfactory due to the existence of these subordinates.

Central Tendency: Central tendency is a common error that occurs when employees are incorrectly rated near the average or middle of the scale. This practice may be encouraged by some rating scale systems that require the evaluator to justify in writing extremely high and extremely low ratings. With such system, the rater may avoid possible criticism by giving only average ratings. However, since these ratings tend to cluster in the fully satisfactory range, employees do not often complain about this (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

Recent Behavior Bias: When rating is not based on the entire appraisal period and just on the last month of the appraisal this is called recent behavior bias. The performance of the subordinate may be outstanding during the year (if the appraisal is done annually) and on the last month the performance of the subordinate worsen. The rater evaluates the subordinate based on the last month and forgets the eleven-month outstanding performance.

It is only natural for a rater to remember recent behavior more clearly than action from the more distant past. However, formal performance appraisals generally cover
a specified time, and an individual's performance over the entire period should be considered. Maintaining records of performance throughout the appraisal period helps avoid this problem (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

Personal Bias: This pitfall occurs when supervisors allow individuals differences such as age, religion, seniority, sex, appearance or other arbitrary classifications to affect the rating they give to appraisee. If the performance appraisal is examined by higher-level managers, this problem will be overcome. This pitfall is not only detrimental to employee morale, but it is also blatantly illegal and can result in costly litigation (Armstrong, 2006).

2.3.6 The Major Uses of Performance Appraisal

The overall aim of performance management is to establish a high performance culture in which individuals and teams take responsibility for the continuous improvement of business processes and for their own skills and contributions within a framework provided by effective leadership. Specifically, performance management is about aligning individual objectives to organizational objectives and ensuring that individuals uphold corporate core values. It provides for expectations to be defined and agreed in terms of role responsibilities and accountabilities (expected to do), skills (expected to have) and behaviors (expected to be). The aim is to develop the capacity of people to meet and exceed expectations and to achieve their full potential to the benefit of themselves and the organization. Importantly, performance management is concerned with ensuring that the support and guidance people need to develop and improve are readily available (Armstrong, 2006).

Performance appraisal has two general uses in organizations, and these roles often are potential conflicts. One role is to measure performance for the purpose of rewarding or otherwise making administrative decisions about employees. Promotions or layoffs might hinge on these ratings, often making them difficult for managers to do. Another role is development of individual potential. In that role, the manager is featured more as a counselor than as a judge, and the atmosphere is often
different. Emphasis is on identifying potential and planning employees’ growth opportunities and direction (Mathis, 2007). Other writers including Mondy and Noe see that the uses of performance appraisal extend to include all human resource functions.

2.3.6.1 Administrative uses

One of the most common uses of performance appraisal is for administrative purposes. The performance appraisal data are potentially administratively valuable for different human resource functional area.

**Recruitment and selection:** Performance evaluation ratings may be helpful in predicting the performance of job applications. In interviews for example, the interviewing committee may use the previous performance appraisal of the applicant to have more obvious knowledge about how the performance of this applicant is expected to be. Also in validating selection tests, employee ratings may be used as the variable against which test scores are compared. In this instance, determination of the selection test validity would depend in the accuracy of appraisal results (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

Performance appraisal can also be used administratively to provide evidence and documents on the performance of employees during a specific period of time. A firm may find an employee's performance unsatisfied and after several attempts of training to improve performance the company decides to fire this employee. In such a position the performance appraisal record can be utilized as a legal document to justify taking such an action (Mathis, 2007).

**Compensation program:** Performance appraisal results provide a basis for rational decisions regarding pay adjustment. Most managers believe that they should reward outstanding job performance tangibly with pay increases. To encourage good performance, a firm should design and implement a reliable performance appraisal
system and then reward the most productive workers and teams accordingly (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

A performance appraisal system is often the link between the rewards employees hope to receive and their productivity. The linkage can be thought of as follows: Productivity performance appraisal rewards Compensation based on performance appraisal is at the heart of the idea that raises should be given for performance accomplishments rather than for seniority. Under performance-oriented systems, employees receive raises based on how well they perform their jobs. The manager’s role historically has been as an evaluator of a subordinate’s performance, which then leads to managers making compensation recommendations or decisions for employees. If any part of the process fails, the most productive employees do not receive the larger rewards, resulting in perceived inequity in compensation (Mathis, 2007).

**Assessment of Employee Potential:** Some organizations attempt to assess employee potential as they appraise their job performances. While past behaviors may be the best predictors of future behaviors, an employee's past performance in one job may not indicate future performance in a higher position or different position. Overemphasizing technical skills and ignoring other equally important skills is a common error in promoting employees in management jobs. Recognition of this problem has led some firms to separate the appraisal of performance, which focuses on past behavior, from the assessment of potential, which is future oriented (Mathis, 2007).

**Internal Employee Relations:** Performance appraisal data are also frequently used for decisions in several areas of internal employee relations, including promotion, demotion, termination, layoff and transfer. For example, an employee's performance in one job may be useful in determining his or her ability to perform another job on the same level, as is required in the considerations of transfers. When the performance level is unacceptable, demotion or even termination may be appropriate. When employees working under a labor agreement are involved, seniority is
typically the basis for layoffs. However when management has more flexibility, an employee's performance recode is generally a more relevant criterion (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

### 2.3.6.2 Development Uses

Performance appraisal can be a primary source of information and feedback for employees, which is essential to their future development. The output of performance appraisal can be useful in different human resource functions.

**Human Resource Planning:** In assessing a firm's human resource, data must be available that describes the promotability and potential of all employees, especially key executives. Management succession planning is a key concern for all firms. A well designed appraisal system provides a profile of the organization's human resource strengths and weaknesses to support this effort (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

**Training and Development:** Performance appraisal should point out an employee's specific needs for training and development. For instance, reporting jobs require skills in technical writing and the evaluation of employee who occupies this post reveals a deficiency in this factor, he/she may need additional training in this aspect. By identifying deficiencies that adversely affect performance, human resource and line managers are able to develop training and development programs that permit individuals to build on their strengths and minimize their deficiencies. An appraisal system does not guarantee properly trained and developed employees. However, determining training and development needs is more precise when appraisal data are available (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

When supervisors identify the weaknesses, potentials, and training needs of employees through performance appraisal feedback, they can inform employees about their progress, discuss what skills they need to develop, and work out development plans. The manager’s role in such a situation is like that of a coach. The coach’s job is to reward good performance with recognition, explain what
improvement is necessary, and show employees how to improve. After all, people do not always know where they could improve, and managers really cannot expect improvement if they are unwilling to explain where and how improvement can occur (Mathis, 2007).

The purpose of developmental feedback is to change or reinforce individual behavior, rather than to compare individuals as in the case of administrative uses of performance appraisal. Positive reinforcement for the behaviors the organization wants is an important part of development.

**Career Planning and Development:** Career planning and development may be viewed from either an individual or an organizational viewpoint. In either case, performance appraisal data are essential in assessing an employee's strengths and weaknesses and in determining the person's potential. Managers may use such information to counsel subordinates and assist them in developing and implementing their career plans (Mondy and Noe, 2005).

### 2.3.7 Characteristics of Effective Performance Appraisal System

An effective performance appraisal system has a strategic importance to the organization. Clearly, the organization must monitor the extent to which it is conducting its performance appraisals effectively, adequately, and appropriately. Also, regardless of which performance appraisal approach is used, an understanding of what performance management is supposed to do is critical. When performance appraisal is used to develop employees as sources, it usually works.

The basic purpose of a performance appraisal system is to improve performance of individuals, teams, and the entire organization. The system may also serve to assist in the making of administrative decisions concerning pay increases, transfers, or terminations. Organizations should seek an accurate assessment of performance that permits the development of a plan to improve individual and group performance. The
system must honestly inform people of how they stand with the organization. According to Mondy and Noe (2005), identify the following factors as important in accomplishing these purposes:

**Job-related Criteria:** Job relatedness is perhaps the most basic criterion in employee performance appraisal. The uniform guidelines and court decisions are quite clear on this point. More specifically, evaluation criteria should be determined through job analysis. Subjective factors, such as initiative, enthusiasm, loyalty and cooperation are obviously important; however, unless clearly shown to be job related, they should not be used.

**Performance Expectations:** Managers and subordinates must agree on performance expectations in advance of the appraisal period. How can employees function effectively if they do not know what they are being measured against? On the other hand, if employees clearly understand the expectations, they can evaluate their own performance and make timely adjustment as they perform their jobs without having to wait for formal evaluation review. The establishment of highly objective work standards is relatively simple in many areas, such as manufacturing, assembly, and sales. For numerous other types of jobs, however, this task is more difficult. Still, evaluation must take place based on clearly understood performance expectations. Standardization: Firms should use the same evaluation instrument for all employees in the same job category who work for the same supervisor. Supervisors should also conduct appraisals covering similar periods for these employees. Although annual evaluations are most common, many successful firms evaluate their employees more frequently. Regularly scheduled feedback sessions and appraisal interviews for all employees are essential.

**Trained Appraisers:** Most systems can be improved by training supervisors, because conducting performance appraisals is a big part of a performance management system. Training should focus on minimizing errors and providing a frame of reference on how raters observe and recall information (Sims, 2007). A common deficiency in appraisal system is that the evaluators rarely receive training.
on how to conduct effective evaluations. Unless everyone evaluating performance is
receives training in the art of receiving and giving feedback, the process can lead to
uncertainty and conflict.

**Continuous open communication:** Most employees have a strong need to know
how well they are performing. A good appraisal system provides highly desired
feedback on a continuing basis. There should be few surprises in the performance
review. Managers should handle daily performance problems as they occur and not
allow them to pile up for six months or a year and then address them during the
performance appraisal interview.

**Performance Reviews:** A special time should be set for a formal discussion of an
employee's performance. Since improved performance is a common goal of appraisal
system, withholding appraisal result is absurd. Employees are severely handicapped
in their developmental efforts if denied access to this information. A performance
review allows them to detect any errors or omissions in the appraisal, or an employee
may simply disagree with the evaluation and want to challenge it.

**Due Process:** Ensuring due process is vital. If the company or the organization does
not have grievance procedure, it should develop one to provide employees an
opportunity to appeal appraisal results that they consider inaccurate or unfair. They
must have a procedure for pursuing their grievances and having them addressed
objectively.

**Consistency with the Strategic Mission of the Organization:** Effective
performance management systems evolve from the recognition that human behaviors
and capabilities collapsed into a single score have a limited use in shaping the
necessary range of performance. In the end, since performance appraisal feeds into
the performance management process and the ultimate goal of this process is to
improve performance on the job, if the process is working, managers should be able
to see real improvements in organizational performance. This improvement may take
the form of fewer errors in production, fewer returns in sales, higher appraisals, or
lower levels of absenteeism or turnover. In the long run, however, these outcomes
are not critical to the organization unless they translate into some improvement in the company's performance. That is, if performance appraisal and performance management systems are doing what they were designed to do, the organization as a whole should perform better (Sims, 2007).

**Collect Relevant Information:** The supervisor should begin by collecting relevant information. One source for information is the critical incident log if one has been maintained throughout the review period, but this should not necessarily be the only source of information used in the review. In addition to observations made by the supervisor about performance, it is important to find out how employees are serving those with whom they work on a regular basis. Obtaining this information can help to reduce concerns about inter-rater reliability and builds credibility with regard to the overall fairness of the review process (Bogardus, 2004).

**Provide Specific Examples:** When preparing the review, it is essential that the supervisor provides specific examples to assist the employee's learning process. Instead of saying only that the employee did a great job (which will no doubt make the employee feel good, but does not identify the results or behavior that made the performance great), a statement that the employee consistently submitted accurate reports requiring little or no revision on or before the deadline describes exactly the kind of behavior that the supervisor wants to encourage (Bogardus, 2004).

### 2.3.8 Motivation Vs Performance Assessment System (PAS)

In the human resources management, performance appraisal systems have a vital role. The performance evaluation is an important mechanism for controlling the organization, where employees can view their performance in the immediate past and take concrete actions for improvement. Performance appraisals also provide important information for the management of human resources to create fair and correct decisions regarding promotions, transfers, compensation, incentives and training programs and career management. Special companies typically require
different performance appraisal system tailored to the needs of the functions and processes (Chen & Chu, 2007). Assessment of performance is related to the motivation of employees. Especially the provision of feedback to enable employees to learn how the employee worked; setting specific goals about what employees should do; team-building to enable employees to participate with friends and their managers in solving problems that hinder their productivity, and monetary incentives that reward good performance (Latham and Wexley, 1994).

According to Mathis and Jackson (2000), factors that affect the individual performance of workers, namely: 1. ability, 2. motivation, 3. support that received, 4. existence of work that they do, 5. Relationship with the organization. Meanwhile, according to Gibson (1987) there are three factors that affect performance: 1) individual factors: ability, skill, family background, experience of employment, social and demographic levels of a person. 2) Psychological factors: perception, roles, attitudes, personality, motivation and job satisfaction 3) organizational factors: organizational structure, job design, leadership, reward systems.

The performance evaluation is a key factor in order to develop an organization effectively and efficiently. Individual performance appraisal is very beneficial for the growth dynamics of the organization as a whole. Through an assessment can be known about how the actual conditions of employee performance can be known. According to Bernardin and Russell (1993) evaluation is a way of measuring the contribution of individuals (employees) to the organizations where they work.

According to Cascio (1992, pp 334) "performance evaluation is a systematic description or a description of the relevant strengths and weaknesses of a person or a group. Furthermore, regarding definition of performance appraisal Grote (2002: pp1) stated that “Performance appraisal is a formal management system that provides for the evaluation of the quality of an individual’s performance in an organization”. Performance appraisal is “the process of evaluating how well employees perform their jobs when compared to a set of standards, and then communicating that information to those employees (Mathis and Jackson, 2000).
Formal performance appraisal can be accomplished after any period, although it is normally conducted on an annual basis. Sometimes organizations require it be done more frequently, quarterly, or semiannually. Frequent performance appraisals can result in greater understanding of the job and improvement in job (Nathan et al, 1991). Mathis & Jackson (2000) state that appraisal typically are conducted once or twice a year, most often annually. For new employees, common timing is to conduct an appraisal 90 days after employment, again at six months, and annually thereafter. Also Anderson in Towers (1996) says that the most common corporate practices are to hold performance appraisals every twelve months or every six months, although more-frequent and less frequent variations can and do occur.

Bhatia (2010) based on the results of his research where he has worked with many companies, found that each step in the assessment process should be no more than 4-5 working days. Further, he said that in assessing the performance of at least six stages which totally takes over 15 - 35 days. The different steps in the assessment process and their time-line might be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.9 Number of Steps Proposed Time-Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 1 Employees finishing their self assessment and submit it to their managers 2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 2 Managers finishing the assessment process and submit it to Heads of Departments 5 to 10 days (depending on the team size)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Head of the Departments completed the score of their employees and then submit it to the HR department 2 to 5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) 4 HR do normalization (removal of departmental bias) throughout the organization, complete the assessment scores and submits it to the managers 3 to 12 days (depends on the level of interaction required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) 5 Managers to discuss the appraisal with the employee and then give those results to the employee for final acceptance 2 to 5 days (depending on the team size)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) 6 Employees receive their assessment results and sign it 1 day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Time Taken 15 to 35 days. Furthermore, performance appraisal can be conducted into two ways, informal or formal. An informal appraisal is conducted whenever the supervisor feels it necessary. A systematic appraisal is used when the contact between manager and employee is formal, and a system is in place to report managerial impressions and observations on employee performance (Mathis & Jackson; 2000, Anderson in Towers; 1996, Oberg; 1972). Although informal appraisal is useful, it should not take the place of formal appraisal.

Performance can be appraised by a number of methods. Winston & Creamer (1997) noted that there are numerous methods to measure employee’s performance appraisal but some of these methods are not suitable in certain cases. Effective appraisal system should include clarity, transparency, and justice; give recognition to productivity through the reward; and realize the leadership qualities of appraisers.

Fitzgerald (1992) defines training as “the acquisition of knowledge and skills for present tasks, which help individuals contribute to the organization in their current positions…. To be successful, training must result in a change in behaviour such as the use of new knowledge and skills on the job” Training is the process of increasing the knowledge and skills for doing a particular job. It is any process by which the aptitudes, skills and abilities of employees to perform specific jobs are increased.

2.3.10 Performance Measurement

Harrington (1995) states “to measure is to understand, to understand is to gain knowledge. To have knowledge is to have power. Since the beginning of time, the thing that sets humans apart from the other animals is our ability to observe measure, analyze and use this information to bring about change”. According to Cronje et al (2005: 274), “the main instrument used to control organizational human resources is performance measurement”. This entails evaluating employees and managers in the
performance of the organization mainly assessing the individuals and groups performance with predetermined standards.

### 2.3.11 Open Performance Review and Appraisal System

The Open Performance Review and Appraisal System (OPRAS) is an open, formal, and systematic procedure designed to assist both employers and employees in planning, managing, evaluating and realizing performance improvement in the organization with the aim of achieving organizational goals.

### 2.3.12 New Public Management (NPM) and Performance Appraisal

The public sector reform drive was initiated under several names, one of which is New Public Management (NPM). These reforms came into existence during the 1980s in the advanced capitalist democracies as a response to the economic constraints. Gregory (2001) highlighted five main factors that have led to this change in perspective. They are re-bureaucratization; lack of trust in government; lack of legitimacy of the government; politicization of public administration; and redefining the recipients of service as customer of citizen. In addition to this, Lane (1997:2) has expressed on how the growing size of the public service contributes to these changes. According to him “in the early 1980s there was a realization that the public sector had a profound problem in relation to how well its various programmes were operating”. The adoption of NPM means the application of private sector practices and solutions to the problems of the public sector.

With the growing number of challenges faced today, there are now, more than ever, increased demands on managers and all other staff members to achieve higher levels of efficiency and productivity. The continuously changing nature of most public services today and the high expectations from the general public have increased pressure on public servants to re-evaluate their contributions in the workplace and the way in which they work. The introduction of performance appraisal systems has been one strategy adopted to meet these challenges.
2.4 Empirical Evidence

2.4.1 Tanzania Public Sector Experience

The Government introduced the use of Open Performance Review and Appraisal System (OPRAS) in July 2004, through Establishment Circular No.2 of 2004. OPRAS replaced the Confidential Performance Appraisal System which was characterized by absence of feedback and poor help in the identification of the training needs of the employees. Hence, it failed to promote performance improvement and accountability in the Public Service. These changes in appraising performance of Public employees are in line with Public Service Management and Employment Policy (PSMEP) of 1998 and the Public Service Act No. 8 of 2002, which both emphasizes on institutionalization of result oriented management and meritocratic principles in the Public Service.

Introduction of OPRAS is a key part of the Government’s commitment to improve performance and service delivery to the public. It is a key accountability instrument for individual employees that emphasize the importance of participation, ownership and transparency through involving employees in objectives setting, implementing, monitoring and performance reviewing process. This way there is continuous communication between supervisors and employees; and understanding on the linkage between organizational objectives and individual

2.4.2 Rationale of Introducing OPRAS in the Public Sector

Like the private sector, public sector organizations around the world face pressure to improve service quality, lower their costs, become more accountable, customer focused and responsive to stakeholders’ needs. And at another side to ensure every Individual is contributing to 2025 vision MDAs.
2.4.3 The Purposes of OPRAS

According to Gibson (2004), appraisals are conducted for two major reasons: evaluation and feedback. When used for evaluation, the appraisal provides input for decisions on promotions, transfers, demotions, terminations, and compensation (salary increases). When used for feedback purposes, the appraisal focuses on the development of the individual, including the identification of coaching and training needs. The job analysis process determines standards of performance, which are clearly communicated to the employees and used as the basis of evaluation in the performance appraisal process.

2.4.4 Characteristic of Good OPRAS

Under OPRAS the characteristics and qualities of Public service employees are evaluated under “attributes of good performance” aspect. The attributes of good performance aim to motivating and instilling positive work behaviours while discouraging actions that come into conflict with established rules of good conduct and values of the public service. Among the notable values are integrity, commitment, discipline, ability, teamwork and effectiveness in establishing good relationship with fellow employees within public service and outside organisations.

**Openness:** allows both employee and employer discuss and agree on the organisational and individual objectives to be achieved during the year; this Provides an opportunity for the supervisor and employee to discuss and agree on measure to improve weaknesses so as to prepare the employee for future organizational responsibilities. Also it guide career decision in organization

**Participation:** involve employees in the process of setting objectives, performance targets and criteria as well as determining, assessing and recording performance;
Accountability: individual employees are required to sign annual performance agreements and account for performance against agreed targets and resources allocated for each activity;

Ownership: shows linkage between individual objectives and the overall organizational objectives in a given period. This helps the employee understand own role and contribution thus creating commitment in achieving organizational goals.

Opportunity To Appeal: Another new element introduced in the OPRAS is an appeal mechanism in case of disagreement of evaluation scores between individual employee and immediate supervisor.

Clear objectives/goals in which Performance is measured against. This help in the established comprehensive standards which are written in a clear and explicit style and communicated to the employee at entry on the job and at the beginning of the appraisal period.

Feedback. Employees are kept informed about methods and purposes of appraisals. Employees are promptly notified in writing and preferably orally, too, of the results of their performance appraisal to prevent misunderstanding about whether the appraisal was given or what the appraisal contained.

2.4.5 The Appraisal Process:

Performance appraisal is “the process of identifying, evaluating and developing the work performance of employees in the organization, so that the organizational goals and objectives are more effectively achieved, while at the same time benefitting employees in terms of recognition, receiving feedback, catering for work and offering career guidance”. (Lansbury, 1988:46)

2.4.6 The appraisal process therefore involves:

1. Setting work standards:
Assessing the employee’s actual performance relative to these standards; and

Providing feedback to the employee with the aim of motivating that person to eliminate performance deficiencies or to continue to perform above par (Dessler, 2000).

2.4.7 Advantages of Using OPRAS

Neely, A. (1995) identifies the following as distinguished advantages of OPRAS if well implemented in public sector in developing world.

2.4.7.1 To the Organization

The job of the person being appraised may be clarified and better defined. Since it require the the employer as well as employees to sit together and to set the expected outcome based on organization objectives. Valuable communication can take place among the individuals taking part (that also include communication between the subordinate and the superior. This is due to the nature of the performance appraisal used. The person whose performance is appraised may develop an increased motivation to perform effectively.

OPRAS tend to develop the self-esteem of the person being appraised particularly good performers since it demand the use of various strategies such as feedback, rewards recognition etc ,this helped a lot to develop self esteem of the employees within organization.

Through the effective use OPRAS; Rewards such as pay and promotion can be distributed on a fair and credible basis. Although the appraisal system in the Tanzania Public Service has yet not been linked to any formal reward under the current system.
OPRAS require both the employees and employers to know the objective of organization clearly before setting any performance standards, this helped to make Organizational goals clearer, well known sense they can be they more readily accepted by both parties.

Valuable appraisal information can allow the organization to do better manpower planning, test validation, and development of training programmes. This can be done through identification of performance gap within organization, the information which can help managers to make proper human resource decisions such as coaching, guidance, recruitment, firing etc.

Better and timely service provision, is another strength of the effective use of OPRAS. Through the use of it the public service provision can be made within well known stipulated time bound. This minimize unnecessary delays in public service deliveries, Enables the employees to know what is expected of them within a limited time, thus greater citizen satisfaction. Example is the speed Migration department of in processing its customer’s passport application.

Making bureaucrats more accountable for their actions is another advantage of using OPRAS in public sector because Appraisal System has the benefit of making individual Officers accountable for their job. It offers an opportunity to both Officers and employees to make a proper assessment of their work and evaluate their contribution in fulfilling the overall mission of the organization. So it is a change of attitude from the old notions of public administration.

### 2.4.7.2 To the Employee

a) Motivated to perform effectively and continuously improve performance due to recognition;

b) Empowered through resources provided to implement planned and agreed activities;

c) Informed of skill gaps and measures for improvement

d) Guided and focused in the execution of duties and responsibilities;
2.4.8 Consequences of Performance Appraisal

There are several consequences of performance appraisal system. Mohrman Jr. et al (1989) has explained a number of such consequences.

- (i) The self-esteem of the person being appraised and the person doing the appraisal may be damaged.
- (ii) Large amount of time may be wasted if not well designed.
- (iii) The relationship among the individuals involved may be permanently worsened thereby creating organizational conflicts.
- (iv) Performance motivation may be lowered for many reasons, including the feeling that poor performance measurement means no rewards for performance (i.e. biased evaluation including favoritism towards some employees).
- (v) Money may be wasted on forms, training, and a host of support services.

2.4.9 Expansion of OPRAS

In April 2004 all government organizations was directed to implement the system across the board. The objective of that scheme has been laudable, yet it has not met with the same success that was originally expected. Indeed, this system was faced with many difficulties and challenges, it is beyond doubt that the current scheme will face fundamental obstacles to be effective institutionalized in the public service (Cutler and Waine, 2005). The main reasons for that are stated as:

Powell, (2004: 1017-23) comment “From the experience of years, it was evident that inadequate and unsustained training offered to public servant. Those who have been trained have been not able to deliver the good. As the result acted as the obstacles to institutionalize the OPRAS in the whole of public service”. In other words, the institutionalization process of the appraisal system was facing Poor
knowledge particularly from public sector bureaucrats on how to conduct effective evaluation through OPRAS. This meant that the ongoing efforts to improve the services provided to the public and making the public service ‘mission-oriented’ were not being properly evaluated in the form of individual performance appraisal.

Another barrier is the culture of Tanzanian society which poses unique challenges for the Performance Appraisal System. According to the system, there needs to be close and continuous communication between the subordinate and the superior. As Asim (2002:4) has mentioned, due to the nature of the Tanzanian Public Service it may “lead to difficulty in making objective assessments in the work place, and the reluctance of managers in taking any action that may disappoint fellow employees”. In other words, it could be generalized that the public service is arguably based on the principles of conflict-avoidance among the subordinate and the superior.

Intellectualise: The Performance Appraisal System has been perceived as an intellectual exercise and thus appears not to be simple to certain categories of employees especial to those who are not well educated. Too many management terms have been used which lacks simplicity and clarity and which “frighten” Public servants. This made the majority of lower or middle cadre employees not to conversant with the scheme this is due to the nature of public servant in Tanzania which involves lower or middle educated individual.

One of the stereotypes about public sector organization in Tanzania are unclear objectives, poor interpreted goal as well as frequency interruption from politicians. This generally reduce the effectiveness of OPRAS, sense they making public sector employees not in a position to know what exactly their efforts are directed. This brings a lot of confusions on what and when to be archived and to what level. This poses a number of challenges in the institutionalization of the performance appraisal system. For the example is clash program for teacher training which a hard hoc decision was and it was out of well known plans.
Poor Participation is among the above mentioned factors, Tangen, (2004) noted the nature of most of public sector institution in Tanzania doesn’t allow the effective participation of the both employers and employees and other stakeholder in equal basis in planning, designing bargaining of what to be done and to what extent. This makes the public administrators themselves to set some unrealistic objectives and performance to be achieved on behalf of employees this makes the whole process invalid to measure employees performance.

Budgetary constraints and poor prioritization is another factor which makes OPRAS to fail in Tanzania. The state of available resources in implementation OPRAS in Tanzania was less convincing to be sufficient as Neely, (1995) noted. It is obvious that, resources were needed to support organization and employees objectives set ,due to this the most of managers employees fail to achieve their expected outcome as agreed, hence poor performance

The openness nature of the system also posed another challenge regarding formal personal as well as professional relationships. Performance Appraisal, being a ‘open’ considered to be as a “western product”, facing difficulties to be implemented in more collectivist cultures like Tanzanian. As Vallance (1999:81) mentions, in most non-western societies “it is important that an individual be allowed to save ‘face’ and to be protected from criticism”. The need to save individual face to a certain extent, leads to its failure.

The concept of time is also a factor that influences the unsuccessful of OPRAS in Tanzania. Not most of us spend as much time planning as we know we should, even though planning is crucial to using time effectively. The world is witnessing fast-moving change, and people’s attitude towards time is not an exception given the changing roles of public administration. Performance Appraisal could be time-consuming for most as it requires considerable time to plan work. However, that occurs when the recipients see the appraisal work as something that is separate from their daily routine work.
Lack of Specificities: it appears that the open Performance Appraisal System cannot be carried out in certain Ministries/Departments because of their specificities. For example, in service offered department like education or health services, the experience shown that it is very difficult to set expected goal to be evaluated is due to the nature of responsibility which require more time and special measurement elements for effective measurement.

Poor communication system is another obstacles for effective implementation of OPRAS need the government to establish effective communication system between the individual within the centre of government and the periphery so as the feedback can be sent on time, in Tanzanian experience things are total different, the information system is not well formulated to allow the quickly transfer of information.

Poor Public Relations: The new system has been wrongly sold out. Indeed, the Public Relations of this system has not been done in an effective manner so that those who are concerned have not been able to know its real objective and how it will affect their performance and work situation. This lead to the Reluctant, conservativeness of public servant towards the scheme ,this attitude made it to fail despite some efforts government puts to implement it for the better public service system. This contributes to inefficiency of the OPRAS in measuring employee’s performance.

Consensus on Agreement: the introduction of OPRAS has failed to gain the consensus of the different stakeholders. For example, the Trade Unions have always been against this system. Consequences of OPRAS itself pose another challenge the public sector in Tanzania particularly after experiencing the pains caused by impact of structure adjustment program such as retrenchment. Its introduction create a sense fearing the consequences of OPRAS which can result to punishment in term of disciplinary action or even to be fired based on OPRAS feedback.
2.54 Introduction
This chapter reviews the theoretical and empirical studies, as it has been done by different authors on what have been practiced by other organizations in applying the Performance Appraisal System in Tanzania and other countries in general.

2.62 Theoretical Review
2.62.1 Performance Appraisal Methods
There are several methods of performance appraisal but the following are the common used methods, a) rating, b) essays and c) result-based appraisal.

In rating scale employee trait/behavior such as cooperation at work, punctuality, creativity, competence, ability to communicate and team work is rated in a grading scale, which is arranged in numbers that are used in rating from ‘poor to excellent’ (Murphy Cleveland 1995) In this method, it involves acquiring the highest point which makes the employee the best performer and other ratings are such as “outstanding, satisfactory or needs improvement” (Weise & Buckley, 1998:236).

The essay method of performance appraisal requires managers to figure out the strengths and weaknesses of an employee and suggest remedies for the identified weaknesses/problems. Here managers/raters respond narratively to questions such as; what is your overall evaluation of this person over the last year?” (Weise & Buckley, 1998:36). Employees should also describe their own strengths and weaknesses and suggest ways to overcome their weaknesses. The combination of these two suggestions will definitely lead to the best way to improve performance (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). This method proved to be inconvenient in providing developmental feedback to the employees hence the current result based appraisal (Weise & Buckley, 1998).
With regards to result based appraisal, it involves rater/supervisor and ratee/subordinate to set and agree upon specific objectives in which will periodically be used to evaluate employee performance and reward according to the result obtained in comparison to the objectives. This method focuses more on achieving goals (results) rather than the how (means) to achieve the goals. Here “goal-setting is an important element because goals can stimulate employee effort, focus attention, increase persistence, and encourage employees to find new and better ways to work” (Karyeija 2010:41). This is the method used in most public organizations to appraise their employees it is also known as manage by objective method.

2.62.2 Performance Appraisal Process

Performance appraisal is a system in which it requires certain things to be in place for it to function. One important thing that the system requires is the constant communication between the appraiser and those who are to be appraised.

According to Gupta (2006) it is important that the subordinates know what is expected of them and how to go about attaining the expected result. And this is possible through communication in which there is flow of information and most important agreement upon the expected goal standard.

There are six processes involved in the performance appraisal system as outlined by Gupta (2006), these are setting of performance standard, communicating the standards, measuring performance, comparing standards, discussing results and taking corrective actions.

(i) Setting performance standards in some organizations it might be done with the participation of subordinates but in the case of ministry the management team does that so the next step is more essential in which the appraiser has to

(ii) Communicate the standards to the subordinates so as for them to agree and know what is expected of them.

(iii) Measuring performance refers to the assessment of one’s performance.

44
Comparing standards involves comparing the actual performance against the agreed/expected performance, while discussing results is the feedback given to the appraise regarding their performance and lastly the step in which the Appraiser takes action regarding the feedback given to the subordinates whether to reward them or boost their performance through training, etc.

This study attempts to link the Performance Appraisal System process and the institutionalization process as they seem interdependent and relate to one another. The assumption here is that the continuous and persistence use of Performance Appraisal system and processes will determine the level of institutionalization of performance Appraisal system in local authorities in Tanzania. As explained in the Performance Appraisal system training manual for Ministry; the existence of performance Appraisal system depend mostly on the persistence of the implementers to continue applying its processes so as to instill them into organization’s and individual’s daily activities (URT, 2004)

The Performance Appraisal system in Tanzania Public Service context is done twice per year, that is after every six months new goals are to be set according to the countries strategic plan in terms of service delivery that is delegated to the local authorities and then are divided into each department, team and individual so as every public servant is equally responsible and accountable for the outcome. So in this rationale in every six months the heads of department (appraisers) are to set new standards communicate them to the supporting staff and appraise the staff according to the agreed standard, give feedback and take action to deal with the feedback. This measured continuity and persistence in the institutionalization process.
Performance Appraisal Controversy

Performance appraisal has two goals that seem to contradict each other as elaborated by Vallance (1999:79) performance Appraisal system is expected to be used to judge and distinguish those who perform well from the poor performers while at the same time performance Appraisal System is to be used to counsel individuals regarding their performance and career development. The system does not clearly specify who is to be trained –“whether the poor performers so as to improve their performance or those who perform well so they can do better”.

Moreover, this controversy also led to some managers to feel confined with the situation of being the evaluator and the judge/executioner, which for them to negatively judge a subordinate whom they know and work with seem awkward.

This situation is what the authors called the “Psychology of leniency” (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995: 340-343). As mentioned before in the appraisal system there are two things involved and these are evaluation and feedback. During evaluation managers are acting as judges of how individuals perform and when giving feedback to their subordinates it is the managers responsibility to reward or appraise those with good performance but also counsel or train those with performance below the agreed standard hence the contradiction.

As explained by Koontz (1988:338) that in evaluating performance, supervisors assume the role of a judge. In contrast, when the aim is to develop subordinates skill, managers need to be counselors, helpers and teachers.

Performance Appraisal System and New Public Management

Performance Appraisal System is an offshoot of the global trend of reviewing and streamlining public administrators across the globe. As such Performance Appraisal System is inspired by NPM reform movement.
New Public Management reforms are said to have initially started in Australia and New Zealand and later on USA, UK and Canada implemented the same reforms from the mid 1980’s (Christensen et al, 2007).

The mix of institutional, environmental, political and historical features can best explain the reform process (Christensen, 2001: 24; Dzimbiri, 2008). New Public Management (NPM) is a concept used to explain a shift of traditional administration also known as old public management styles to a new one which included several changes in system, structures and processes with the objective of improving them (Sincai 2008:5).

Performance appraisal is one of the tools that were inspired by NPM to be used in its administrative reforms, which originated in the West and spread across borders into different administrative settings (Vallance, 1999). These administrative reforms were deliberately meant to transform administrative practices (Caiden 2007:43). “With the wave of New Public Management (NPM) a number of reforms were introduced and implemented to different countries with the focus on public sector with the aim of introducing greater economy, effectiveness, transparency, accountability and efficiency in public services” (Sincai 2008:3).

Christopher Hood mentioned seven characteristics of NPM which included, hands on professional management in the public sector, explicit standards and measures of performance, greater emphasis on output control, shift to disaggregation of units in public sector by breaking entities into corporate agencies in order to increase efficiency, greater competition in public sector through tendering and contract, stress on public sector style of management practice and greater discipline and parsimony in resource use (Hood 1991:3).

Performance appraisal is driven from three of the above elements, as it is the tool that is aimed to evaluate and motivate employee’s performance. “NPM emerged as a problem driven solution to bureaucratic rigidities, inefficiencies and lack of responsiveness” (Mia Valbo 2002:7).
It is by virtue of NPM reforms that the tool performance appraisal formally originated as an effective management tool for evaluating employee’s performance. Through policy transfer these reforms crossed borders to other countries as explained by Dolowitz and Marsh (2000) and it is how NPM administrative reforms found their way into Tanzania.

Performance appraisal system is not a new concept in the Tanzanian public sector (as there was the annual confidential report system) but the administrative reforms brought new ways of doing things as well as new ways of appraising employees in which, these ways originated from the west which has quite different culture as well as political setting not to mention different way of doing things compared to the Tanzania public sector. But administering and implementing these reforms to most African countries were conditions influenced by donors and International financial institutions (Chitoo et al, 2009; World Bank 2008), this is so due to the fact that most African countries especially Tanzania at the time were going through an economic decline and depended heavily on financial assistance from donor countries (Agrawal et al 1993).

Before NPM reforms the public sector was assuming so many functions including developing infrastructures, providing services, operating the commercial activities such as banking, marketing and industries hence controlling trade (Balogun, 2003 cited by Dzimbiri, 2008).

In 1980’s the economic situation proved all these functions to be too much for the public sector especially in developing countries where poverty and economic crisis worsened at the time (Dzimbiri, 2008). When the NPM changes began taking place in most developing and developed countries the state had to rule back on some of its functions and the emphasis was shifted from the state to the private sectors and non-governmental organizations.
In developing countries like Tanzania donor countries and agencies recommended these changes, and they were introduced in the form of Structural Adjustment Programs, which included political, economic and administrative reforms (Ayeni, 2002).

The NPM approach was geared towards efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and productivity. NPM emphasized on result oriented as opposed to the process oriented of the traditional public sector (Hughes, 2003). In a nutshell NPM was characterized by shifting the system into a direction where public servants are more accountable for achieving results, cutting the bureaucratic red tape, providing efficient services and enhancing value for money so as to create a better public sector for less.

Performance Management System is an NPM inspired tool, which aims to mold public servants into result-oriented performers, efficient, responsible and accountable through monitoring and evaluating their performances individually. This is so because NPM insists on goals and performance evaluation than rules and procedures (Hughes, 1998). In this NPM inspired performance Appraisal System employees are expected to perform specific targets both as an individual and at the organizational level. Performance Appraisal System adheres to the motivation and rewarding incentive (Armstrong, 2003).

Also this NPM inspired Performance Appraisal System is compulsory to all public servants of all carders and level. Performance Appraisal System introduction to the public sector in Tanzania came along with major changes (such as instead of promotions to be based on tenure and experience now promotions are to be based on performance evaluations) in accordance to the aim of NPM to restructure the public sector. For a while now the public sector has been confronted with complex political, technological and regulatory changes as a result of NPM related reforms, which led to radical adaptation of these changes (Greenwood et al, 1996).
For almost two decades now the public sector has been aspired by NPM reforms, which brought major administrative, economic and political changes. Public organizations were forced to adapt these changes as introduced by their states.

Due to the pace of introduction and adaptation of these changes by the organizations there seemed to be a variation. According to Weick & Quinn (1999) organizational change can be categorized into two distinctions these are episodic, discontinuous and intermittent change and change that is continuous, evolving and incremental. They further explain that reasons for adapting change determine which category that change will fall in. Hence the need to find a theory that well explains the reasons that led to introduction of Performance appraisal system in Tanzanian public sector and these reasons will shine some light on whether Performance appraisal system is an episodic and intermittent change or continuous, evolving and incremental change which will enable the study to determine on the level of institutionalization of performance appraisal system.

There are a great number of literatures with endless theories that can be used to explain organizational change, and no one theory that can best describe these changes as argued by (Christensen et al; 2007).

2.73 Empirical Review
The amount of research regarding performance appraisal is vast. However, the limitation of much of this research to the advancement of the understanding or practice of performance appraisal is generally acknowledged (Latham & Lee, 1986; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991). Prior to the early 1980’s the majority empirical studies focused on improving the psychometric characteristics of the rating instrument in an effort to reduce the subjectivity inherent in performance ratings (Feldman, 1981). Due in part to the emphasis on psychometric aspects, the development of a “better” rating scale format that was valid and reliable received a great deal of attention (Woehr & Miller, 1997). Research focusing on rating scale format and development peaked in the 1960’s and 1970’s with the development of several new formats including the Behavioral Observation Scale (BOS), the Behaviorally Anchored
Rating Scale (BARS) and the Mixed Standard Scale. Other popular and related research topics included training raters to reduce rating errors and improve observational skills and developing performance appraisal practices.

Research examining the efficacy of the different rating scales format generally indicated that ratings were not affected by changes in the rating scale format (Woehr & Miller, 1997). According to Arvey and Murphy’s (1998) review of the research, there were literally hundreds of studies between 1950 and 1980 on the different types of rating scales; of rating versus ranking; and ways of achieving ratings that were objective measures of performance. Andy and Farr (1980) published a highly critical and influential review evaluation of the performance appraisal research. In this review they called for a moratorium on rating format research and attempted to redirect research to other areas such as understanding the rater and the process in an organizational context. Landy and Farr (1980) characterized the abundance of studies in the following categories: “roles” or characteristics of the rater and rate; the “vehicle” or rating format and form; the context of the rating including its use; and, and the rating process which dealt with data analysis and rater training.

The influence of Landy and Farr (1980) and Feldman (1981) resulted in a change of focus away from the rating scale format and rater training to understanding the rater as a decision maker who processes information and social cues. Research in the 1980’s and early 1990’s focused on raters and the accuracy of ratings and judgments and the application of knowledge about the judgment process in the development of Performance Appraisal System (PAS).

According to Ilgen et al (1993) the “rater process perspective” includes three critical sets of operations 1) acquisition of information about those to be evaluated; 2) organization and storage of this information in memory; and 3) retrieval and integration of the information in a fashion that leads to the recording of an evaluation of the person being appraised. Researchers borrowed heavily from basic psychological research in cognitive psychology and social cognition to address the
three process domains described above and to develop theories of the performance appraisal process (Denisi, 1984; Feldman, 1981; Ilgen & Feldman, 1983).

Other research included ratee and rater characteristics such as race, gender and likeability. Rater attributes including race, cognitive style and knowledge of the job to be rated were examined. Rating scale accuracy continued to be studied and the characteristics of the setting in which appraisal occurs such as the purpose of appraisal, rater training and other factors were investigated (Ilgen et al; 1993). Research on performance rating accuracy and the development of accuracy criteria was common in the 1980’s. Research focused on common psychometric biases, called rating errors, such as leniency, central tendency and halo, with the assumption that these implied a lack of accuracy (Ilgen, et al, 1993). It was assumed that decreasing the biases increased accuracy. Researchers argued that this assumption was not necessarily true in that bias-free ratings were not necessarily more accurate (Hulin, 1982; Murphy & Balzer, 1989; Roch, 1997). Research on accuracy shifted from rater errors to discrepancy between ratings and some standard of performance.

Research of the performance appraisal process during the 1980’s contributed a number of key ideas to the literature including a heightened awareness of the importance of observation in the appraisal process and how knowledge obtained by raters is utilized. The research of the 1980’s also helped to clarify or correct some assumptions about performance appraisal such as the belief that rating errors as commonly defined were evidence for rating errors when in fact the research indicated that there may not be resulting inaccuracies (Murphy & Balzer, 1989; Smither & Reilly, 1987). Another contribution related to the use of performance appraisal ratings. The context in which the ratings were obtained and the beliefs about the use of such rating were found to influence the results. Researchers further argued that ratings should only be used for those purposes understood by the raters at the time of the rating (Murphy et al, 1984, Zedeck & Cascio, 1982). Ilgen, et al (1993) acknowledged these contributions but stated that the overall impact to the improvement of performance appraisal practice had been limited.
Like Landy and Farr in 1980, they called for a redirection of research efforts away from demonstrations of cognitive effects towards the investigation the content of cognitive variables, the identification of factors that influence these variables and the design of appraisal systems that incorporate cognitive principles.

More recent research into performance appraisal has emphasized process and structural characteristics that influence the attitudes and affective reactions of system participants in addition to psychometric characteristics. Murphy and Cleveland (1991; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995) suggest that researchers should consider the rating context before attempting to analyze or evaluate the effectiveness of ratings or rating systems. Research has included measures of employee attitudes toward performance appraisal and system acceptance and rater and ratee satisfaction in the appraisal process (Roberts, 1990). Bernardin and Beatty (1984) suggested that relative measures of the attitudinal kind may ultimately prove to be better measure and predictors of rating validity than such traditional psychometric variables as leniency, halo, and discriminability. A performance appraisal system can be psychometrically sound in design and construction but still wholly ineffective in practice due to resistance or lack of acceptance on the part of users. Thus, the effectiveness of a system is particularly contingent on the attitudes of the system users, both raters and ratees (Roberts, 1990).

Bretz, et al (1992) generalized that research in the late 1980's and early 1990's was heavily weighted toward cognitive process issues. Ratee and rater personal characteristics and rating errors and accuracy were also researched. The source of appraisal, appraisal feedback mechanisms, rater training, and performance appraisal format were found to be studied frequently. Other empirical research has focused on the performance appraisal process and the factors that influence the communication and behaviors exhibited by the raters and ratees during evaluation. Most of these studies are in experimental settings and not in the field (Karol, 1996).

While theoretical research on performance appraisal continues to evolve, practical literature has focused primarily on improving the performance appraisal process,
making the review interview more positive, improving the contribution of the employee to the process, emphasizing goal-setting and applying procedural improvements (Karol, 1996). Professional journals are filled with articles discussing performance appraisal practices in various organizations under varying conditions. Case studies and "how to" articles are common. Arvey and Murphy (1998) indicate that the literature indicates a substantial gap between research and practice in performance appraisal. According to these researchers the gap between research and practice was apparent in the 1989’s when many studies were conducted in the laboratory and focused on discrete variables of cognitive processing in appraisal and evaluation.

Much of the past research have focused on the individual as related to the act of performance appraisal as opposed to performance appraisal as a system within the larger context of an organization. The researcher has identified the gap from previous study. The researcher will assess employees’ perception on effectiveness of performance appraisal
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
The discussion in this chapter is about the methodology to be used in the study. This includes research design, research instruments, sampling methods; data collection techniques and analysis.

3.2 Research Area
The study was conducted in Dodoma and Dar Es Salaam where the selected employees and few management members were incorporated. Researcher selected Dodoma Regions because PMO-RALG headquarters are based in Dodoma with larger number of staff of different cadres. Also was easier to a researcher to get all the necessary information because all PMO-RALG information are handled and communicated through the two centers of Dodoma and Dar Es Salaam respectively.

3.3 Research Design
This study used cross sectional design since it is easy to collect data only once. On the other hand, a case design was used in this study. A case study design provides a plan of intensively exploring and analyzing the work performed by a single unit, section and department (Tripath187). It is also appropriate in the sense that it gives an
opportunity to the researcher to have thoroughly investigation of the way performance Management in PMO-RALG is taking place.

3.4 Sampling Design

3.4.1 Sampling Frame

The population of the study included 400 staff from all PMO-RALG departments involving supporting and operational staff. Also members of the management team were interviewed so as to obtain detailed information about the study. All these groups were interviewed to get their views, suggestions, opinions, experiences, knowledge and problems concerned their observations regarding the efficient & effectiveness or poor performances in applying the performance management system.

3.4.2 Sampling Units

Target employees included PMO-RALG officials at the Headquarters, including the top Management, Managers, and officers at the operations and supporting sections. Lower cadres group were aware and affected directly by the performance appraisal in the PMO-RALG because others were at the salary bar, no promotions or further training. And this was due to a number of various reasons, mismanagement of appraisal reports and feedback being one of those reasons.

3.4.3 Sample Size and Sampling Procedures

The sample size was 80 respondents. That is 20% of the 400 PMO-RALG employees. Also the selection of the sample was supported by Cohen et al (2000) who state that selecting a sample size; the researchers are advised to consider the availability of population, methods of sampling to be used and the financial resources available for the facilitation of the study.

The study employed multistage cluster sampling to get 80 staff for the interviews. The reason of this technique was to ensure that all individuals in different units or sections had equal chance to be selected.
3.5 Data collection methods and Tools

The research used primary and secondary data. The methods for data collection and tools are explained below.

3.5.2 Primary Data

Unstructured Interview

The study used unstructured interview with an aid of the questionnaire, because a number of staff in PMO-RALG are very busy to meet their job targets and field visits outside the station. The method is advantageous over the questioners techniques because it generating more information. The interviews provide flexibility to a researcher as well as freedom of expression to respondents. Due to time factor this method assisted the researcher to control the research process by close administration of the interviewees through the unstructured questionnaire which the researcher would have been directly recording the response. Another advantage which made the researcher to select this type is that it is easier and it makes the respondents to answer the questions spontaneously without too much meditation and thus it acts like a check of fabrication.

3.5.2 Secondary Data

This study employed documentary reviews to on various information such as minutes of management meetings, monthly and annually OPRAS, PMO-RALG reports, past studies and observations in performance Management system, all this helped to reveal the extent to which Performance Appraisal system impacts employees' perception.

3.6 Validation and Reliability of Research Instruments

3.6.1 Validity

This study ensured that Validity is determined such as that whether the research truly measures what it was intended to measure or how truthful the research results are. Prior to the actual research, Revisit study/ Pilot study/ Pre test was conducted by the researcher. The first visit was done in order to be familiar with situation and to identify those who were ready to participate in the study. The second visit was done
during validation of study instruments. And this aims at testing if instruments were appropriate for collecting intended data. Results from the testing of instrument have helped the researcher to make corrections to make them effective in collecting valid data during the research. The questionnaires were pre-tested by some respondents in order to test their validity (Creswell, 1994).

3.6.2 Reliability

The study provided the questionnaire to different respondents before the actual data collection to check the reliability of the results. If the results of a study could be reproduced under a similar methodology, the research instrument was considered to be reliable.

3.7 Data Processing, analysis and Presentation

Data were processed manually to clean some outliers, errors and gaps. Therefore, coding was made in the SPSS for data entry. The analysis was done in the SPSS and exported to Microsoft Excel Software - 2003 for the sake of generating results in forms of table, graphs, and charts and cross tabulations. The results generated were amenable for discussions.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the findings that have been obtained from the analysis of data collected from the field. The data include profile of respondent, operationalisations of OPRAS, status of OPRAS implementation and challenges still face OPRAS.

4.2 Characteristics of Respondents

4.2.1 Sex of the respondents
Table 4.1 below shows the sex of respondents as follows: 55% (55) were males and 45% (45) were females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher Findings, 2013
4.2.2 Education Level of Respondents

Table 4.2 below shows the characteristics of respondents based on their education level as follows: 3.8% (3) had certificate, 40% (32) had first degree, 52.5% (42) had masters, 3.8% (3) had postgraduate diploma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Degree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher Findings, 2013

4.2.3 Regions of Respondents

Table 4.3 below represents the regions of respondents as follows: 28.8% (23) were from Dar es Salaam and 71.2% (57) were Dodoma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.2.4 Departments of the Respondents

Table 4.4 below summarizes the positions in which the respondents were drawn. About 11.2% (9) were from DEC, 32.5% (26) from DUD, 10% (8) from DAHRM, 6.2% (5) from GCU, 12.55% (10) from DICT, 13.8% (11) DRA, 10% (8) from DLG and 33.8% (3) from DSC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUD</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAHRM</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCU</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICT</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLG</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher Findings, 2013
### 2.2.5 Position of the Respondents

The composition of respondents by position was as follows: 23.8% were education coordinators, 6.2% information officers, 23.8% were economist, 10% were senior financial management officer, 6.2% were accountant and epicor support, 12.5% were assistant directors, 13.8% were human resource officers, and 3.8% were community development officers.

Table 4.5: Positions of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Coordinator</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Officer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Financial Management Officer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant and Epicor support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Officer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher Findings, 2011

### 4.3 Operationalisation of OPRAS

#### 4.3.1 Evidence on Signing Performance contract (OPRAS) with your employer/supervisor

Table 4.6 below shows the response on whether the staff had ever signed a performance contract on OPRAS with the employer or supervisor. Based on this study about 72.5% the respondents agreed that they signed while 27.5% did not agree.
Table 4.6: Evidence on signing performance contract (OPRAS) with your employer/supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher Findings, 2011

4.3.2 Frequency of signing the performance Contract

Table 4.7 below shows the findings on the number of times that the staff have signed the performance contract with the employer or supervisor. The results are as follows:

- About 23.4% said once,
- 23.4% said twice,
- 20.3% said thrice,
- 23.4% said four times, and
- 9.4% said rarely signed.

Table 4.7: Frequency of signing the performance Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrice</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four times</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher Findings, 2011
4.3.3 Status of signing the OPRAS forms Last financial year (2011/2012)

Table 4.8 below show the response with respect to whether staff signed the OPRAS forms last year. About 53.8% agreed while 46.2% did not agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher Findings, 2013

4.3.4 Time required to fill the OPRAS Forms

Table 4.9 below shows the findings on the time required to fill the OPRAS forms. About 64.7% of the staff mentioned that it might take 1-3 days, 19.6% mentioned a week, 9.8% said a month and 5.9% could not manage to mention the time to used to fill the forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 days</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher Findings, 2013
4.4 Status of OPRAS achievements

4.4.1 Awareness of the contributions of OPRAS

Table 4.11 below shows the results on the extent of awareness among the staff on the application of OPRAS. Based on the table it is reported that about 87.5% of the respondents said that they know and only 12.5% said that they are not aware of them.

Table 4.10: Awareness of the contributions of OPRAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2011

4.4.2 Forms of participating in OPRAS

Table 4.12 below show the opinion on how the staff participate in OPRAS. From the table about 13.5% of respondents said that they attended a seminar, 43.3% filled forms, 16.3% interviewed other staff, 26.9% did a mid year review.

Table 4.11: Forms of participating in OPRAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation forms</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini seminar</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling OPRS forms</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing with the head of the unit</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the mid-year review for the final outcome</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2 Incidence of training on OPRAS

Table 4.13 below shows the opinion on the extent of which staff get training on OPRAS issues. The results show that 60% of the respondents said that they received trainings while 40% of them were contrary.

Table 4.12: Do you get any training on OPRAS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2011

4.4.3 Reasons for Few training on OPRAS

Table 4.14 below shows the opinion on the reasons as to why training on OPRAS have been few. The results show that 50% of the respondents said that they there was low priority of OPRAS, 34.6% of them said that OPRAS is not rewarding while 15.4% of them said that few resources are dedicated to the OPRAS.

Table 4.13: Reasons for Lack of Training on OPRAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No rewarding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few resources allocated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.4 Reasons for not Giving OPRAS due Priority

Table 4.15 below shows the opinion on the reasons as to why OPRAS is not given due weight. The results show that 47.1% of the respondents said that the budget for OPRAS is low, 38.2% of the staff mentioned that no law to enforce the use of OPRAS and 14.7% of the staff said that the OPRAS is not used in promotion and appointing civil servants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Few resources allocated</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No law for enforcing the implementation of OPRAS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPRAS is not used to upgrading/ appoint civil servants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.5 Benefits of OPRAS for Sections Using It

Table 4.16 below shows the opinion on how does OPRAS help those sections that were using it. The results show that 19.8% of the respondents said that OPRAS assisted in work distribution, 42.7% said that assists in accountability, 8.3% of them mentioned that OPRAS ensure more communication among staff, 3.1% said that it increases the value for money, 11% of the staff mentioned that OPRAS increases the confidence to work and 14.6% said that the OPRAS increases job satisfaction.
Table 4.1: Benefits of OPRAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assists in work distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists in work accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.6 Criteria to be used with OPRAS

Table 4.17 below shows the criteria that were used with OPRAS application. The results show that 31.6% of the respondents said that OPRAS uses the time frame agreed, 42.1% said that the OPRAS focused on objectives agreed, 6.3% on the obstacles on reaching the target and 38% mentioned that OPRAS focused on the agreed target indicators.

Table 4.16: Criteria to be used with OPRAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective and other aims</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed to reach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles in reaching general aims</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed performance Targets</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Challenges facing OPRAS

4.5.1 Areas making OPRAS weak

Figure 1 below shows the challenges that OPRAS faces. The results are as follows: about 10% of the staff mentioned inadequate training, 23% mentioned that OPRAS is not given priority, 38% of the staff mentioned existence of fixed pay, 5% said that leaders were not serious and lack of knowledge on filling forms and 24% of the staff mentioned that bureaucracy is a challenge for OPRAS to be effective.

**Figure 4.1: Challenges of OPRAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate training</th>
<th>leaders not serious</th>
<th>Not of priority</th>
<th>Fixed pay</th>
<th>bureaucracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35, 24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54, 38%</td>
<td>15, 10%</td>
<td>7, 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.2 Sources of Challenges

Table 4.18 below shows the sources of challenges that OPRAS faces. The results are as follows: about 18.6% of the staff mentioned that the challenges are due to politicians, 22.9% mentioned employees as a source of challenges and 58.6% of the staff mentioned that top management is responsible for the failure of OPRAS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2011
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings made from the previous chapter. It further draws some technical issues that are related to the way OPRAS has been perceived by employees of PMO RALG in Dodoma and Dar es Salaam regions. The discussion draws some experience of the previous studies on OPRAS as well as a few cases of private sector in Tanzania and elsewhere.

5.2 Characteristics of Respondents

5.2.1 Sex of the Respondents

The results show the sex of respondents as follows: about 55% (55) were males and 45% (45) were females. This implied PMO RALG has managed to implement the policy of gender balance with much emphasis on women staff. On one hand, the application of OPRAS is studied also in the context of gender perspective, seeing how both male and female have perception on the use of OPRAS. As one can learn from the response rate by percentage, it appears that in PMO RALG the issue of performance management does not bias gender. All employees are being rated in accordance with the tasks being assigned and agreed upon and not based on their gender inequalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE Figure 5.1:9</th>
<th>Sex of Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERC</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher Findings 2013
5.2.3 Education Level of Respondents

Results in Table 4.2 shows the characteristics of respondents based on their education level as follows: 3.8% (3) had certificate, 40% (32) had first degree, 52.5% (42) had masters, 3.8% (3) had postgraduate diploma. Thus, the study managed to collect data from staff that were highly educated. The observation in terms of response between the seemingly highly educated and the seemingly less educated suggests that the management level of understanding in official responsibilities as well as the analytical aspects of Local Government policies and strategies is soaring to enhance sound appraisal and execution of OPRAS.

The above state of affairs induces other staff to follow the suit by assuming that what seems important to the educated group must equal be important to those who are less or not educated at all. In addition, having majority of staff who have the positive thinking on the application of OPRAS though not interested in its implementation, is a good sign that suggests that if OPRAS is introduced, given the weight it deserve, staff trained on its importance and applied throughout the organization, it can yield positive results to the organization.

**TABLE Figure 5.2: 0 Educational Level of Respondent**

![Educational Level of Respondent](image)

*Source: Researcher Findings 2013*
5.2.4 Regions of Respondents

Results in Table 4.3 represent the regions of respondents as follows: 28.8% (23) were from Dar es Salaam and 71.2% (57) were Dodoma. There were many workers from Dodoma since it is the headquarter of PMO RALG and yet a political city. In addition, it was easier to get more data from Dodoma office since most of the database is in Dodoma. Thus, lessons on the application of OPRAS for Dodoma could provide sound evidence on this study. The responses in Dodoma were received earlier than those from Dar Es Salaam office and this was due to the fact that the employees in Dodoma offices have all the necessary data and needed information which they could produce on request as compared to those in Dar Es Salaam Office whose stay there is somewhat temporary because of the nature of the work they do which is a liaison office. The fact is that all Ministries and Departments of the United Republic of Tanzania are based in Dar Es Salaam and it is only PMO –RALG which is the Ministry based in Dodoma, and in order to make it work effectively, it was necessary to have a liaison office in Dar Es Salaam for the purpose of providing coordination services.

**TABLE Figure 5.4.3**

Regions of Respondents

Source: Researcher Findings 2013
5.2.4 Departments of the Respondents

Results have shown that about 11.2% were from DEC, 32.5% (26) from DUD, 10% (8) from DAHRM, 6.2% (5) from GCU, 12.55 (10) from DICT, 13.8% (11) from directorate of regional administration, 10% (8) from DRA and 3.8% (3) from Sector Coordination. Thus, the study managed to ensure that perception of staff on the application of OPRAS was collected from every department. In addition, departments with many staff such as Directorate of Urban Planning (DUD) and Directorate of Regional Administration (DRA) had a good chance to provide data on application of OPRAS. The results through the analysis suggests that the question of performance management is somewhat accepted by individual employees in various Departments and it only requires an enforcement law and training to make it accepted and implementable.

5.2.5 Position of the Respondents

The composition of respondents by position was as follows: 23.8% were education coordinators, 6.2% information officers, 23.8% were economists, 10% were senior
financial management officers, 6.2% were accountants and epicor supports, 12.5% were assistant directors, 13.8% were human resource officers, and 3.8% were Community development officers. The study thus involved staff with different positions and with varying work experiences and background. The aim of doing so was to ensure that the perception on the use of OPRAS is balanced and the historical background of the implementation of OPRAS to get known easily. In addition, there was a need to hear from staff that came from junior to senior positions on how they perceive OPRAS. However, majority of staff were education coordinators and economists. Again from the research it was clear that the majority of management and other staff who happened to respond to research questions, were well experienced and this connotes that the majority of staff have long work duration and hence experience of which, according to the reviewed literature, the New Public Management Policy insists on the match between the professional education and experience rather than the isolation between the two. This in turn helps the performance appraisal using OPRAS to be done more objectively and rationally rather than by instinct.

**TABLE 4.235.5:** Positions of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education coordinator</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information officer</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Financial officer</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Officer</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community dev. Officer</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher Findings 2013
5.3 Operationalisation of OPRAS

5.3.1 Evidence on Signing Performance contract (OPRAS)

Results show response on whether the staff had ever signed a performance contract on OPRAS with the employer or supervisor. Based on this study about 72.5% the respondents agreed that they signed the performance contract with the employer or supervisor while 27.5% did not agree. It is learnt that employers have been engaging their staff to sign the OPRAS performance contract that stipulates what they were to do in a particular fiscal year. In addition, contracts put forward the agreements on what could be met by both the employees on one hand and the employer on the other hand.

TABLE 4:24 Figure 5.6: Evidence on signing Performance Contract with Employer/Supervisor

Source: Researcher Findings 2011
5.3.2 Frequency of signing the performance Contract

On the basis of number of times that the staff were signing the contract with the supervisors, the results have revealed that 23.4% of the staff managed to sign once, 23.4% of staff signed twice, 20.3% signed thrice, 23.4% signed four times and 9.4% rarely signed. The study has revealed that most staff have been signing contract on OPRAS use several times. This is a good signal on making the use of OPRAS active and hence can be used to measure the performance of the staff. However, few staff had reservation that they were signing contract very rarely since their supervisors were not giving them the forms and even when they gave they could not remind them to collect. In other words, this tendency suggests that even some of supervisors do not have the abc of what OPRAS entails nor the importance of evaluating their employees performance by using OPRAS forms. This is a tendency that needs to be collected immediately for survival of our institution.

TABLE 4:2
Figure 5.7: Frequency of Signing the Performance Contract

Source: Researcher Findings 2011
5.3.3 Status of Signing the OPRAS forms Last financial year (2011/2012)

The results on whether staff signed the contract form on the use of OPRAS last year received different opinion where 53.8% agreed while 46.2% did not agree. The results have shown that about half of the staff managed to sign the forms last year while the rest could not sign. There had been a low response on signing the contracts on the use of OPRAS since the OPRAS has not been used effectively in human resource management. For those who signed revealed that, they were forced to fill them and some mentioned that the forms were used during selection of the best performers of the year for Mei mosi day (Workers Day). However, the forms have never been used for promotion or appointment purposes.

### TABLE 4.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of signing the OPRAS forms Last financial year (2011/2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![Pie chart showing 54% Yes and 46% No.](image)

Source: Research Findings, 2013

5.3.4 Time required filling the OPRAS Forms

There was a concern that the time required to fill the form is too long and the forms themselves are tiresome and tedious. The perception on whether the forms were tiresome to fill and time long said that about 64.7% of the staff mentioned that it might take 1-3 days, 19.6% mentioned a week, 9.8% said a month and 5.9% could...
not manage to mention the time to use to fill the forms. It is learnt that staff were
hesitant to fill the forms not because they were not used in promotion and other
human resource purposes, but also it was taking too long to fill the forms. In
addition, the filling of forms required that staff had identified the objectives to
accomplish in such period of time. These made staff to be hesitant to fill the forms.

**TABLE 4.27**

**Figure 5.9:** Time Required to Fill the OPRAS Forms

![Pie chart showing time required to fill OPRAS forms]

Source: Researcher Findings, 2013

### 5.4 Status of OPRAS Achievements

#### 5.4.1 Awareness of the Contributions of OPRAS

Staff portrayed that the use of OPRAS was not known to most of them since 87.5% of
the respondents said that they were aware of the OPRAS and only 12.5% said that
they were not aware. The study has learnt that most of staff were aware of the
existence and the need for the staff to fill the forms for appraisal and performance review. However, supervisors had been reluctant to provide the forms on one hand and if provided, they were not using them effectively. There were evidence that some promotions did not consider the results of OPRAS and even the appointment of staff staff could not use OPRAS staff. In addition, it was difficult to use OPRAS since staff were not informed on their objectives to be accomplished in such period.

TABLE 4.28 Figure 5.10: Awareness of the Contributions of OPRAS

Source: Research Findings, 2011

5.4.2 Forms of Participating in OPRAS

Results have shown that staff have been participating in different forms such as about 13.5% of respondents said that they attended a seminar, 43.3% filled forms, 16.3% interviewed other staff, and 26.9% did a mid year review. These different
forms of which staff use to participate in OPRAS did not suffice to make the use of OPRAS effective. Use of seminar had been common, and even some staff was involved in interviewing other staff as part of assessment. However, the use of OPRAS among the staff had remained questionable with little attention from the top management.

**Table 4.29** Figure 5.11: Forms in participating in OPRAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini Seminar</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling OPRAS Forms</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing with HODs</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the midyear review</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2011

**4.4.2 Incidence of training on OPRAS**

Trainings have been useful for staff especially juniors. PMO RALG has been providing such training on OPRAS to staff of different cadres. Results show that 60% of the respondents said that they received trainings while 40% of them were
contrary. Thus, it is acknowledged that PMO RALG has been providing training on the use of OPRAS, how to fill forms and even on how to use the forms for promotion, demotivation and appointment.

TABLE 4.30 Figure 5.12: Do you get any on OPRAS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2011

4.4.3 Reasons for not getting OPRAS Due Priority
OPRAS has been given considerable weight since 47.1% of the respondents said that the budget for OPRAS is low, 38.2% of the staff mentioned that no law to enforce
the use of OPRAS and 14.7% of the staff said that the OPRAS is not used in promotion and appointing civil servants. Thus, allocating few funds for the OPRAS tended to make the use of OPRAS at risk. This is because the OPRAS results need to be discussed and those who have performed well were supposed to be reward either in terms of funds or other means. In addition, those who could not perform well were supposed to be punished. But the budget for most projects had been inadequate and its disbursement normally is untimely. Generally, the study revealed that there were other problems encountered in the operationalization of OPRAS in individual divisions. According to the study, it was found that the highest ranking problem was the existence of too many adhoc activities and political directives from the controlling office of the Prime Minister. Those activities literally would be expected to follow the action plan but in most cases that is not so. The second ranking problem that causes inefficient is uncertainty in release of funds from the treasury followed by overlapping of activities and lastly some respondents believed that the system is inconsistent, time consuming and not worth using it.

**TABLE 5.3 Figure 5.13:** Reasons for not giving OPRAS due to priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Few resources allocated</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No law for enforcement</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPRAS not used for upgrading/appointing staff</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.33 Figure 5.14: Reasons for lack of Training on OPRAS

![Pie chart showing reasons for lack of training on OPRAS]

Source: Research Findings, 2013

4.4.5 Benefits of OPRAS for Sections Using it

Even though most of the sections in PMO RALG do not use OPRAS seriously, however, for those which use it have shown provided some benefits as follows. The results show that 19.8% of the respondents said that OPRAS assisted in work distribution, 42.7% said that assists in accountability, 8.3% of them mentioned that OPRAS ensure more communication among staff, 3.1% said that it increases the value for money, 11% of the staff mentioned that OPRAS increases the confidence to work and 14.6% said that the OPRAS increases job satisfaction. Thus, it is learnt that departments which were using OPRAS managed to ensure that staff became accountable, responsible and creative in their works. In addition, the OPRAS helped the staff to increase their service delivery confidence and communication among themselves.
5.4.6 Criteria to be Used with OPRAS

The use of OPRAS required the staff and the supervisor to agree on some issues. The results show that 31.6% of the respondents said that OPRAS uses the time frame agreed, 42.1% said that the OPRAS focused on objectives greed, 6.3% on the obstacles on reaching the target and 38% mentioned that OPRAS focused on the agreed target indicators. Thus, the application of the OPRAS bases on the designed principles such that the staff and their supervisors should agree on the objectives to be accomplished, the time frame that such objectives will be accomplished, the targets and the reporting mechanism for the results. However, the principles have been silent on how the resources should be channeled to staff so that they manage to accomplish the agreed objectives.
5.5 Challenges facing OPRAS

4.5.1 Areas making OPRAS weak

OPRAS has not been free from challenges. Since its existence, there had been a number of reported weaknesses that both the employees and their supervisors have mentioned. The results are as follows:- about 10% of the staff mentioned, inadequate training, 23% mentioned that OPRAS is not given priority, 38% of the staff mentioned existence of fixed pay, 5% said that leaders were not serious and 24% of the staff mentioned that bureaucracy is a challenge for OPRAS to be effective. Thus, the use of fixed pay system among staff has made the use of OPRAS to be neglected. This is because; staff assumes that whether they work hard or not, at the end of the month they will receive the salary. In other words, the OPRAS has not come up with the mechanisms to ensure that pay is attached to performance. Secondly, trainings on OPRAS have been adhoc and in most cases occurred when there was a push from then top. This has made the staff and supervisors to see the OPRAS as a mere tool. Third, bureaucracy in management has made the OPRAS use being at risky. This is because, some supervisors misuse their positions to undermine those who had been
hard workers and uplift those who are irresponsible. Lastly, the analysis and the decision rules of OPRAS results have been questionable.

4.5.2 Sources of Challenges

The challenges facing OPRAS has been coming from different areas. The results reported that 18.6% of the staff mentioned that the challenges are due to politicians, 22.9% mentioned employees as a source of challenges and 58.6% of the staff mentioned that top management is responsible for the failure of OPRAS. It can be learnt that some of the Politicians such as councillors have been encouraging the violations of OPRAS by forcing the employees to make decisions that were not part of the OPRAS contract. The employees have been shirking, delaying to accomplish their objectives and don’t fill the forms when provided. The management have been allocating few resources to projects, delay to commit funds and even not using the results of OPRAS to make decision.
Figure 5.17: Source of Challenges

Source: Research Findings, 2013
CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Introduction
This chapter provides the summary of the study as well as the conclusion made. In addition, it provides some policy recommendations to address the issues that have been raised herein.

6.2 Summary and Conclusion
6.2.1 Summary
It is learnt that employers have been engaging their staff to sign the OPRAS performance contract that stipulates what they were to do in a particular fiscal year. In addition, contracts put forward the agreements on what could be met by both the employees on one hand and the employer on the other hand. The study has revealed that most staff have been signing contract on OPRAS use several times. This is a good sign on making the use of OPRAS active and hence can be used to measure the performance of the staff. However, few staff had reservation that they were signing contract very rarely since their supervisors were not giving them the forms and even when they gave they could not remind them to collect.

There had been a low response on signing the contracts on the use of OPRAS since the OPRAS has not been used effectively in human resource management. For those who signed revealed that, they were forced to fill them and some mentioned that the forms were used during selection of the best performers of the year for Mei Mosi day (Workers’ Day). However, the forms have never been used for promotion or appointment.

It is learnt that staff were hesitant to fill the forms not because they were not used in promotion and other human resource purposes, but also it was taking too long to fill the forms. In addition, the filling of forms required that staff had identified the
objectives to accomplish in such period of time. These made staff to be hesitant to fill the forms. The study has learnt that, most of staff were aware of the existence and the need for the staff to fill the forms for appraisal and performance review. However, supervisors had been reluctant to provide the forms on one hand and if provided, they were not using them effectively. There were evidence that some promotions did not consider the results of OPRAS and even the appointment of staff could not use OPRAS staff. In addition, it was difficult to use OPRAS since staff were not informed on their objectives to be accomplished in such period. These different forms of which staff use to participate in OPRAS did not make the use OPRAS effective. Use of seminar had been common, and even some staff was involved in interviewing other staff as part of assessment. However, the use of OPRAS among the staff had remained questionable with little attention from the top management. Thus, it is acknowledged that PMO LARG has been providing training on the use of OPRAS, how to fill forms and even on how to use the forms for promotion, demotivation and appointment.

Thus, allocating few funds for the OPRAS tended to make the use of OPRAS at risk. This is because the OPRAS results need to be discussed and those who have performed well were supposed to be rewarded either in terms of funds or other means. In addition, those who could not perform well were supposed to be punished. But the budget for most projects had been inadequate and its disbursement normally is untimely. Thus, it is learnt that departments which were using OPRAS managed to ensure that staff became accountable, responsible and creative in their works. In addition, the OPRAS helped the staff to increase their service delivery confidence and communication among themselves.

Thus, the application of the OPRAS bases on the designed principles such that the staff and their supervisors should agree on the objectives to be accomplished, the time frame that such objectives will be accomplished, the targets and the reporting mechanism for the results. However, the principles have been silent on how the resources should be channeled to staff so that they manage to accomplish the agreed objectives.
The fixed pay system among staff has made the use of OPRAS to be neglected. This is because; staff assumes that whether they work hard or not, at the end of the month they will receive the salary. In other words, the OPRAS has not come up with the mechanisms to ensure that pay is attached to performance. Secondly, trainings on OPRAS have been ad hoc and in most cases occurred when there was a push from then top. This has made the staff and supervisors to see the OPRAS as a mere tool. Third, bureaucracy in management has made the OPRAS use being at risky. This is because, some supervisors misuse their positions to undermine those who had been hard workers and uplift those who are irresponsible. Lastly, the analysis and the decision rules of OPRAS results have been questionable.

It can be learnt that some of the Politicians such as councillors have been encouraging the violations of OPRAS by forcing the employees to make decisions that were not part of the OPRAS contract. The employees have been shirking, delaying to accomplish their objectives and don’t fill the forms when provided. The management have been allocating few resources to projects, delay to commit funds and even not using the results of OPRAS to make decision.

6.2.2 Conclusion
From this study it is concluded that employees of PMO RALG have negative perception on the use of OPRAS. Despite the patches of benefits that were reported, yet majority of employees believe that OPRAS has not been given due weight. There are many concerns that OPRAS results are not well interpreted and hence used in the promotion and penalizing staff. On one hand, delay in committing funds to the departments, existence of bureaucracy among the managers and fixed pay have been reported to make the use of OPRAS unrealistic.

6.3 Recommendations
The following recommendations are made from this study

(i.) The government should avoid using fixed salary if it really wants to use OPRAS to promote performance
(ii.) Having existing institutional and legal framework is one thing and ensuring its implementation is another thing. The legislation is necessary but not sufficient condition for institutionalization the tool for performance appraisal. Both laws and other measures like awareness creation among staffs on the prons and cons of OPRAS are required to enforce compliance with OPRAS requirements in PMO-RALG.

(iii.) The government should make sure that funds are timely disbursed and committed to staff so that they strive to achieve their targets. This will smooth the appraisal system as it will be objective based.

(iv.) Number of other aspect related to the appraisal system also need to be followed through in order to gain the ownership and commitment from the staff member that will bring valuable rewards such as promotion, salary increase and clear career path.

(v.) The system should establish clear link between the objective of the organization and individual work objective and there should be participation in target setting and formulation, this will ensure the appraisal becomes fair to all levels and reduce biases.

(vi.) Staff should ensure that they work hard as per agreed objective and that they interpret explicitly the OPRAS objective before starting the implementation year. This will help both management and staff to meet their objectives.

(vii.) In order for OPRAS to be successfully the office should create an environment of constructive feedback to allow employees to know where they stand, what is needed to achieve, acceptable performance and to assist staff to do the right thing and to do them better.
OPRAS has not been given due weight, since in some cases the OPRAS is used and in other cases it is not in use. This can be seen whereby most of the staff do only participate in filling form which is the initial stage and there after this has imbalanced staff to keep on using it as a tool for measuring performance and promoting staff. Therefore, this study recommends that PMO-RALG needs to change focus from insisting on OPRAS forms filling to performance review and development through training of all employees.

Although regular training are being carried out on the use of OPRAS this is not enough since this training should go hand in hand with assessing the relevance in terms of planning the performance appraisal.

OPRAS cannot simply be borrowed from one country or one organization and be applied to another. If OPRAS has to be effective the first important step is to change the focus from performance appraisal to performance planning, review and development. PMO-RALG should plan and review the performance appraisal system to customize the evaluation criteria to match with the performance requirements for the office. In a nutshell we could say that the current performance appraisal model/system does not suit to some of the Tanzanian Public Institutions like PMO-RALG, we borrowed the idea but we should develop our own system which could best fit our context and culture

6.4 Areas for Further Research

This study focused on the perception of the PMO RALG employees on Open Performance Review and Appraisal System. It covered issues of benefits, the way it was operationalized and challenges facing implementation process. However, this study could not cover the following areas and thus recommends for further studies.

(i.) How fixed salary affects the adoption of OPRAS
(ii.) The use of pay for performance in the public sector
(iii.) Use of OPRAS results to reward best performers
REFERENCES


APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Budget And Time Table Of The Research

The research will be guided by a timetable starting from writing a research proposal to research report submission (see table B bellow). Six month will be used by the researcher to complete the report writing proposal. A total budget of Tshs. 1,066,000 (see table B bellow) will be used by the researcher to run the whole processes of research proposal writing. This will include stationeries, transport cost, food allowance and daily expenses.

Table A. Research Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stationery</td>
<td>Tshs. 8000</td>
<td>5 Reams 5 x 8000 = 40,000</td>
<td>Tshs. 481,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cartridge 160,000</td>
<td>2 Cartridge 2x 160,000 = 360,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing pads 3,500</td>
<td>3 Writing pads 3 x 3500 = 7500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Binding 1,500</td>
<td>Binding 4copies 4 x 1500 = 6000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transport cost</td>
<td>Tshs. 10,000</td>
<td>10,000 x 45days=</td>
<td>Tshs. 450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Food allowance and daily expenses</td>
<td>Tshs. 10,000</td>
<td>10,000 x 45, days =</td>
<td>Tshs. 4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tshs3,090,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B: Research Time Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January-February, 2013</td>
<td>Writing proposal</td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-14 April, 2013</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>PMO-RALG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Staff Questionnaire

Dear Respondent,

Mr. Gerald G. Mwanilwa is a candidate of MSC-HRM from Mzumbe University (MU). He is currently undertaking a research on the assessment of Public service employee’s perception on OPRAS and is using Prime Minister’s Office-RALG in Dodoma as a case study. This is one of the requirements for the partial fulfillment of the Master studies. As a member of this community, you are kindly requested to provide some information on the problem in question in terms of coping strategies and the activities meant to improve the OPRAS.

This information is important as it will explore the perception of employees on OPRAS, challenges being faced for the ongoing initiative of implementation of OPRAS and thus be able to come up with recommended good practices that may improve the performance of the individual employees as well as that of the organization. It will provide a foundation for further studies on performance management in the public organizations. Your name is optional and all the information given will be treated with strict confidentiality.

Your cooperation is highly needed for the success of this research.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Gerald G. Mwanilwa
MSC  Candidate

Date of Interview……………………………………………………………………

Name of Interviewer…………………………………………………….. (Optional)

Instructions for Interviewers:
Choose an appropriate answer and then fill in the spaces the best numeric (value) accordingly otherwise fill in the blanks with suitable string/discrete value/ answers (words): Be neat and brief and Use a pen. In case of language problem, you may use both Swahili and English language.

Part One: Profile of Respondents

1.1 Education level
(i.) Primary
(ii.) Secondary
(iii.) Certificate ………………
(iv.) Diploma
(v.) First degree
(vi.) Masters

Others (Specify)……………………………………………………………………...

1.1.1 Position

1.1.2 Department/Unit
Part Two: OPRAS implementation at PMO – RALG

2.1 Have you ever signed a performance contract (OPRAS) with your employer / supervisor?
   (i.) Yes ( )
   (ii.) No ( )

2.2 If yes, how many times have you signed OPRAS forms with your employer / supervisor?
   (i.) Once ( )
   (ii.) Twice ( )
   (iii.) Thrice ( )
   (iv.) Four times ( )

2.3 Last financial year (2011/2012) did you sign OPRAS forms with your supervisor?
   (i.) Yes ( )
   (ii.) No ( )

2.4 If yes, how much does it take to fill the OPRAS forms
   (i.) 1 – 3 days ( )
   (ii.) One week ( )
   (iii.) One month ( )
   (iv.) Over 1 month ( )
2.5 If yes, in 2.3 which stage did you reach in OPRAS cycle.
(i.) Filling forms ( )
(ii.) Midyear review ( )
(iii.) Annual review ( )
(iv.) None ( )

Part Three: Perception of employees on OPRAS implementation at PMO – RALG

3.1 Are you aware of the effects of OPRAS?
(i.) Yes ( )
(ii.) No ( )

3.2 If yes in 3.1 above, how do you participate in OPRAS exercise
(iii.) .................................................................
(iv.) .................................................................
(v.) .................................................................

3.3 Do you get any training on OPRAS?
(i.) Yes ( )
(ii.) No ( )

3.4 If No in 3.3 above, what are the reasons?
(i.) .................................................................
(ii.) .................................................................
(iii.) .................................................................

3.5 If Yes in 3.3 above how often do you get training?
(i.) Very often
(ii.) Often
(iii.) Not often
3.1 Are there resources for implementation of OPRAS
  (i.) Yes ( )
  (ii.) No ( )

3.2 If No in 3.1 above, what could be the reason
  (i.) .................................................................
  (ii.) .................................................................

3.3 If yes in 3.1 above, what could the possible sources of funds for OPRAS
  (i.) .................................................................
  (ii.) .................................................................

3.4 Are the resources for implementation of OPRAS adequate?
  (i.) Yes ( )
  (ii.) No ( )

3.5 Is the political environment supporting the existence of OPRAS?
  (i.) Yes ( )
  (ii.) No ( )

3.6 If No in 3.5 above, state how
  ........................................................................

3.7 If yes in 3.5 above, state how
  ........................................................................

3.8 Is the Management in PMO-RALG supporting the OPRAS?
  (i.) Yes ( )
  (ii.) No ( )

3.9 Are the resources for implementation of OPRAS adequate?
  (i.) Yes ( )
  (ii.) No ( )

3.10 Is the political environment supporting the existence of OPRAS?
  (i.) Yes ( )
  (ii.) No ( )

3.11 If No in 3.9 above, state how
  ........................................................................

3.12 If yes in 3.9 above, state how
  ........................................................................

3.13 Is the Management in PMO-RALG supporting the OPRAS?
  (i.) Yes ( )
  (ii.) No ( )
3.14 If No in 3.12 above state how
…………………………………………….

3.15 If yes in 3.12 above state how
……………………………………………..

3.16 Have you ever been appraised by OPRAS?
(i.) Yes (     )
(ii.) No (     )

3.17 If no in 3.15 above, what other approach did your organisation use to
appraise your performance?
……………………………………………………
……………………………………………………

3.18 If yes in 3.15 above, for how long have you been appraised by using
OPRAS
(i.) 1 - 3 Years
(ii.) 4 - 6 years
(iii.) More than 6 years

3.19 Does OPRAS assist you in performance improvement and that of staff
in your division /Units?
(i.) Yes (     )
(ii.) No (     )

3.20 If yes, how?
(i.) Assist in work distribution (    )
(ii.) Assist in work accountability (    )
(iii.) Increased communication (    )
(iv.) Increased in Value for money (    )
(v.) Increased in confidence (    )
(vi.) Increased in job satisfaction (    )
3.21 Which criteria in appraisal process as per your knowledge are given more preference under OPRAS in your organisation?
(i.) .................................................................
(ii.) .................................................................
(iii.) .................................................................

3.22 Which other criteria should be included in OPRAS?
(i.) .................................................................
(ii.) .................................................................
(iii.) .................................................................

Part four: Challenges Facing OPRAS

4.1 Do you think that the OPRAS has some problems?
(i.) Yes ( )
(ii.) No ( )

4.2. If Yes in part 4.1, what are the problems of OPRAS? (Put a tick in the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Politicians</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Top management</th>
<th>Central government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 If No in 4.1 above state how
(i.) .................................................................
4.4 If the OPRAS has failed to show the expected result, kindly propose any two other best approaches to appraise staff performance

5.1 If the OPRAS has failed to show the expected result, kindly propose any two other best approaches to appraise staff performance

5.2 In your opinion what do you think could be done to strengthening OPRAS in PMO-RALG

Part Five: Ways on improving OPRAS at PMO-RALG
Appendix 3: Interview Guide (For Heads of Department and few Senior Staff)

1. When PMO – RALG started to implement OPRAS?
2. Which strategies applied before introduction of OPRAS?
3. How activities planned and channeled to Divisions/Sections/Units and to individual?
4. Is OPRAS applicable to all employees at PMO – RALG/Divisions/units?
5. How do you review employees’ performance?
6. Do you think OPRAS is well implemented in PMO – RALG?
7. What factors impede or influence implementation of OPRAS at PMO – RALG?
8. What is your suggestion for the strengthening the performance Appraisal in PMO – RALG?
No underline, Font color: Black

**Page 11:** Formatted

Sabaya  
8/5/2005 9:20:00 AM

Justified, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

```
Page 11: [41] Change
Unknown
```

Field Code Changed

**Page 11:** Formatted

Sabaya  
8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM

Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

```
Page 11: [42] Formatted
Unknown
```

Field Code Changed

**Page 11:** Formatted

Sabaya  
8/5/2005 9:52:00 AM

Justified, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

```
Page 11: [43] Change
Unknown
```

Field Code Changed

**Page 11:** Formatted

Sabaya  
8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM

Justified, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

```
Page 11: [44] Change
Unknown
```

Field Code Changed

**Page 60:** Formatted

Sabaya  
8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM

Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

```
Page 60: [53] Formatted
Unknown
```

Field Code Changed

**Page 60:** Formatted

Sabaya  
8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM

Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

```
Page 60: [54] Formatted
Unknown
```

Field Code Changed

**Page 60:** Formatted

Sabaya  
8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM

Heading 2, Left, None, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: 0.39", Left
Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Heading 3, None, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers, Tab stops: Not at 2.44"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:55:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:55:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Heading 3, None, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers, Tab stops: Not at 2.42&quot;</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Heading 3, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Justified, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:56:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Line spacing: single, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:56:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Justified, Line spacing: single, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:56:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: single, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:56:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Justified, Line spacing: single, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:56:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: single, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:56:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Line spacing: single, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8/5/2005 9:56:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 65: [139] Formatted</td>
<td>Sabaya</td>
<td>8/5/2005 10:03:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [140] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 10:03:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [141] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [142] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [143] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [144] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 10:03:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [145] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [146] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 10:03:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [147] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justified, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [148] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 10:03:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [149] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 10:03:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [150] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 10:03:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [151] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 10:03:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 65: [152] Formatted</th>
<th>Sabaya</th>
<th>8/5/2005 9:08:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered, Line spacing: 1.5 lines, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>