



International Journal of Social Sciences and Management

A Rapid Publishing Journal

ISSN 2091-2986



Indexing and Abstracting

CrossRef, Google Scholar, International Society of Universal Research in Sciences (EyeSource), Journal TOCs, New Jour, Scientific Indexing Services, InfoBase Index, Open Academic Journals Index (OAJI), Scholarsteer, Jour Informatics, Directory of Research Journals Indexing (DRJI), International Society for Research Activity (ISRA): Journal Impact Factor (JIF), Simon Fraser University Library, etc.

Vol- 3(2), April 2016



Impact factor* : **3.389**

*Impact factor is issued by SJIF INNO SPACE. Kindly note that this is not the IF of Journal Citation Report (JCR).

For any type of query or feedback kindly contact at email ID: editor.ijssm@gmail.com



Research Article

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FOR EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT: EXPLORING PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISORS

Anup Bhurtel^{1*} and Eka Raj Adhikari²

¹Training and Education Department, Training Institute for Technical Instruction (TITI), Sanothimi, Bhaktapur, Nepal

²Training Development Division, Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT), Sanothimi, Bhaktapur, Nepal

*Corresponding author's email: abh@titi.org.np

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to explore the perceptions of supervisors on performance appraisal in relation to employee development adopting a qualitative design. In line with its research objective, data obtained from semi-structured interviews conducted with 14 supervisors from the proposed 10 model technical schools and the head office of the Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT), Nepal was analysed. The study brought forth that supervisors perceived the existing performance appraisal system less effective as it was used merely for getting employee-promotion. The supervisors were unable to appraise non-permanent employees; and even for permanent classed employees, they were obliged to keep the results confidential. They were thus unable to discuss the results with the concerned employees and jointly set goals for their further development. The study calls for establishing a comprehensive performance appraisal system for all employees in which results were analysed, and linked with plans for employee development. As the paper was confined to exploring the perception of 14 supervisors, further research could be done in future with greater number of samples. Moreover, there is room for studying the appraisees' perception so that this issue can be explored from wider perspective aiding in the employee performance.

Keywords: performance appraisal; employee development; supervisors; Nepal

Introduction

Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) is the bedrock for producing skilled human resources. In the context of Nepal, Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT) established in 1989 is an umbrella organization mandated by its own act to formulate policies on TVET, coordinate among TVET providers and provide quality services to produce basic, mid and higher level skilled human resources. There are 932 employees working in its system (CTEVT, 2014).

The five-member Recruitment and Promotion Committee in CTEVT recruits, selects and promotes employees required for the system. Its authority has also been delegated to its constituent schools. To manage the performance of all CTEVT employees, By-Laws relating to Service, Terms and Facilities of Employee, 2012 is in existence (In this paper, the term By-Laws denotes the same). The By-Law 42 (1) has the provision for performance appraisal of the employees. The employees working as supervisors throughout the system follow this By-law while appraising the employees working under them (CTEVT, 2012).

In this context, this paper examines the perceptions of supervisors about current performance appraisal system of CTEVT with respect to employee development. It has come forth as there is a dearth of study on this issue. Thus, the paper has made an attempt to fulfil the identified gap and aims at contributing to the body of knowledge on performance management in the Nepalese TVET sector. The paper is based on the following research question:

- a) How do supervisors perceive performance appraisal with respect to its role in employee development?

Review of existing literatures

To establish a base for analysis, the researchers have initially performed a review of available literature on performance appraisal. Performance appraisal is a formal management system that provides for the evaluation of the quality of an individual's performance in an organization (Grote, 2002). According to Armstrong (2006), it is a systematic process for improving organizational performance by developing the performance of individuals and teams. In this connection, Lawler *et al.* (2012) state that it is one of the most frequently criticized talent management practices.

Among many significant benefits of performance appraisal, employee development is the one that is of paramount importance for supervisors. As stated by Grote (2002), performance appraisal helps supervisors to motivate employees who excel in their performance, provide counselling to underperformers and identify needs for individual training and development. Armstrong (2006) also adds that performance appraisal allows the supervisors to grasp the full potential of the employees through capacity development. Performance appraisal reveals career-growth plans; helps identify their training needs and helps align employee goals with organizational goals. With reference to employees, allows them to express their views and concerns about issues related to works (Arthur, 2008). Performance appraisal process is taken as a medium to reduce the underperformance of employee. Through performance appraisal, the human resource management can identify employees with capability of high performance yet showing underperformance. Based on the results obtained from the appraisal, the supervisors can mobilize them in suitable areas or provide them required training (Akinbowale *et al.*, 2013).

Effective performance appraisal is done to recognize the efforts exerted by high performers. It helps the supervisors identify the outstanding employees so that managers can reward them to foster loyalty, and retain them (Delpo, 2007; Arthur, 2008). The supervisors can motivate the employees to achieve the organizational goals. Based on performance appraisal results, managers can set goals that are more challenging to those employees with competency. Besides, it also helps managers self-assess to know if they are being able to achieve optimum performance for their department's goals or not. As one of the human resource practices, it strengthens behaviours of employees and induces them to comply with organizational goals (Perry *et al.*, 2006).

Performance Appraisal Practices in CTEVT

CTEVT has a separate By-Law that has a provision of performance appraisal for the purpose of employee promotion. It has been mentioned in the By-Law No. 42. Among other criteria for promotion, performance appraisal is one, which carries 40 points out of 100. The By-Law requires that each employee should fill up the Performance Appraisal Form as mentioned in its Annex – 12. Performance Appraisal Form has three parts from 'A' to 'C'. In the form, the employee has to fill up five tasks completed throughout the fiscal year that ends in the Nepali month of Ashadh¹. As per the provision, the employee submits the completed form by the 7th Shrawan²

to the concerned office and the completed form is to be appraised by three levels of supervising authorities, viz., the Supervisor, the Reviewer, and the Review Committee respectively.

The duly filled up form is appraised by the respective supervisor every year by the 15th of Shrawan and then he/she has to submit it to the Reviewer. Subsequently, the Reviewer is required to make appraisal of the received form within 15 working days and send the same to the Review Committee. After this, the Review Committee has to mandatorily complete the appraisal process by the 15th of Ashwin³ and finally submit the form in sealed form at the secretariat of the Recruitment and Promotion Committee.

The By-Laws state that Performance Appraisal Form is only for permanent employees. However, the By-Laws maintain that the form is not for those employees who are classless (e.g., drivers, gardeners, peons, and so on) even if they are permanent. In this connection, the Admin Director of CTEVT said that 137 out of 932 employees were not permanent (R. Bakhati, personal communication, October 1, 2015). Among the remaining 795 employees, 157 are classless. This indicates that out of 932 employees, only 638 employees are appraised.

The CTEVT By-Laws mention that the provision of performance appraisal is mainly for the promotional purpose. The stated provisions are only for the permanent employees. However, there are a great number of other kinds of employees working in the system. Importantly, it is the responsibility of supervisors to groom up his/her supervisees regardless of their employment status (Silverstein, 2007). Besides this, the literature also shows that effective performance appraisal is closely linked with employee development (Bacal, 2004). However, it seems slightly contradictory with the existing By-Laws of CTEVT as there is the provision of performance appraisal only for permanent employees, and the appraisal is only for the purpose of promotion. In this context, the present paper has explored the perceptions of supervisors on performance appraisal in relation to employee development in CTEVT.

Research Design and Empirical Data

Qualitative Research, Sample, Ethics

The study is based on qualitative research design. As stated by Ticehurst and Veal (2000), qualitative methods are concerned with gathering rich data about considerably few people or organizations. Qualitative research is more concerned with issues that are related to human interests. According to Patton (1990) and Cresswell (2003), the

¹Ashadh is the 3rd month in the Nepalese calendar. It is the end of fiscal year and falls around from the 3rd week of June to the 3rd week of July.

²Shrawan is the 4th month in the Nepalese calendar. The 7thShrawan falls in around the 4th week of July.

³Ashwin is the 6th month in the Nepalese calendar. The 15th Ashwin falls in around the 1st week of October.

researcher in qualitative research digs about the experiences and perception of the participants after making first hand observation. The present paper is about exploring the perception of supervisors regarding the existing performance appraisal system. Qualitative interviewing is appropriate when the research is based on the ontology that views, experiences and perception of participants give a meaningful result to explore the social reality (Mason, 2001). The author also explains that semi-structured interviews help researchers to explore a number of themes and to develop unexpected themes. Thus, semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted. Besides, perception of supervisors about performance appraisal may differ from one individual to another. In this context, semi-structured interview gives some flexibility to the set guidelines; allows probing and altering the sequence of questions when needed (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). Hence, semi-structured interview method was considered suitable to explore this complex phenomenon. The interview was conducted with the purposively selected 14 supervisors from the proposed ten model schools located in different parts of the country and from the head office of CTEVT, Sanothimi, Bhaktapur, Nepal. The respondents selected were on various supervisory positions such as Principals, Deputy Admin Director, Vice-Principal, Programme Coordinators, Head of Department and Admin Officers. The data derived from primary sources were substantiated with the data derived from such secondary sources of data as CTEVT acts, regulations and by-laws, journal articles and books on performance management.

In qualitative research, data are of various kinds such as participants' verbal responses, non-verbal behaviours, photographs, drawings, and field notes (Mason, 2003). The paper has taken the verbal and non-verbal information provided by the participants as data of the study. Ereat (2003) stresses on the criticality of analyzing the details of feelings, avoidances and ambivalence based on research's relevancy to make righteous interpretation and infer this knowledge. So, non-verbal behaviours of the participants were also taken into consideration in the study. The identity of the participants was kept anonymous. None of them was pressurized to take part in the study. As suggested by Chrzanowska (2003), the interviews were conducted by building a working relationship with the participants through rapport building and by ensuring an environment comfortable for them. In case of hesitation and denial, the researchers analysed the non-verbal expressions.

The questions were asked in the Nepalese language. The responses were recorded, and translated from Nepali into English. The researchers analysed the data obtained from interviews through the 'framework method' of thematic analysis (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003) and brought forward the

discussion with relevant theories of human resources management.

Perceptions on Performance Appraisal System in CTEVT

Strengths of Existing PA: The participants considered the existing performance appraisal effective for promotional purpose as well as for professional development. The performance appraisal tool was used mainly to find out the degree of punctuality, honesty and results achieved. The existing tool has a clear marking system based on objective criteria. As one participant stated:

Talking about strengths, evaluation is done based on various sections such as time allocated for certain jobs and quantity of work done which is a good thing...(Interview: Participant 9)

The performance appraisal process was found to be helpful in making the employees concentrated on tasks. In this context, the participants identified two categories of tasks, viz. pre-planned and unplanned. With a slight smile, one participant shared:

Its strength is that an employee can fill up the pre-assigned tasks in the form and other bhaipart⁴ tasks assigned by the boss. (Interview: Participant 13)

The employees can fill up the tasks accomplished throughout the year. The Supervisors then evaluate how sincerely they have done the tasks. This makes the marking done by the Supervisors justifiable.

Weaknesses of PA: While digging into the participants' perception about the existing performance appraisal system of CTEVT, the study found that most of them stressed on its weaknesses. Almost all the participants pointed out that it was only used for the promotional purpose. One of the weaknesses was that the results were kept confidential. It was found that there was no feedback from the Supervisors and Reviewers to the concerned employee. Participatory performance appraisal was hardly present. It was fully one directional. In this regard, a participant expressed with disappointment:

I cannot see the results in it and cannot know what my weaknesses are that I need to work on. It goes into my personal file, yet I cannot view it... (Interview: Participant 6)

Performance appraisal is to be done once a year as per the By-law for permanent employees and for administrative purpose. It was found that there was no other formal tool to systematically appraise the employees for recording.

⁴It is a Nepali term commonly used in Nepalese organizations, which means casual or unplanned. At other times, Bhaipari is also used to refer to contingent, unforeseeable tasks.

However, the appraisal was not done regularly. As one participant expressed:

It is not done regularly. In recent years, we have been doing it annually. We fill up the Performance Appraisal Form and submit it to the concerned department by the end of the fiscal year. The case was even worse some years ago. Although the CTEVT By-Laws state that it has to be filled up every year, they used to fill up the Performance Appraisal Form once in 4 or 5 years. (Interview: Participant 2)

Some tasks are easily quantifiable while others are not. Likewise, the effectiveness of some tasks cannot be measured through the percentage completed. Besides, the form has been complained for not being spacious. In the form, the appraisee has space only for five tasks completed, but no space available to mention the all work done. One participant expressed:

In the form, there is space to write five responsibilities only and not an employee's all responsibilities can be included in it. If 10 responsibilities are given and only five are completed, the employee will fill up those five only in the given space and thus the supervisor is obliged to give him/her marks based on what is written in the form...(Interview: Participant 12)

The participants revealed that the existing practice of performance appraisal was not effective in differentiating between high performers and under-performers. With a sense of grievance, one participant stated:

The form does not allow the employee to list more than five major tasks. It does not differentiate between a person who performed more than five tasks and the one who just performed five tasks in a year. So, it does not help evaluate all the duties and responsibilities performed by the employee. Thus, performance appraisal has not become as effective as it should be. (Interview: Participant 2)

It was revealed that sometimes the score on employee performance was provided by those Reviewers or Review Committee members who had not observed the employee performance. Disclosing the cause behind it, one participant said:

The employees from regional and central office⁵ are involved in the appraisal process. It is said employees from these offices, who are in the Review Committee and fill up Section 'C' of the Performance Appraisal Form, visit for evaluation. But I have not seen this yet. (Interview: Participant 14)

Here, participants raised an important issue about the involvement of those parties who had not directly observed the employees' performance. To this perception, another participant added:

School is the one that monitors an employee's day-to-day work. Regional office or Central office would not even know the employees working in the school. The role performed by regional and central office is more of a formality in reality. (Interview: Participant 12)

As there is involvement of three levels of appraisal extending to regional or even central office, the process of appraising performance at technical schools was found to be lengthy. However, interviews found a couple of participants reluctant to disclose the weaknesses while unearthing the perceptions. One participant agreed only to discuss in surface and wrapped up the response with this expression:

...If we dig in deep, we can unearth many weaknesses (pause). So, I do not think it is necessary to disclose you all the confidential matters (laughs). In average, it is okay. (Interview: Participant 6)

Performance Appraisal with respect to Employee Development

The participants who were working as Supervisors in the performance appraisal process talked about challenges in linking performance appraisal with employee development. They commonly voiced that one of the major challenges they had to face as supervisors was that there was no systematic practice of linking the results of performance appraisal with employee development. The role of performance appraisal was found to come into light only during the phase of promotion. It had always been a challenge for supervisors to develop the desired level of performance among employees in existing practice of performance appraisal. One participant critiqued:

Performance appraisal has never been used to link with employee development... Employee developments are rather done based on seniority, attitude towards work, student satisfaction through feedback, class observation and feedback from On-the-job training. (Interview: Participant 8)

Another problem that stood up as the challenge for them was performance appraisal of all employees. They were found to be abiding by the existing By-Laws, which state that appraisal has to be done only of the permanent employees. As a participant disclosed:

Our By-Laws do not consider temporary or contract employees as the actual employees. So, evaluation is done only of permanent employees. There is no tool or basis for appraising them. It is just done based on

⁵The term 'Central Office' in CTEVT denotes the Head Office.

information we hear from others. (Interview: Participant 13)

Despite the existence of a standard and consistent system, they were obliged to follow informal procedures to identify the weaknesses of employees and then plan for their performance improvement. It was found that in case of instructors, the Supervisors had the practice of appraising or monitoring their daily activities and getting feedback from students and Trade Heads. In this regard, a participant revealed:

There is no such established system of appraising the performance of temporary instructors. The only way is that their classes are observed and they are provided with feedback. In this sense, performance appraisal is mainly based on students' perspectives. (Interview: Participant 1)

Gap identification was thus another challenge for the Supervisors. As the practice of observation for non-permanent employees was informal as well as optional, they were unable to explore performance gaps of all the employees. They explained that they had to spend additional time, resources and effort if they had to evaluate those employees' performance. A participant expressed:

...the existing Performance Appraisal System has no link with Human Resource Development. We have not been able to identify skill gaps. It is only for promotional purpose. Existing Performance Appraisal does not guide us in making a plan of actions. Gap is only seen through monitoring and student feedback. So, we have to rely on other processes as we cannot rely on its Performance Appraisal System but an effective performance appraisal could give actual results. Extra efforts and other processes consume time. (Interview: Participant 12)

The information in Performance Appraisal was found to be kept confidential. Due to this, they were unable to provide feedback and plan for their development based on the performance appraisal done consequently. With saddening tone, a participant shared:

The weak points of employees are not discussed with them. Due to this, if the supervisors ask them for reasons of poor performance, they backfire asking 'Have you given me the training?' I cannot send any employee for training or decide what kind of training is required and for which employee. I can only recommend employees for certain trainings available in the system based on their own requests and cannot explore their training needs. (Interview: Participant 7)

The Supervisors did not always have authority to take up initiatives for employee development and send them for training. One participant's helplessness was expressed thus:

I might be able to identify that an employee needs certain development programme but I have no authority to take an action for that. I have to report to my seniors and the challenge appears when they refuse to entertain my request. If the requests were based on the results of performance appraisal, employee development could occur. But, just being based on the feelings or observation of the supervisor or request of instructors to update with the technology, I am unable to send them to training or take action for their development. (Interview: Participant 9)

These findings have highlighted the scenario of performance appraisal system in CTEVT and have practical as well as research implications that are presented in the following discussion section.

Discussion

As literature suggests, communication with the appraisee with appropriate feedback on the performance is the foundation of effective performance appraisal. Communication is vital for employee development. Kirkpartrick (2006) has stated that employee development is achieved through performance improvement and change of attitude towards the work and team. Managers or supervisors may use different appraisal methods such as Management by Objectives, Graphic Rating Scale or Critical Incident Method (also known as hard quality management practices). Irrespective of the methods used, they should communicate the results with the appraisee under appropriate interruption-free settings considering time, place, facilities, gathered information and materials (soft quality management practices) in order to plan to formulate mutually agreeable plan of actions. Thus, effective performance appraisal involves a balance between soft and hard quality management practices (Abdullah & Tari, 2012).

In the appraisal process, it is important for the appraisers to prepare for discussion to professionally review the results which include accomplishments for rewards, identify the areas for improvement and then plan for improvement (Rudman, 2003). Feedback is one important way with which employees identify those areas in which they need to work on. Akinbowale *et al.* (2013) advocate that the proper follow up of feedback reports ultimately helps in improving performance of employees. Feedback in addition to persuading the appraisees of the result also assists in ensuring transparency of the appraisal process. The employees that participate and possess overall

knowledge in the performance appraisal process perceive positively towards its fairness (Kavanagh *et al.*, 2007). In CTEVT, however, the supervisors are obliged to keep results of performance appraisal confidential and the employees remain clueless about the basis of promotional decisions. Marking of appraisees of the CTEVT schools by the senior employees from regional and/or central office without having an observation of their performance creates a doubt on the fairness of the system. Due to the existing By-Laws, supervisors lose the opportunity to discuss the areas they need to improve on; thus, the fairness of the performance appraisal system further loses its credibility. Perceived fairness of performance appraisal has been classified with distributive, procedural, and interactional justice by organizational justice theory in which the procedural justice stresses on the impartiality of the performance appraisal process regardless of the results (Harrington & Lee, 2015). The weakness prevails with concerning fairness of the process despite the hesitation of a couple of participants in disclosing weaknesses in depth. In consideration of the existing literature including that on organizational justice theory, supervisors as a role model should provide affirmative and developmental feedback based on the results not only to plan for future actions, but also to persuade them of the fairness of the appraisal system. This indirectly reflects on job satisfaction. Hence, in absence of systematic review system, they have the challenge to find their own ways to feed them with suggestions for improvement without disclosing how they along with the representative of other two levels in the appraisal system have appraised them.

As explained by Kavanagh *et al.* (2007), employee participation is necessary to ensure positive image of performance appraisal system. This allows them to have their say in the decision making process which is undeniably a source of motivation. Lowin (1968) has defined participative decision making (PDM) as that style of processes in which decisions as to activities emerge from the very employee/s who are to execute those decisions. It has been taken as a means to bring about positive attitude in employees towards the management. In this connection, the PDM theory maintains that those Supervisors who are employee-centred can harness the potentials of their subordinates and thereby can bring effectiveness in the management system (Likert, 1958). The author found out that employees feel closer to the managers if participative management style was applied as opposed to hierarchically controlled management style. Implementation of acceptable performance system increases employees' trust for top management (Mayer & Davis, 1999). Akinbowale *et al.* (2013) also support the PDM theory and state that the atmospheres, in which employees have an active participation and get the opportunity to make interactions with the managers in the

performance appraisal process, augment their job satisfaction and improve their performance. However, the PDM theory would hardly apply to the existing performance appraisal system of CTEVT. In non-existence of the practice of providing feedback, the participative decision making process is also not in practice. That is why the participants described the performance appraisal process as just a sign of formality. Such unfavourable perception may raise questions about the supervisors' leadership skills and pose threat to the organizational success. According to Yu and Lee (2015), if there is more assistance from the supervisors, the employees will put more effort to help the organization in achieving its goals and will have a higher emotional investment and attachment to the organization.

An effective performance appraisal process incorporates discussion of objectives, review of standards, and overall progress, and needs and/or interests for further training and development (Kirkpatrick, 2006). Goal setting in appraisal for performance has a moderating role that enhances employee performance and gives them satisfaction with the appraisal system (Kuvaas, 2006; Roberts, 2003). Goal setting is done in performance appraisal based on the performance review and commitment they make through manager-employee discussions. Goal setting theory suggests that when employees understand the expectations of organization from them, they tend to be more motivated and inclined towards achieving goals (Locke & Latham, 2002). In the paper, the authors pointed that giving reasonably challenging goals helps in performance increment and in absence of basic goals, the employees are not motivated to work and there is no meaning for them to stick to their jobs. Locke and Latham (1990) have presented that one of the mechanisms through which employee performance can be made optimum is the development of task strategies and plans. Mento *et al.* (1987) show coherence to the goal setting theory presenting reasonable level of difficulty of goals increases performance in their meta-analysis. In CTEVT, however, the employees and supervisors do not set goals together. To set the goals based on their performance results, the Supervisors first need to provide feedback and invite for participative decision making process to set a plan of actions based on those results. This was not in practice in the CTEVT schools at all, which was discussed in the preceding section of this paper. In absence of goal setting, the strategies of employee development to achieve the goals become out of question. Supervisors thus find it difficult to act on further development of employees. This also grows the risk of stagnation on innovative practice. Mento *et al.* have further illustrated significant implication of goal setting for employees on supervisory levels as an organizational intervention. In the context of organizational success, supervisors perceive it to be of a

bigger challenge for them to motivate employees in absence of concrete mutually agreeable goals and to uphold their performance level. Illumination of goal setting emerges to be of necessity in the system.

In an organization, the supervisors have a major stake in shaping the employee's behaviour, which may either help to optimize their performance or cause to drop it. Equity theory pinpoints that when the employees feel they are treated unevenly, they decrease their commitment and performance; therefore, performance appraisal must be performed fairly for it to be perceived as effective (Fulk *et al.*, 1985). In CTEVT, non-permanent employees are never asked to fill up performance appraisal forms as Supervisors' hands are tied by the By-Laws. Hence, the conviction of these non-permanent employees about the system gradually fades away as they are not treated righteously. On the other hand, performance of classless permanent employees is also never appraised; instead, they get promoted after some regular periods. The promotion decision is independent of the work attitudes, contributions and commitment. The fact that non-permanent employees and the classed permanent ones who do not get periodic promotion the way classless ones do may therefore internalize the stance that human resource practice of filling up performance appraisal forms is merely a formality. As explained by Tzafrir (2005), challenges for managers come forth in absence of effective performance appraisal to build trust on competency of human resource management and make the employees believe that they are working to improve employees' performance. The feeling of being treated discriminately demotivates them and they deliberately reduce their efforts for the organization. In terms of non-permanent employees in CTEVT, to calibrate to ideal practices by finding alternate informal ways to professionally groom them such as observations, student feedback or personal discussion stands as the key challenge for the Supervisors. Supervisors need to exert more effort and time to use such informal tools to make them feel equal to others and motivate them to initiate actions for further development.

The performance appraisal system is perceived as having some strength by the appraisees and it can be applied as a motivational tool by the supervisors in their appraisal process. Kopelman *et al.* (2010) explain that employees satisfied with the practices of the organization tend to be self-motivated and self-directed and thus encourage the supervisors and leaders to follow McGregor Douglas's theory Y style of leadership. Managers who adopt the theory Y consider employees as positive towards their work and willing to take up job responsibilities. Mohamed and Nor (2013) argue that the supervisors practising theory Y management style that encourages employees to participate in management decision making process are effective leaders as compared to those following the

Theory X. The practice of filling up existing performance appraisal form of CTEVT gives them some degree of freedom as it is task-based. The employees are allowed to show five tasks they have successfully completed. The sense of satisfaction appraisees experience while being able to depict those accomplished tasks can be taken as source of motivation for them. It eases supervisors to inspire them to continue to professionally grow further and adopt theory Y style of management. Russ (2011) argues that managers adopting theory X perceive participative decision making negatively and those adopting Theory Y perceive it positively. However, Supervisors in CTEVT despite being inclined to embracing the theory Y are unable to fully adopt principles of this theory. As found by Ozaralli (2002), managers adopting Y style of management were evaluated high with respect to perceptions of employees on managerial competence and their satisfaction with their supervisor increased. Supervisors in the CTEVT system were not able to satisfy their employees due to absence of participative management practices. In such a contradictory scenario, employees feel self-motivated to mention select five tasks but they might as well be confined to those very tasks. They may not be inspired to harness their potential and develop themselves as competitive employees.

TVET is concerned with providing hands on skills to make the graduates competitive in the world of employment. It needs a huge array of resources among which the human resources are the most important. Performance management system lies in the core of human resource management. If this system is strong, it can motivate the employees to perform better and provide them opportunities for further development. In the world of TVET, employees need to be updated and competent to produce such graduates that meet the demands of market. Through performance appraisal, supervisors can find out the performance gaps of their employees and develop plan of actions to make them more proficient. If the challenges brought into light in the paper are addressed, it can boost up the efficiency level and effectiveness of the existing performance system and leverage those human resources.

The discussion so far has created some interesting avenues for further research. As the paper is limited with the Supervisors' perceptions, further research could be done on the satisfaction of those employees who just fill up the performance appraisal form. Likewise, a comparative study of the understanding between those who fill up and those who do not can help us depict the picture of performance appraisal further clear.

Conclusion

The paper has outlined the Supervisors' perceptions on the effectiveness of the existing performance appraisal system of the CTEVT with regard to employee development.

CTEVT has a clear set of guidelines mentioned in the By-laws that guide its overall performance appraisal system. All the Supervisors follow the prescribed procedures. The existing practice holds certain strengths but more of drawbacks making it difficult for them to link the results of performance review with employee development. Supervisors perceive it less effective as there is no provision for Supervisors to appraise non-permanent employees in the first place. Another highlighted issue explored from the perception of Supervisors with regard to permanent employees is confidentiality maintained in the appraisal process. Since appraisers are not allowed to discuss the results with the appraisees, the latter get no opportunity to ask for the reasons of performance gap. The Supervisors and employees do not set goals jointly, either. As a result, the Supervisors cannot point out and offer necessary skills required for further development. Although they have perceived the existing system to some extent objective and motivating, they feel that there needs to be a more comprehensive performance appraisal system that treats all employees equally, allows review of the results, and has a clear linkage with employee development.

Acknowledgments

We are indebted to Dr. Arhan Sthapit (PhD), Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, for his scholarly guidance throughout the research and writing work. A sincere gratitude also goes to Ms. Monika Sapkota, Scholar at University of Edinburgh, UK for her relentless support in writing the paper.

References

- Abdullah MMB and Tari JJ (2012) The influence of soft and hard quality management practices on performance. *Asia Pacific management Review*. **17(2)**: 177-193. Retrieved from http://apmr.management.ncku.edu.tw/issue_detail.asp?id=128#
- Akinbowale MA, Jinabhai DC and Lourens ME (2013) The impact of performance appraisal policy on employee performance – A case study of Guaranty Trust Bank in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. **4(14)**: 677- 686. doi:10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n14p677
- Armstrong M (2006) Performance management: Key strategies and practical guidelines (3rd ed.). Kogan Page, London.
- Arthur D (2008) *The first-time manager's to performance appraisals*. American Management Association, New York.
- Bacal R (2004) *Manager's guide to performance reviews*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Chrzanowska J (2003) *Interviewing groups and individuals in qualitative market research*. Sage, London.
- Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT) (2012) *Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training By-Laws Relating to Service, Terms and Facilities of Staff*, 2012. Retrieved from http://ctevt.org.np/files/admin_CTEVT%20service%20Bylaw%202069.pdf
- Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT) (2014) A glimpse of Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training, Bhaktapur, Nepal.
- Cresswell J W (2003) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd eds.). Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Delpo A (2007) *The performance appraisal handbook: Legal and practical rules for managers* (2nd eds.). Nolo, Berkeley.
- Ereaut G (2003) *Analysis and interpretation in qualitative market research*. Sage, London.
- Fulk J, Brief AP and Barr SH (1985) Trust-in-supervisor and perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluations. *Journal of Business Research*. **13(4)**: 299-313. doi: 10.1016/0148-2963(85)90003-7
- Harrington JR and Lee JH (2015) What drives perceived fairness of performance appraisal? Exploring the effects of psychological contract fulfillment on employees' perceived fairness of performance appraisal in U.S. federal agencies. *Public Personnel Management*. **44(2)**: 214–238. doi: 10.1177/0091026014564071
- Kavanagh P, Beson J and Brown M (2007) Understanding performance appraisal fairness. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, **45(2)**: 132-150. doi: 10.1177/1038411107079108
- Kirkpatrick DL (2006). *Improving employee performance through appraisal and coaching* (2nd eds.). American Management Association, New York.
- Kopelman RE, Prottas DJ and Falk DW (2010) Construct validation of a Theory X/Y behavior scale. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*. **31(2)**: 120-135. doi: 10.1108/01437731011024385
- Kuvaas B (2006) Performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: Mediating and moderating roles of work motivation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* **17(3)**: 504-522. doi: 10.1080/09585190500521581
- Lawler III EE, Benson GS and McDermott M (2012) What makes performance appraisals effective? *Compensation & Benefits Review*. **44(4)**: 191-200. doi: 10.1177/0886368712462331
- Likert R (1958) Measuring organizational performance. *Harvard Business Review*. **36(2)**: 41-50.
- Locke EA and Latham GP (1990) Work motivation and satisfaction: Light at the end of the tunnel. *Psychological Science*. **1(4)**: 240-246. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.1990.tb00207.x
- Locke EA and Latham GP (2002) Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*. **57(9)**: 705-717. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.57.9.705

- Lowin A (1968) Participative decision making: A model, literature critique, and prescriptions for research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. **3(1)**: 68-106. doi: 10.1016/0030-5073(68)90028-7
- Mason J (2003) *Qualitative researching* (2nd eds.). Sage, London.
- Mayer RC and Davis JH (1999) The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. **(84)1**: 123-136. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.84.1.123
- Mento AJ, Steel RP and Karren RJ (1987) A meta-analytic study of the effects of goal-setting on task performance: 1966-1984. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. **39(1)**: 52-83. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(87)90045-8
- Mohamed RKM and Nor CSM (2013) The relationship between McGregor's X-Y theory management style and fulfillment of psychological contract: A literature review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. **3(5)**: 715-720. doi:10.6007/IJARBS/v4-i6/939
- Ozaralli N (2002) A study on conflict resolution styles employed by Theory-X and Theory-Y leaders and perceived leader competence. *The Journal of Business Perspective*. **6(2)**: 81-86. doi:10.1177/097226290200600208
- Patton MQ (1990) *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd eds.). Sage, Newbury Park.
- Perry JL, Mesch D and Paarlberg L (2006) Motivating employees in a new governance era: The performance paradigm revisited. *Public Administration Review*. **66(4)**: 505-514. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3843936>
- Ritchie J and Lewis J (2003) *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Sage, London.
- Roberts GE (2003) Employee performance appraisal system participation: A technique that works. *Public Personnel Management*. **31(3)**: 333-342. doi: 10.1177/009102600203100306
- Rudman R (2003) *Performance planning and review: Making employee appraisals work* (2nd eds.). ALLEN & UNWIN, Crows Nest.
- Russ T (2011) Theory X/Y assumptions as predictors of managers' propensity for participative decision making. *Management Decision*. **49(5)**: 823-836. doi: 10.1108/00251741111130887
- Silverstein B (2007) *Evaluating performance: How to appraise, promote and fire*. HarperCollins, New York.
- Ticehurst GW and Veal AJ (2000) *Business research methods: A managerial approach*. Longman, Frenchs Forest.
- Yu MC and Lee MH (2015) Managers' career development in Taiwanese companies. *Asia Pacific Management Review*. **20(1)**: 11-17. doi: 10.1016/j.apmrv.2015.01.001