Journal of APF Command and Staff College

Human Resource Development Oriented Performance Appraisal System in Armed Police Force, Nepal

Suraj Paudel

paudel.suraj12@gmail.com

Corresponding Editor

Ramesh Raj Kunwar
kunwar.sangla@gmail.com

Abstract

Human Resource Management (HRM) involves managing and developing the workforce, while Human Resource Development (HRD) optimizes performance, fosters growth, and aligns HR practices with employee needs. Performance Appraisal (PA) is vital for HRD, identifying strengths, development areas, fostering growth, and optimizing organizational performance. The research employed a descriptive design with a sequential explanatory method, gathering quantitative data from 74 and qualitative data from 25 respondentsout of 1741 officers in the Armed Police Force, Nepal (APF). Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to examine the quantitative data as well as thematic analysis was executed for the qualitative analysis to study the performance appraisal system in the APF focusing on its alignment with HRD principles. The study reveals that the APF has an HRD climate and is oriented towards HRD principles in its performance appraisal system. However, significant improvements are needed to enhance the system's effectiveness and fairness. The study further highlights the importance of the monitoring on performance appraisal process and linking performance appraisal results with other HRD mechanisms for a comprehensive HRD-oriented PA system. The research suggests implementing training for appraisers, improving performance review frequency, and incorporating potential appraisal, adopting a more systematic and objective evaluation system to foster a

fair and growth-oriented appraisal environment. These findings have significant applications for enhancing the PA system and promoting HRD within the organization since the study emphasized the importance of a strong monitoring system, regular feedback, and potential appraisal to foster an HRD-oriented appraisal process, ultimately promoting employee growth and organizational development.

Introduction

In any organization, a cohesive group of individuals and resources work towards a shared purpose (Anderson, 2019). To achieve this purpose, organizations rely on their human, capital, and technological resources. Efficient functioning is typically achieved through the implementation of processes, hierarchies, and division of responsibilities (Herbel &Rocchigiani, 2013). Among these resources, human capital plays a fundamental role and serves as a measure of an organization's competency and standards (Tripathi, 2001). Acknowledging this, human resource management (HRM) emphasizes the importance of employees as valuable assets and aims to align HR practices with their needs and aspirations to achieve organizational goals (Adhikari, 2010).

In response to the changing competitive landscape, the recognition of the socio-psychological value of employees, and the evolving concept of human resources, the notion of human resource development (HRD) has emerged as an extension of HRM. HRD is rooted in the philosophy that by providing a favorable environment for individuals to express their unlimited potential, organizations can harness their capabilities to achieve their objectives (Rao, 1991). HRD focuses on optimizing the performance of individuals, committees, and groups, ultimately striving to create an enabling organization (Panigrahy, 1989).

Various mechanisms contribute to the HRD framework, as outlined by Rao (1991), including performance appraisal, potential appraisal and development, feedback and performance coaching, career planning, training, organization development, rewards, employee welfare, quality of work life, and human resource information. Among these mechanisms, performance appraisal holds significant importance as it serves as a prerequisite for other HRD aspects such as career planning, potential appraisal, training planning, and organizational development (Alhalboosi, 2018; Bena & Priya, 2014; Creswell, 2009; Dessler &Varkkry, 2009; Rao, 2006).

The current study delves into the performance appraisal system of the APF, exploring its functioning and how it is interlinked with other HRD mechanisms. Additionally, the study seeks to assess the HRD climate within the APF. The key research questions driving this study are as follows: a) How does the performance appraisal system of the APF function, and b) to what extent does it align with the principles of HRD?

Through a comprehensive examination of the performance appraisal system within APF, this study aims to shed light on its effectiveness and integration with broader HRD principles, thereby contributing valuable insights into optimizing organizational performance and employee development.

The objective of this study are: to analyze the existing performance appraisal system of

APF and to explore the alignment between the current performance appraisal system in APF and the principles of HRD.

Review of the Literature and Hypothesis Development

Performance appraisal is built upon the core philosophy of enhancing efficiency and performance improvement (Whitford & Coetsee, 2006). It involves measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of actions, a concept dating back to philosophers like Bacon and Hobbes, who associated it with causality and desired effects (Jain, 2014). The appraisal process is deeply rooted in organizational and individual behavior, with techniques categorized into past-oriented and future-oriented approaches (Aggarwal & Thakur, 2013; Hossain, 2015). Methods such as essay appraisal, graphic rating scale, and management by objectives contribute to this process (Cintrón & Flaniken, 2017; Dessler & Varkkry, 2009; Faizal, 2005).

Performance appraisal is an integral part of human resource management (HRM) and strategically evaluates an individual's achievements within a specific timeframe (Clark, 2015). HRM emphasizes efficient control, while the philosophies of HRD stress on the development and freedom for proactive individuals (Hossain, 2015). HRD philosophy centers on unlocking the unlimited potential of individuals through systematic efforts (Panigrahi, 1989) and values human beings beyond their contributions to corporate productivity (Silvera, 1990). With societal changes, HRD's importance has grown in organizations (Jeung et al., 2011).

The western definition of HRD, proposed by Swanson (1995), emphasizes developing human expertise to enhance performance through organization development and personnel training. HRD's purpose is to improve individual performance, organizational effectiveness, and productivityTabibi (2011, as cited in Alhalboosi, 2018)leading to increased efficiency, competitive advantages, and a more responsive workforce.

Performance appraisal and HRD are based on maximizing efficiency, human potential, and individual development to achieve organizational objectives effectively. These principles contribute to continuous performance improvement and the overall well-being of the workforce.

Rao (1991) defines HRD as a continuous process aimed at acquiring and sharpening capabilities required for present and future job functions, developing individual potential, and fostering a congenial organizational climate. To achieve these objectives, HRD measures are essential, ensuring continuous acquisition and utilization of employee capabilities. The mechanisms or subsystems of HRD, as outlined by Rao (1991), include performance and potential appraisal, feedback and performance coaching, career planning, training, organization development, rewards, employee welfare, quality of work life, and human resource information. These HRD sub system/mechanisms should lead to processes like role clarity, performance planning, and development climate, resulting in competent, satisfied, and committed employees contributing to organizational growth (Bhattarai, 2013).

Table 1

Contribution of HRD Subsystems to Development Dimensions

Development Dimensions		HRD Subsystems	
Individual	Training	Career planning	Potential appraisal and development
	Feedback and Coaching Performance	Rewards	
Individual in the present role	Performance appraisa	Training	Feedback and performance coaching
		Rewards	
Individual in regard to likely future roles	Potential appraisal and development	Training	PA Feedback and performance coaching
Dyadic relationships	Feedback and performance coaching	Performance appraisal	Training
Teams and teamwork	Organization development	Training	Team rewards
Collaboration among different units/teams	Organization and development	Training	
Self-renewing capability and health of organization	Performance appraisal	Organization development	Training

Note. Adopted from the book reading into HRD, Rao (1991). The table describes how the HRD subsystems are interrelated with development dimension.

Table 2

Links Between the Subsystems of HRD

	Performance appraisal	Potential appraisal and development	Feedback and performance coaching	Training	Career planning	Employee Welfare and quality of work life	Rewards	OD and systems development	Human resources information
Performance Appraisal (PA)	-	PA dimensions develop the potential of employees for higher level jobs	PA data are the basis for feedback and counseling	PA indicates the job training needs of each individual	PA data are used	-	PA data form the basis for Decision	PA data can be used	PA data are used
Potential appraisal and Development (PAD)	-	-	PAD data should be used for feedback and counseling	Training may be provided to develop candidates with potential	PAD is based on career plans, and careers plans are prepared using PAD data	-	-	OD Programs can Be undertaken of potential is not Available within the organization	PAD data are Used
Feedback and Performance Coaching (FPC)	-	-	-	Training needs can be identified	Career counseling can be part of this	-	Verbal rewards Can be part of feedback	FPC data can be used for improving the development climate	FPC data can be Used to monitor individual development

Training (T)	-	-	-	-	Training may be undertaken on the basis of career-development Plans	Training can be part of QWL programs	Training can be Used as a reward	Training can be part of OD	Data are used for Promotion decision
Career Planning (CP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Research on promotion patterns can be conducted for OD programs	CP data are used for HR audits and career planning
Employee Welfare and Quality of Work Life	-	-	-	-	-	-	Group efforts can be rewards through QWL measures	OWL improvements can be part of OD activities	Welfare benefits Require data
Rewards	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Data are used for rewards and reward data are entered
OD and Systems Development (OD and SD)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	HRI can be used for system development and OD purposes

Note. Adopted from the book Reading in Human Resource Development, Rao (1991), The table above highlights the role of performance appraisal among HRD subsystems. The rows and columns represent HRD mechanisms, and the matrix describes their interrelationships. Eight differentsubsystems are identified as part of HRD, and the table demonstrates how they are interconnected. It indicates that performance appraisal has a significant influence on other HRD mechanisms.

Rao (1999) the HRD sub-systems or mechanisms should not be thought of in isolation. They are designed to work together in an integrated system although any of them may exist in an organization that does not have an overall HRD plan.

The existing research on PA and HRD has primarily focused on these aspects separately, without exploring their potential integration. Several studies in Nepal and internationally have examined the effectiveness of PA systems and identified issues such as technical and cultural challenges (Mainali, 2010), factors affecting the accuracy of performance evaluation (Pandey, 2019), and employees' perception of satisfaction and outcomes related to PA (Bishowkarma, 2017; Bhurtel& Adhikari, 2016; Pudasaini, 2013; Sharma, 2018).

While some researchers have delved into the HRD aspects in isolation (Singh, 2005; Kumar, Harish, & Gowd, 2016; Sharma, 2018), there is a clear lack of comprehensive studies that explore the relationship between HRD and PA systems. Many of the existing studies have not adequately covered the integration of HRD in the context of PA, and vice versa.

The research aims to address this gap by examining how HRD-oriented PA systems can be effectively linked together. The study will conduct a thorough review of existing literature on both PA and HRD to investigate the potential for a comprehensive HRD

system that incorporates performance appraisal. This integrative approach will contribute valuable insights into optimizing organizational performance and employee development, fostering a more holistic understanding of HRD and PA's interplay.

After thoroughly reviewing the literature and conducting a comprehensive analysis, the study aims to investigate the relationship between the independent variables - planning, monitoring, interlink, and biasness - and the dependent variable, which is the "existing performance appraisal system." By exploring how these independent factors influence the current state of the performance appraisal system, the research seeks to provide valuable insights into improving its effectiveness and alignment with organizational goals. The study recognizes the significance of understanding the impact of planning, monitoring, interlinking, and biasness on the performance appraisal process to enhance overall organizational performance and employee development.

The following hypothesis have been derived from the review of literature and theories.

H1: The level of performance appraisal planning positively predicts the degree of HRD orientation in the PA system.

H2: A higher degree of performance appraisal monitoring is positively linked to the HRD orientation of the PA system.

H3: The presence of strong interlinking between the PA system and other HRD mechanisms positively influences the HRD orientation of the PA system.

H4: Reducing biasness and influence in the PA system leads to a greater HRD orientation of the PA system.

Research Method

The researcher utilized a sequential explanatory design to collect and analyze data, aiming to examine the performance appraisal system of the APF,Nepal. This design involves first collecting and analyzing quantitative data, followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data. The sequential exploratory research design is employed to explain, interpret and contextualize the quantitative findings and to investigate unexpected results in more detail through a qualitative study.

The study's population includes all senior officers of the APF,Nepal, which is 1741 (O&M, 2079). The required minimum sample size of 65 was determined with a 12% margin of error and a 90% confidence interval, based on the known population of 1741.

Table 3

Sample Size Calculation

Class	Number	Percentage	Starta of Sample
Special Class	4	0.22%	1
First Class	49	2.81%	2
Second Class	586	33.65%	21

Third Class	1102	63.29%	41
Total	**1741**	**100%**	**65**

Note. The table 3 presents data on different classes and their corresponding numbers and percentages within a sample. The total population is 1,741. It is divided into four classes: Special Class with 4 occurrences (0.22% of the sample), First Class with 49 occurrences (2.81% of the sample), Second Class with 586 occurrences (33.65% of the sample), and Third Class with 1,102 occurrences (63.29% of the sample). The "Start of Sample" column indicates the percentage value from the population. Stratified random sampling divides a population into subgroups (strata) based on relevant characteristics. A random sample is then taken from each stratum, ensuring representation of all groups for more accurate analysis.

$$n_0 = \frac{Z^2PQ}{e^2} = \frac{1.96^2 * .5 * .5}{.12^2} = \frac{.9604}{.0144} = 66.69 \;; \therefore n = \frac{n_0}{1+\frac{n_0}{N}} = \frac{66.69}{1+\frac{66.69}{1741}} = \frac{66.69}{1.038306}$$

$$= 64.23 \approx 65$$

A total of 74 samples were collected to increase generalizability and statistical power, surpassing the required sample size of 65. A structured questionnaire was used for the quantitative data collection and an open-ended questionnaire was also developed to gather qualitative information. Total 25 respondents responded to the qualitative questionnaire. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to examine the quantitative data as well as thematic analysis was executed for the qualitative analysis. The Cronbach's Alpha of the questionnaire was 0.869.

Performance Appraisal System in Civil Service

The Civil Service Act (1993) introduced the concept of performance-based evaluation for civil servants. Earlier, the focus was on evaluating individual attributes. According to the Civil Service Act, work performance evaluation is conducted at three tiers, involving the supervisor, reviewer, and the review committee (Civil Service Act, 1993).

The primary purpose of performance evaluation in government and public enterprises is to promote employees. It is not used for providing performance feedback, managing rewards, or identifying training and development needs. In the civil service, 40 percent of performance appraisal is confidential, and therefore not transparent to employees (Agrawal& Thakur, 2013).

In the promotion process, performance evaluation is considered the primary factor, while factors like education, training, and experience (seniority) are seen as additional considerations. However, performance evaluation only accounts for 40% of the total weightage in the promotion evaluation, as per The Civil Service Act, 1992. On the other hand, other criteria like seniority (30%), education (12%), service in specific geographical regions (16%), and training (2%), collectively carry respective weight other than the performance evaluation (Civil Service Rule, 1993).

The Nepalicivil service consists of as many as 137,614 civil servants working in central level Ministries, Secretariats, Commissions, as well as in province, local, and district level organizations (Department of Civil Personnel Records, GoN, 2022). These civil servants are classified intotechnical and non-technical services horizontally, and they

are grouped into gazette, non-gazette, and unclassified categories vertically, each having a different form for performance appraisal.

The Civil Service Rule (1993) further provides the procedure for performance appraisal. In the civil service, they have a bi-yearly performance appraisal and a yearly performance appraisal system. The system includes provisions for self-declaration, supervisor's appraisal, reviewer's appraisal, and the appraisal by the review committee. The supervisor summarizes the bi-yearly performance appraisal of the personnel and assigns appraisal marks accordingly. The description of the works performed must mention a minimum of five works, which should align with the objectives of the organization and the job description of the post.

Clear justification must be provided for giving more than ninety-five percent and less than seventy-five percent marks pursuant to sub-rule (7) of Section 24A of the Civil Service Act 1993. Similarly, the competent authority shall take departmental action against the evaluator who alters marks obtained using correction fluid (tipex) (Civil Service Rule, 1993).

The performance evaluation is conducted based on tasks, and civil staff members undergo bi-yearly appraisals to assess their achievements in specific objectives. This appraisal system places a strong emphasis on objectivity and goal-oriented outcomes.

Performance Appraisal System in Nepali Army

There is *"Sainik Aadhikrit Neki Bedi Karyabidhi 2077"* which is the guiding document for the performance appraisal of the Nepali Army. Rule 39 of the Military Service Regulation (2069) includes the provision for the performance appraisal system of army personnel. According to the regulation, Lt. Colonels or above must fill out two copies, while other military personnel below that rank must fill out one copy of the performance appraisal form. These appraisals should be completed from the fifteenth of Chaitra every year until the end of the same month and must be presented to the unit commander.

When considering promotion from the rank of Major to Lieutenant Colonel, the total marks for performance amount to 43 (forty-three) marks. Among these, two marks are calculated from the average performance appraisal during the tenure of the Lieutenant, ten marks from the average performance appraisal during the Captain, and fifteen marks from the average performance appraisal during the Major. Furthermore, an additional sixteen marks are earned if the Major has experience in commanding the Company. However, if the Major has not commanded then the 2ic (Second in Command or Second Man) appointment becomes the basis for the performance evaluation.

During the promotion from Lieutenant Colonel to Colonel, a total of 44 marks are allocated for the performance appraisal. Among these, 4 marks are derived from the average performance appraisal during the Major Rank, 8 marks from Company Command, 12 marks from the Lieutenant Colonel rank, and 20 marks from Battalion Command (Military Service Regulation, 2069).

These practices highlight the commendable approach of the Army in aligning its

command Task, staff, and other tasks with the performance appraisal process. The clear connection between these tasksreflects the Army's commitment to professionalism. It is evident that reaching high-ranking positions in the Nepali Army requires maintaining discipline and delivering persistent effort.

Performance Appraisal System in Nepal Police

The performance appraisal and evaluation system of Nepal Police are established based on the organizational format and its role. The organization has its own rank-based performance appraisal system, which is extensively provisioned in its regulations.

Article-31 of the Nepal Police regulations provisions the performance appraisal system. Police officers undergo an annual performance evaluation. The evaluation is based on a total of 40 marks, with a maximum of 20 marks given by the supervisor, 10 marks by the reviewer, and 10 marks awarded by the Review Committee. The appraisal system operates independently and centers around the performance delivered by each individual. Key measurement factors include their ethical conduct, permissible contributions, and dedication to duty.

Performance appraisal plays a significant role in the performance, promotion exercise, and commitment of police officers to the goals and objectives of the organization. In the performance appraisal of police officers commanding the district, the Chief District Officer (CDO) of the respective district is also involved. The Supervisor's 20 marks are divided between the Supervisor and the CDO, with 12 marks for the Supervisor and 8 marks for the CDO.

In Nepal Police, there is a rank-based performance evaluation system in place for every individual. A senior rank is responsible for supervision, and two ranks senior oversee the review process. Multiple Review Committees are established to conduct evaluations based on ranks and designated offices. However, it is argued that certain aspects of the system may hinder the effectiveness of the appraisal process in providing an accurate, unbiased, and reliable assessment of individual behavior and performance.

As part of the annual performance appraisal system, every police officer must submit their appraisal form to the Supervisor within a specified timeframe, following the prescribed procedures.

Similar to the Armed Police Force, the Nepal Police has established a structured appraisal system for senior officers. This comprehensive process involves self-declaration, evaluations from supervisors, reviewers, and review committees. As per Police Regulation 2071, the appraisal focuses on ten essential aspects of officer performance, including professional integrity, professionalism, service delivery, communication, leadership, technological literacy, behavior towards subordinates, planning, decision-making, and innovativeness. This holistic approach ensures a thorough assessment of officers' skills, contributing to a well-rounded and effective police force.

The appraisal system allocates 40 marks for promotion, making it a crucial factor in

maintaining discipline, consistency, and professionalism within the organization. By emphasizing individual performance, ethical behavior, and dedication, it contributes significantly to the growth and effectiveness of the Nepal Police. This approach ensures that officers are well-equipped to serve their roles and responsibilities efficiently, ultimately leading to a more efficient and competent police organization.

Performance Appraisal System in APF

The APF, is a federal police organization under the Government of Nepal, established in 2000 AD. APF, currently comprises 37,153 personnel. Being a central police force, it has deployed its personnel across all districts of Nepal. The Armed Police Rule, 2072, outlines the provisions for the Performance appraisal system, which follows a yearly appraisal process. In security organizations like the APF, promotion is significantly dependent (40%) on employees' performance and seniority.

In the Armed Police Regulation (2072), a performance appraisal system is explicitly mentioned. All personnel are required to write down a self-declaration of their tasks delivered during the year in four broad areas: a) Maintaining peace and security, Implementation/Leadership and Responsibilityb) Management and Coordination, c) Motivation to the subordinates and Initiative and d) any other significant tasks they have undertaken.

There are three tiers of performance evaluation: the first involves the supervisor, the second involves the reviewer, and the third involves the review committee. Each tier carries a different weight: 50% for the supervisor, 25% for the reviewer, and 25% for the review committee. The performance is evaluated based on three criteria: individual characteristics, work efficiency, and the status of implementation.Under the individual characteristics, there are eight different indicators. Similarly, under work efficiency and status of implementation, there are eight and four indicators, respectively

In the APF, promotions to higher positions follow a specific allocation of weights: 40 percent based on performance appraisal results, 20 percent on seniority, and varying percentages for factors such as academic qualifications, training, and accomplishment of challenging jobs.

In the context of APF, there is a monthly appraisal system in place, but it lacks formalization in the final appraisal process. One significant concern with the performance appraisal system is the tendency to assess diverse mandates and tasks under common headings, mainly due to the organization's varying responsibilities and objectives. This approach of generalized evaluation may not accurately capture the nuances and specific achievements of individuals within the organization, potentially leading to skewed or unfair assessments during the appraisal process. Addressing this issue could lead to a more accurate and equitable evaluation of employees' performance and better support the organization's goals and objectives.

After analyzing the literature, it is found that the independent variables are "planning," "monitoring," "interlink," and "biasness," while the dependent variable is the "existing performance appraisal system."

Descriptive Statistics

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics (Summary)

Descriptive Statistics (Summary)	N=74	
	Mean	**Std. Deviation**
Planning	2.8486	.87761
Monitoring	3.0324	.89076
Interlink	2.2432	.87333
Biasness	2.0135	.89402
Existing Performance Appraisal System	3.1297	.95052
Average Mean	2.6538	

Note. A total of 74 responses (denoted by N) were collected from the questionnaire. Five independent variables were measured using five questions each, utilizing a Five-Point Likert scale. The mean value in the column represents the average response from the 74 participants. The standard deviation indicates the variability of responses. A higher standard deviation suggests greater variability, while a lower standard deviation indicates data points closer to the mean. In this study, a low standard deviation with the highest mean is considered good. The data was analyzed using the statistical software (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, SPSS), and the table shows the outcomes of the analysis based on the survey data collected in 2022.

The data presented in Table3 provides a comprehensive overview of the descriptive statistics for various dimensions of the performance appraisal system in the APFNepal. The mean values indicate that performance monitoring received the highest rating (3.0324), suggesting that it is relatively well-implemented and recognized as an essential aspect of the appraisal process. Meanwhile, planning (2.8486) and interlink with other administrative systems (2.2432) scored slightly lower, indicating areas that require attention and improvement. Moreover, biasness in the performance appraisal process was rated relatively low (2.0135), implying a level of fairness in evaluations.

Furthermore, the mean value of 3.1297 for the existing performance appraisal system suggests a positive orientation towards HRD. While the system does not require a complete overhaul, it does necessitate further enhancements in planning, monitoring, interlink, and biasness to ensure a more robust and effective performance appraisal process.

In addition to that, with an average mean score of 2.6538, APF surpasses the mid-value of 2.5, indicating positive signs of having an HRD climate. Nevertheless, there is still potential for further improvement in the system to attain even more favorable outcomes. It's important to acknowledge that APF Nepal is presently aligned with HRD principles.

The findings from the descriptive statistics provide valuable insights for policymakers and stakeholders to fine-tune the existing system and foster a fair and growth-oriented appraisal environment in the Armed Police Force.

An Inferential Statistic

Table 5

Correlations

		Planning	Monitoring	Existing Performance Appraisal System	Interlink	Biasness
		Correlations	N=74			
Existing Performance Appraisal System	Pearson Correlation	.619**	.605**	1	.678**	.520**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						

Note. The Pearson Correlation coefficient "r" measures the linear relationship between variables, ranging from -1 to +1. Positive values indicate a positive correlation, negative values show a negative correlation, and values close to zero suggest weak or no correlation. The Sig. (2-tailed) indicates the significance level of the correlation, determining if it is statistically significant. N represents the sample size used for the analysis. In the table, correlations between "Existing Performance Appraisal System" and other variables are shown, along with their significance levels. The data was analyzed using the statistical software SPSS, and the table shows the outcomes of the analysis based on the survey data collected in 2022.

The correlation analysis, as presented in Table5, reveals the interrelationship among the different aspects of the existing performance appraisal system in the APF. The pearson correlation coefficients indicate the degree of association between variables. A significant positive correlation is observed between existing performance appraisal and each of the following: performance planning (correlation coefficient = 0.619**), performance monitoring (correlation coefficient = 0.605**), interlink of performance appraisal with other hrd mechanisms (correlation coefficient = 0.678**), and biasness (correlation coefficient = 0.520**). These significant correlations signify that when there are changes in one variable (e.g., performance planning), it is accompanied by corresponding changes in the existing performance appraisal system. In other words, an improvement in performance planning, monitoring, interlink, and biasness is likely to positively influence the overall effectiveness of the performance appraisal system. The findings highlight the importance of addressing these interconnected variables collectively to enhance the overall performance appraisal process and foster a more robust and comprehensive HRD-oriented appraisal system in the APF.

Regression

The presented ANOVA table displays the results of a regression analysis aimed at understanding the impact of various independent variables on the dependent variable "Existing Performance Appraisal System" in the context of the APF. The model uses

four predictors, namely "biasness," "planning," "monitoring," and "interlink." Regression analysis allows us to determine which of these factors matter most, which can be ignored, and how they interact with each other to influence the dependent variable.

$$Yi = \beta 0 + \beta\neg 1X1 + \beta 2X2 + \beta 3X3 + \beta 4X4 \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots. (i)$$

*Note.*The multiple linear regression model allows us to estimate the relationship between the dependent variable and multiple predictor variables simultaneously. By fitting this model to the data and estimating the coefficients, we can make predictions for the dependent variable based on the values of the predictor variables and understand the individual and combined effects of the predictors on the dependent variable.

The equation $Yi = \beta 0 + \beta 1x1 + \beta 2x2 + \beta 3x3 + \beta 4x4$ represents the relationship between the dependent variable (existing performance appraisal system) and the independent variables (biasness, planning, monitoring, and interlink).

Table 6

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

S.N.	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
**ANOVA**						
1	Regression	35.711	4	8.928	20.368	.000b
	Residual	30.244	69	.438		
	Total	65.955	73			

a. Dependent Variable: Existing Performance Appraisal System

b. Predictors: (Constant), Biasness, Planning, Monitoring, Interlink

Note. The Sum of Squares represents the total variability in the dependent variable (Existing Performance Appraisal System) that can be attributed to the predictor variables (Constant, Biasness, Planning, Monitoring, Interlink). Degrees of Freedom (Df) is the number of independent pieces of information available for estimating a parameter. Mean Square (MS): The Mean Square is calculated by dividing the Sum of Squares by the corresponding Degrees of Freedom. F-ratio (F) is the test statistic used to assess whether the model's explanatory power is significantly greater than what would be expected by chance. It is calculated by dividing the "Regression MS" by the "Residual MS." In this table, the F-ratio is 20.368 (8.928 divided by 0.438). The significance level (p-value) indicates the probability of observing the F-ratio if there were no true effect of the predictors (null hypothesis). A low p-value (usually less than 0.05) indicates that the model's explanatory power is statistically significant. In this table, the significance level is highly significant ($p < 0.001$). The data was analyzed using the statistical software SPSS, and the table shows the outcomes of the analysis based on the survey data collected in 2022.

The ANOVA table shows the breakdown of variance into two components: the variance explained by the regression model (Regression) and the unexplained variance (Residual). The "Regression" row reveals that the model, incorporating all four predictors, is statistically significant (p-value = .000), indicating that these predictors collectively have a substantial impact on the "Existing Performance Appraisal System" variable.

The calculated F-value of 20.368 further confirms the significance of the regression

model. This value, when combined with the low p-value, suggests that the model is meaningful and provides valuable insights into the variation observed in the "Existing Performance Appraisal System" variable.

The ANOVA results support the importance of the predictors (Biasness, Planning, Monitoring, and Interlink) in explaining the variation in the "Existing Performance Appraisal System" variable within the APF. These findings contribute to a better understanding of the factors that influence the performance appraisal system and offer valuable implications for improving HRD-oriented performance appraisal practices in the organization.

Table 7

Coefficients

S.N.	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.767	.293		2.615	.011		
	Planning	.196	.133	.181	1.469	.146	.439	2.278
	Monitoring	.265	.127	.249	2.097	.040	.473	2.115
	Interlink	.465	.137	.427	3.384	.001	.417	2.396
	Biasness	-.021	.126	-.020	-.166	.868	.472	2.117
a. Dependent Variable: Existing Performance Appraisal System								

Note. B represents the unstandardized regression coefficients, also known as regression weights. They show the estimated magnitude and direction of the relationship between each predictor variable (Planning, Monitoring, Interlink, and Biasness) and the dependent variable (Existing Performance Appraisal System). Std. Error (Standard Error) measures the accuracy of the coefficient estimates. It shows the average amount of variability or uncertainty in the B values. Smaller standard errors indicate more precise estimates. Beta represents the standardized regression coefficients. These coefficients allow for comparison of the relative importance of each predictor variable since they are expressed in standard deviation units. Larger Beta values indicate stronger contributions to the dependent variable. The T-value is the ratio of the unstandardized coefficient (B) to its standard error. It is used to test the statistical significance of each predictor's contribution. Higher T-values indicate more significant relationships. Sig. (Significance): The significance level (p-value) Sig. indicates the probability of observing the T-value if there were no true effect of the predictor variable (null hypothesis). A low p-value (usually less than 0.05) indicates a statistically significant relationship. Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) are measures of multicollinearity, which assesses whether predictor variables are highly correlated with each other. High multicollinearity can affect the reliability of regression estimates. Tolerance values close to 1 and VIF values around 1 indicate low multicollinearity.

The coefficients table (Table 7) presents the results of the regression analysis, highlighting the relationships between the independent variables (Planning, Monitoring, Interlink, and Biasness) and the dependent variable (Existing Performance Appraisal System) in the context of the APF .

It shows that the cofficient value of "Monitoring" and "Link With Other HRD Mechanisms" have Sig. value 0.040 and 0.001. The Sig. value less than 0.05 denotes that these variables must be strong to achieve the objectives.

The "Monitoring" and "Interlink" exhibit statistically significant relationships with "Existing Performance Appraisal System." "Monitoring" has a coefficient of 0.265 and a p-value of 0.040, while "Interlink" has a coefficient of 0.465 and an extremely low p-value of 0.001. These results indicate that both "Monitoring" and "Interlink" have a positive and substantial impact on the "Existing Performance Appraisal System" score.

The standardized coefficients (Beta values) provide a measure of the relative importance of each independent variable. Among the predictors, "Interlink" stands out with the highest standardized coefficient of 0.427, indicating its significant influence on the dependent variable. "Monitoring" also has a considerable impact with a Beta value of 0.249.

The collinearity statistics (Tolerance and VIF) indicate that multicollinearity is not a concern in the model, as all VIF values are well below the threshold of 3.

There is another significant reselt is shown that if the biasness is incrrased by 1 there is the negative impact will increase by 0.021%. It shows that biasness has negative relationship with PA system.

The analysis shows that "Monitoring" and "Interlink" are the key factors that strongly influence the "Existing Performance Appraisal System" in the APF. While "Planning" and "Biasness" also play a role, their impact is not statistically significant. To enhance the performance appraisal system, the organization should focus on improving the monitoring process and strengthening the interlinkages with other HRD mechanisms. These findings provide valuable guidance for improving the performance appraisal system and promoting HRD within the organization.

The result showed the logical result, that to have a excelent performance appraisal system, there should be strong link among HRD mechanisms. The improvement in the linking system positively affects 46.5% in overall performance appraisal system and performance appraisal monitoring positively affects 26.5% .

Hypothesis Testing

Performance appraisal planning has a statistically significant beta coefficient of 0.196 with p-value $(0.146) > (0.05)$. There is sufficient evidence to accept null hypothesis for this statement indicates that there is not enough evidence to conclude that the level of performance appraisal Planning has a statistically significant positive relationship with the degree of HRD orientation in the Performance Appraisal system at the 5% significance level.

Performance appraisal monitoring has a statistically significant beta coefficient of 0.249 with p-value $(0.040) < (0.05)$. There is sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis for this statement indicate that there is a strong relationship of performance appraisal monitoring with performance appraisal system.

Link with other HRD mechanisms has a statistically significant beta coefficient of 0.465 with p-value (0.001) <(0.05). There is sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis for this statement indicate that interlinking between the PA system and other HRD mechanisms positively influences the HRD orientation of the PA system.

Reducing biasness has a statistically significant beta coefficient of - 0.021 with p- value 0.868 >0.05Thereis sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis for this statement.There is sufficient evidence to accept null hypothesis for this statement indicate that there is no relationship of reducing biasness and Influence with performance appraisal system. Hence, I reject null hypothesis. This means that there is association between Reducing Biasness and HRD oriented PA system.

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal in APF: Challenges and Recommendations

The qualitative analysis is based on qualitative questions asked to the respondents. A total of 25 respondents responded to the qualitative questions, and informal discussions with the respondents were also used as the basis of the analysis.

APF has been evaluating its employees' performance under certain specific headings but lacks the tools and methods to measure the performance effectively. Although the performance appraisal system does exist in APF, its effectiveness and implementation are very weak

The APF has provisions in its regulations concerning the performance appraisal system of its personnel. The performance appraisal primarily focuses on and is used for the promotion criteria and process within the APF rather than identifying individual and organizational development gaps. APF has developed a standard format and template for the performance appraisal process of its personnel. One of the respondents stated that

The APF considers only the last four years' performance appraisal marks for promotions. This practice should be reviewed as it may not accurately generalize the overall performance of the officers.

The performance appraisal in APF doesn't cover modern approaches, such as self-assessment, 360-degree evaluation, and peers' evaluation. The traditional method of performance appraisal does not evaluate employees' performance in its true meaning. The one-way evaluation system always tends to risk biasness while conducting performance appraisals. This further leads to unfair evaluations in which employees are judged not by their accomplishments but by their likability.

Performance appraisal should be based on the objective measurement of the performance

Feedback mechanism - Performance appraisal is also a part of the organization's process of understanding its employees better and giving them feedback to help improve their performance. However, the performance appraisal system in APF lacks the provision to provide proper feedback about performance to enhance employees' performance. The periodic performance feedback for APF personnel is not provided under the current

appraisal provision in Nepal. Performance appraisals in APF are also not utilized for an employee's personal and professional development. Instead, the appraisal is conducted merely to fulfill routine administrative duties. It should be conducted based on the strengths and weaknesses of employees. The appraisal system in APF doesn't identify areas for improvement and fails to help employees enhance their professional skills and knowledge for better performance, individual development, and organizational growth.

The appraisal system should be systematic, regularly monitored by a monitoring committee, and include training and pre-evaluation classes for the commanders who will conduct the evaluations. Commanders who provide truthful evaluations should be encouraged, and they should be held accountable for their evaluations.

The performance of APF personnel is not being properly supervised. The performance appraisal is conducted annually in APF. In most cases, the performance of APF personnel is supervised by different supervisors in various ways. During the performance appraisal, the evaluation is done by the last supervisor based on their limited supervision period. As a result, the appraisal is not conducted based on the entire year's performance but rather on the last supervision period.

Evaluating the performance appraisal based on job descriptions.

The current performance appraisal system adopted in APF doesn't help employee to set clear objectives and at the same time doesn't set of factors to evaluate employees based on their skills set. Furthermore, the criteria under which the performance of APF,Nepal's personnel are being evaluated lacks the well-defined performance criteria under specific roles and responsibilities during performance period. The job period, previous experience in the field, training and other factors and dimensions of performance appraisal are not considered during the performance appraisal in APF.

We should make it scientific as well as transparent.

Most of the time, the performance of APF employees is evaluated by administrative staff rather than their immediate supervisor. Moreover, APF employees don't consider the appraisal as vital for their individual and career development since it doesn't provide rewards or punishment for excellent or poor performance. The performance of all APF personnel is evaluated using the same criteria, even though they work in different difficult fields and services within the organization. APF doesn't have a field and service-specific performance evaluation system, leading to an unrealistic performance appraisal system. Technical, administrative duty, command and instructor duties are appraised under the same criteria, which doesn't seem scientific and practical.

The overall performance appraisal system is objectively needed to modify on the basis of given mandate. The annual individual deployment roster should be prepared and it should be connected to appraisal system.

The performance appraisal doesn't appear to be considered a key factor for the career development of APF personnel. Despite the promotion criteria allocating more marks for performance appraisal, it doesn't seem to significantly contribute to individual career

development. Instead, employees with strong political affiliations but fewer skills seem to be rewarded with organizational opportunities like promotions and command positions, while those with excellent performance are not sometimes adequately rewarded.

The basic evaluation of APF's personnel is managed using a developed format that includes discipline, decency, work efficiency, and implementation evaluation. Although these indicators are practical, scientific, and genuine, there is a strong need for objective assessment for each performance appraisal indicator. If these shortcomings are addressed, the PA system of APF could become one of the most competent and scientific methods among other government sectors.

Discussion

The evaluation of the performance appraisal system in the APF, based on statistical data and feedback from respondents, reveals several significant findings. It is evident that there is a strong need for performance appraiser's training in the APF, as indicated by the low mean value of 2.22, suggesting that appraiser training is rarely provided. This lack of training contributes to biasness in measurement and highlights the necessity to clarify the performance appraisal method.

The analysis also shows that personnel's job-related performance is rarely measured, with a mean value of 2.41. The absence of formal job descriptions and performance standards leads to biasness in the performance appraisal process, emphasizing the demand for clear job descriptions for employees.

The frequency of performance review needs improvement, as the current quarterly review system may lead to biased assessments based on recent success or failure. A regulated and monitored performance review system, with an emphasis on addressing yearly performance appraisal needs, would be beneficial.

Moreover, the research reveals the significant role of the review committee in the performance appraisal process in APF, and the time allocated for the PA process plays a crucial role in strengthening the system.

Appraisal interviews and feedback to employees are essential components of the PA system, which require attention and implementation in the APF. While superior review is a major strength, it is concerning that supervisors do not adequately review appraisals, often forwarding or authenticating results proposed by the Performance Supervisor/ Appraiser.

Although the contribution of Performance Appraisal marks to promotion and individual development is positively perceived at 40%, the lack of "Potential Appraisal" hinders employee training needs, succession planning, rewards, pay, and incentives. This necessitates corrections in the PA method.

The research highlights the need for Performance Targets in the APF to reduce biasness and improve the PA system towards HRD. Additionally, the complaint mechanism requires improvement.

The existing performance appraisal Systemshows strong points such as proper reporting, a formal appraisal system, opportunities for self-review and reflection, and a quarterly feedback system. The orientation of the Existing Performance Appraisal System towards HRD is evident. In addition to that, it also assures the HRD climate in APF.

The correlation and regression analyses emphasize the importance of Performance Appraisal Monitoring and Linkage with other HRD mechanisms in achieving an HRD-oriented PA system in the APF.

The feedback from the survey indicates that an objective evaluation system, evaluation by immediate supervisors, proper feedback, service-specific evaluation criteria, well-defined performance criteria, and linkage with career development and welfare benefit schemes are essential. Moreover, separate performance appraisal criteria/forms for employees in different appointments are necessary.

To enhance the effectiveness of the performance appraisal system in the APF, implementing performance appraiser's training, clarifying job descriptions, improving performance review frequency, establishing a formal monitoring system, conducting appraisal interviews, and incorporating potential appraisal are crucial steps. By addressing these areas and fostering a strong link among HRD mechanisms, the APF can develop a more comprehensive and HRD-oriented performance appraisal system, contributing to the organization's overall success and development.

The Overall Impression

From the quantitative (descriptive analysis, inferential analysis) and qualitative (the analysis of the descriptive open-ended data/ responses from the officers of APF) the researcher has derived the final impression of the research as "The PA system of APF is perfectly blameless and systematic. For the better measurement and execution of thePA results APF needs perfection on the performance appraisal method and performance appraisal actors (supervisors, reviewers and review committee and the employee/ appraisee)." There are ample indicators and evidences that shows the HRD climate is presented in APF's performance appraisal system. Furthermore, APF,Nepal's performance appraisal system is in alignment with the principles of human resource development.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the research highlights the urgent need for significant improvements in the performance appraisal system of the APF. The study reveals several key areas of concern, including the lack of performance appraiser training, absence of formal job descriptions, and biasness in the appraisal process. Additionally, the research underscores the importance of a strong monitoring system, regular feedback, and performance targets to enhance the HRD orientation of the appraisal system. To achieve a more effective and objective performance appraisal, the organization must address these critical issues and implement necessary reforms to promote fairness, transparency, and career development opportunities for its personnel.

•

References

Adhikari, D. (2010). "Human resource development (HRD) for performance management". *International journal of productivity and performance management, 59*(4), 306–324. 10.1108/17410401011038883

Agarwala, T. (2002). "Human resource management: The emerging trends". *Indian Journal of IndustrialRelations, 37*(3), 315-331. www.Jstor.Org/Stable/27m/767793

Aggarwal, A., & Thakur, G. S. (2013). "Techniques of performance appraisal-a review". *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology (IJEAT), II* (3), 617-621.

Anderson, B. C. (2019). What is an organization. Businessdictionary.com. Bhattarai, N. K. (2013). *Human Resource Development in Government Organizations of Nepal.* Kathmandu: Tribhuwan University; Phd Thesis

Bena, B. Y., & Priya, V. (2014). "A study on the HRD climate and its influence on the performance among employee". *International Journal of Research and Development - A Management Review (IJRDMR), 2*, 5-9.

Bhattarai, N. K. (2013). *Human resource development in government organizations of Nepal.* Kathmandu: Tribhuwan University; Phd Thesis.

Bhurtel, A., & Adhikari, E. R. (2016). Performance appraisal for employee development: exploring perceptions of supervisors. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management, 3*(2), 93. doi:10.3126/ijssm.v3i2.14670

Bishowkarma, G. (2017). "Employees perception on performance appraisal and their work outcomes in Nepalese service sector". *IRA International Journal of Management & Social Science, 7* (3), 465-478.

Chaudhari, A. K. (2017). *Statistical metohos for business students.* Kathmandu: MK Publications.

Chaudhary, R., Rangnekar, S., &Barua, M. K. (2012). "HRD climate, occupational self-efficacy and work engagement: A study from India". *The Psychologist-Manager Journal,15*(2), 86–105. doi:10.1080/10887156.2012.676938

Cintrón, R., & Flaniken, F. (2017). "Performance appraisal: a supervision or leadership tool?" *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2* (17), 29-37.

Civil Service Act. (1993). Nepal law commission.

Clark, R. (2015). *Performance appraisal. In validating your business continuity plan* (Pp. 216-217). It Governance Publishing. Retrieved June 29, 2020, From Www.Jstor.Org/Stable/J.Ctt19qgf40.18

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design.* New Delhi : SAGE Publications.

Dessler, G., & Varkkry, B. (2009). *Human resource management* (Eleventh Ed.). New Delhi: Pearson.

Faizal, M. (2005). *Instituliation of performance appraisal system: A Case Study of Maldivian Public Service.* Norway : University of Bergen.

Herbel, D., & Rocchigiani, M. (2013). *Organization analysis and development.* Food and Agriculture Organization.

Hossain, S. (2015). *Performance appraisal.* https://www.scribd.com/presentation/219476032/ PerformanceAppraisal-HRM

Jain, V. (2014). Performance appraisal as a sub-system of HRD – A Case Study. *IOSR Journal of business and management*, 26-34.

Jeung, C.W., Yoon, H. J., Park, S., & Jo, S. J. (2011). The contributions of human resource development research across disciplines: A citation and content analysis. *Human resource development quarterly, 22*(1), 87– 109. doi:10.1002/hrdq.20062

Kumar, T. S., Harish, G. S., &Gowd, T. H. (2016). "Evolution of performance appraisal system". *Anveshana's international journal of research in regional studies, law, social, i(9)*, 49-56.

Megginson, L.C., (1982), *"Personnel and human resource administration"* Homewood III: Richard D. Irwin, p.6.

Military Service Regulation. (2069). Nepal Law Commission.

Military Service Regulation. (2069). Nepal Law Commission.

O & M. (2079). *Armed Police Force organization and management survey.* Kathmandu: Armed Police Force, Nepal.

Pandey, B. (2019). *Performance appraisal system in nepalese civil service.* Kathmandu: Thesis

Panigrahy, D. (1989). "Human resource development in business organization. In b.l. Mathur (Ed.)". *Human resource development: strategic approaches and experiences.* Jaipur, India: Arihant Publishers.

Pudasaini, N. (2013). *Employee performance appraisal: comparison between public and privat sector commercial banks of Nepal*. New York: International American University.

Rao, T. V. (1991). Planning for human resource development. In B.L. Mathur (Ed.). *Human resource development: a strategic approach and experiences.* Jaipur (India): Archiant Publishers.

Rao, T. V. (2006). *Reading in human resource development.* New Delhi: Oxford & IBH.

Rao, T.V. (1999). *HRD audit: Evaluating the human resource functions for business improvement.* New Delhi: Response Books, A Division of Sage Publications.

Sharma, D. (2018). Human resource development in civil service, case of Nepal. *The Nepalese Journal of Public Administration,* 113-132

Silveira, D.M. (1990). *Human resource development: The Indian experience.* New Delhi: New India Publications.

Singh, A. K. (2005). HRD practices and philosophy of management in indian organizations. *Vikalpa, 30*(2), 71–80. 10.1177/0256090920050207

Swanson, R. A. (2001). Human resource development and its underlying theory. *Human Resource Development International, 4*(3), 299–312. doi:10.1080/13678860110059311

Tangen, S. (2004). Performance measurement: from philosophy to practice. *International*

Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 53(8), 726–737. doi:10.1108/17410400410569134

Tripathi, P.C. (2001). *Human resource development.* New Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons Educational Publishers.

Whitford, C. M., & Coetsee, W. J. (2006). A model of the underlying philosophy and criteria for effective implementation of performance management. *SA Journal of human resource.*