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Human resources are the most valuable assets in an organization and as such when effectively managed, they can contribute significantly to employee performance. Performance appraisal has proved to be an effective tool that can enable organizations to realize employee productivity. This paper investigated the Influence of Performance Appraisal Management Practices on Employee Productivity in Muheza District in Tanzania. A sample of 339 employees participated in the study through questionnaires and interviews. Validity was ensured through expert judgment and reliability ranged between 0.682 and 0.955 Cronbach’s Alpha implying all items in the questionnaire were reliable. Descriptive statistics represented mean scores while Pearson Product moment correlational Coefficient evaluated potential relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The findings of this study highlight the fact that performance appraisal tools such as recognition and feedback are vital to employee's performance and indeed influence employee productivity in the organization. However, surprisingly training and development and promotion did not have a significant effect on employee productivity. The study recommends that to improve employee productivity, training and promotion should focus on increasing employees’ commitment and should be based on performance. Furthermore, raising employee satisfaction through recognition should be used as a tool for maintaining competent employees and screening out less effective.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Organizations in today’s environment seek to determine the reasonable balance between employee productivity and performance of the organization. Reward and recognition programs serve as the most contingent factors that can ensure a number of organizations realize the productivity of their employees. Consequently, employee motivation has become a key determinant of the quality and quantity of services offered to the public, and as such poor employee productivity has been found to be an obstacle to service delivery in many low-income countries (Songstad et al., 2012). This has also been the case in developed and developing countries where labour productivity has been subjected to deterioration. This is evident from a study on the labour productivity in Europe by Bertelsmann et al.
Communication on how feedback and employee productivity in any organization. A study on how to shift over and absenteeism affect negative employee productivity but in most cases poor communication on how feedback and performance is delivered has become the critical factor.

According to this study, lack of motivational incentives and poor communication of the appraisal feedback are the leading key issues facilitating higher labour turnover. In the global level, employee productivity is measured in terms of commitment, employee and customer satisfaction, quality and quantity service and low labour turnover to mention few (Lai, 2011). In general, it measures how an individual employee produces the required output and beyond the expectations that is sufficient enough to change the country’s economic performance. As such; employee productivity has been described as an assessment of the efficiency of a worker or group of workers, in terms of the output of an employee in a specific period of time. Krugman (1994) quoted it as:-

“Employee Productivity isn’t everything, but in the long run it is almost everything. A country’s ability to improve its standard of living over time depends almost entirely on its ability to raise its output per worker. In other words, it measures how efficiently production inputs, such as labour and capital, are being used in an economy to produce a given level of output” (Krugman, 1994).

From the above quotation, it is worth noting that improving employee productivity means organizations produce more while using less effort and resources. That is to say, increasing the productivity of each employee can radically transform an organization’s income, market share, and longevity in any organization. A study on how to shift employee productivity curve in developed countries by Smart Talent Management (2015) found that while it’s often assumed that employee productivity can be improved simply by focusing on performance of individual employee, but it is worth mentioning that driving sustainable productivity actually starts before an employee's first day on the job. This is because, successful organizations know that the secret to consistent productivity lies in shifting the employee productivity curve, not at the middle of the employee lifecycle, but at the very beginning of and throughout the entire lifecycle. This can be illustrated in Figure 2.

The employee productivity curve, as illustrated in Figure 2, charts the effectiveness of employees over time. It is given that employees become more productive as they progress through learning their job and increase their comfort level with responsibilities. The productivity curve typically plateaus after all competencies are learned, unless the employee decides to train and perform a new role or take on additional responsibilities.

Robert, (2014) quoted it as:

“Organizations that commit to moving the productivity curve leftward at each phase implementing productivity measures earlier in and more consistently throughout the employee lifecycle, can see dramatic increases in productivity during an employee’s tenure”(Robert, 2014).

The above quotation illustrates practical measures that organizations can take to shift the employee productivity curve by employing smart talent management practices that is believed to be of great help for each employee from

![Figure 1: Labour Productivity in Italy, France and Germany](image)

Source: Bertelsmann et al. (2009).
new hires to the top of his/-her career path. Additionally, a study on how to maximize organization success using on boarding program for New Employees in Turkey by Talya (2014) discovered that employee productivity can be realized when organization leadership try to catch up with creative and better people and quickly helping them get connected through different induction programs. That is to say, organization managers need to quickly understand the benefits of investing in on boarding, learning, and additional talent management solutions for their employees with the objective of making them more productive and effective.

Consequently, employee motivation has become a great challenge facing most organizations and has in recent years assumed a global dimension. That’s why, Dugguh (2014), cautions that organizations that operate under these conditions of poor employee motivation and need to enhance performance and productivity, managers and other organization’s stakeholders have to motivate employees in such a way that their efforts would bring about job satisfaction and commitment. This is because, the success and effectiveness of any organization depends to some extent on how well the effort of employees of that particular organization are recognized in terms of different motivational incentives.

**Statement of the Problem**

Most organizations in this competitive market fail to achieve their targets successfully because employees perform below standard, and this is due to the inability of the working environment to encourage them to work harder. If management does not invest much into the welfare of their workers, problems are bound to arise that may lead to industrial labour turnover, low commitment to work, low morale, poor job satisfaction that may also lead into low productivity of goods and services. For this reason, most organizations established attractive performance appraisal systems to help motivate their employees to strive hard towards the desired performance that will be reflected on their productivity. However, regardless of the efforts and resources devoted to the implementation of various performance appraisal systems in Tanzania, employee productivity has been deteriorating to the large extent. As much as this is happening, there seem to be a vacuum in the actual contribution of performance appraisal enhancing tool on employee productivity. This study therefore intended to assess influence of employees on performance appraisal management practices such as training, promotion, recognition and feedback on employee productivity in
Muheza District Council.

**Review of Related Literature and Studies**

**Performance Appraisal System**

Employee performance appraisal refers to an opportunity to take overall view of work content (loads and volume), and to look back at what has been achieved during the reporting period and agreed objectives for the next planning period (URT 2011). To this end, performance appraisal system is an evaluation of individuals work performance and their potential to develop with the objective of improving their future performance. That is to say, the working goals or expectation has to be a joint venture between the supervisor and the employee. That’s why performance appraisal is an integrated process that occurs regularly and frequently between supervisor and workers. Rao (2005) opines that performance appraisal is a method of evaluating the behavior of employees in the workplace and it normally includes both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of job performance of an individual employee.

Performance appraisal can be an important tool for supporting and improving the quality of services provided by the Local Government employees to the Public. Unfortunately, employee evaluation has been frequently viewed not as vehicle for growth and improving employee productivity, but rather as a formality that must be endured (Stronge and Tucker, 2003). As such; Performance Appraisal has been observed as an important step to avoid making the exercise look like yearly ended system. In other words, Performance Appraisal has been seen as a tool with no objective to achieve but to fulfill public service management policy which requires staffs to fill every year with no evaluations. Thus, Open Performance Review and Appraisal System have to document the quality of employee’s performance, by helping them improve and hold them accountable for what they produce. It was reported that evaluation of employees is an important exercise because without capable, high quality staffs in the working environment, there will not be true public sector reform effort that can possibly succeed and bring the desired results (Decenzo, 2003).

Therefore, performance appraisal processes is concerned with individual and his/her immediate supervisor and it must involve an interchange between them regarding the individual job attainment over the last six month or a year. The major output from appraisal process according to Aswathapa, (2005), should be a set of agreed actions to be undertaken by the supervisor and subordinate for the following appraised period in order to improve employee’s performance. On the other hand, Decenzo (2003) viewed the appraisal process in a different way. To him, the appraisal process must begin with the establishment of performance standards followed by communicating performance expectations to employee, measurement of actual performance, comparing actual performance with standard, discussing the appraisal with employees and if necessary initiating the action that can overcome the identified performance gap.

The process of Open Performance Review and Appraisal System (OPRAS) has some elements mentioned by Aswathapa (2005) and Decenzo (2003). However one element of OPRAS that is monitoring performance of an individual employee on a regular basis was not mentioned which is an important factor to ensure optimal productivity. Another element of OPRAS which is rather unique from the ones mentioned by the above scholars is emphasis on agreement of activities and output between the supervisor and supervisee. To them, agreement on what to be achieved implies that both of them should participate in establishing the objectives, task and output for the appraisal period. The establishment of performance targets and output against which the individual is to be assessed must be specific, measurable, and time bound and must be jointly agreed between supervisor and supervisee (URT, 2011). Since the OPRAS system bears transparency and openness towards the end of financial year, the supervisee should complete his/her form and forward it to his/her supervisor who on receipt of appraisal form is supposed to arrange for an appraisal meeting with supervisee in which the past performance, future action plans, objectives, training and developmental needs of the supervisee should be discussed (URT 2011).

Likewise, the head of section/ supervisor is also required to rate the employee and provide comments and then the supervisor convenes the supervisee and an observer who is the witness for the final step of the appraisal evaluation. The final score is computed by averaging the final score of employee and his supervisor and the last section of the form requires the supervisor to recommend the appropriate rewards, developmental measures, or sanctions against the supervisee in accordance with the agreed performance targets during the planning process (URT 2011).

To this end, commitment to the OPRAS process is essential to improving employee productivity. Aswathapa (2005) noted that a lot of commitment from the supervisor and supervisee is needed from the beginning of the exercise to the end of the process. It is therefore crucial that an annual agreement on objectives, targets, performance criteria and the resources required that agreed upon by both the employee and the employer to ensure the successful achievement of the desired objectives (Armstrong 2012). Therefore, it is advisable that
supervisors and subordinates staff should discuss and agree on the objectives to ensure clarity and details of the job on which performance of the supervisee will be appraised during the appraisal period and also the rewards or sanctions expected by the appraisee.

Determinants of Employee Productivity

Globally, employee productivity is usually determined by various factors developed by management in an organization one being performance appraisal. This is because; employee performance appraisal drives employees in an organization to produce excellent standards of performance and even beyond the expectations. Thus, employee productivity can be measured in terms of employee commitment, employee and customer satisfaction, quality and quantity service and low labor turnover to mention few (Sinclair et al, 2008). These factors have been identified to be the prerequisite ingredients that motivate employee to perform to the required standard and acceptable output.

Moreover, The Global Workforce Report, (2012) provides a comprehensive snapshot of the attitudes and concerns of workers around the world on what really motivate them to increase their performance. The report was designed to shed light on how employee's views affect their satisfaction in their work and commitment to their employers, and ultimately, their behavior and performance on the job. Consequently, the report gives organizations and their leadership teams important insights into the elements of the work environment that help shape employee behavior related to what drive positive performance.

However, Gundecha, (2012) cautioned that organizational leadership need to pay attention to processes and practices that improve on-the-job support, strengthen a sense of attachment to the organization and account for the changing nature of the work experience. Otherwise, the risk of a continuing drop in sustainable engagement due to job dissatisfaction could be worsened and as a result begin to affect business outcomes in the long run. This risk is significant even in a growing economy, where retention is often a challenge. But, it is particularly problematic when organizations have to count on sustained employee productivity from a lean workforce. Clarifying more on that, Atif (2010) quoted it as:-

“When employee commitment starts to decline, companies become vulnerable not only to a measurable drop in productivity, but also to poorer customer service and greater rates of absenteeism and turnover”(Atif 2010).

From the above quotation, one can declare that employee commitment is the precondition to employee productivity. This is because, given that environment has all the required conditions in which to motivate employees and as a result commitment is realized that eventually affect positively on performance. Consequently, employee loyalty helps organization to overcome the problem of employee absenteeism and turnover that have detrimental effects on organizational performance.

Besides, in developed countries, a study on factors affecting labor productivity at a building construction project in the USA by Gundecha (2012) revealed that, employee productivity can be achieved if project management could include the skills of education and training, the work method, personal health, motivational factors, the type of tools and machines required and materials, personal skills, the workload to be executed, expected work quality, the type of work to be done, and the supervisory personnel skills available. To them, the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations to a large extent is dependent on numerous factors ranging from employee motivation, commitment, job satisfaction and skills of each particular employee as well as availability of the required resources to enable one to accomplish the required tasks. It is therefore worth noting according to Butler and Rose (2011) that motivation is the driving force to pursue and satisfy one’s needs while job satisfaction is an employee’s (individual’s) emotional response to the current job condition measured in terms of different incentive packages in an organization.

Moreover, employee commitment has been described as ranging from work engagement, job involvement, and organizational commitment but empirically have distinct different observations (Hallberg and Schaufeli 2006). To them, it also refers to an individual’s psychological attachment to the organization, while employee engagement refers to a person’s attitude and attachment towards their organization. To this end, employee engagement is not an attitude but it is the degree to which an individual is attentive and absorbed in the performance of their roles (Saks, 2006).

Furthermore, the study by Raskowska et al. (2015) on the determinant of employee commitment in Italy, Spain and Poland, they discovered that only 58% of employees in public sectors are fully engaged in their job; 31% strongly felt that they are valued; 31% are very satisfied with their job/working conditions; 20% strongly believe they are adequately compensated, 32% strongly believe they have the tools and training needed to do their jobs effectively. Basing on their findings, one can confidently declare that in developed countries, incentive and other motivational factors are not the only one constrains that increases employee commitment. From their study, they suggested that there is a need to define which factors play a key role in increasing job engagement and employee commitment in the public sector organisations with particular attention to developing countries.
However, many studies have tried to find if there is a relationship between performance of a public service employee and their organizational commitment and came up with diverse results as follows. Seppala et al. (2009) and Turkyilmaz et al. (2011), among others, declared that there is a clear and direct relationship between performance of public service employees and organization commitment. Consequently, one can confidently declare that application of different incentives and motivational packages do affect positively public employee’s commitment and their job satisfaction that in turn enhance their productivity.

Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that employee satisfaction is an essential factor to the success of any business organization. Branham, (2005) noted that a high rate of employee satisfaction is directly related to a lower turnover rate. Therefore, keeping employees satisfied with their careers should be a major priority for every employer. That’s why, Saeed and Shahbaz, (2011) asserts that there are numerous reasons why employees can become discouraged with their jobs and resign, including high stress, lack of communication within the company, lack of recognition, or limited opportunity for growth. Thus, it is advisable that management should actively seek to improve factors that demoralize employee satisfaction if they hope to lower their turnover rate.

This is because; lack of communication in the workforce is a major contributor factor to job dissatisfaction that in turn affects employee productivity. This is usually a result of managerial staff that is isolated and does not know how to relate to their employees on a personal or professional level (Branham, 2005). This is due to the fact that; bad communication in terms of feedback leaves employees feeling disconnected from the organization; hence affect negatively the level of job satisfaction. And this is detrimental to the wellbeing of the organization because when an employee feels neglected, they will tend to perform at a lower level that in turn affect the quality of service provided to the public (Gregory, 2009). That is to say, when feedback is not provided to the employees through communication on how they have performed against the agreed targets, they will definitely fail to know how they can improve their performance in the future, and as a result they become dissatisfied with the job. In the study on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey, Gunlu et al. (2010) found that if a company does performance appraisals, the results may be given in such a harsh tone that, rather than motivating an employee, it intimidates and an employee may feel uncomfortable in the workplace, rather than encouraged to achieve more.

Besides, a study on job satisfaction and employee performance among the Greek Banking staffs by Hyz, (2010) found that job satisfaction has been identified as one criterion for establishing the health of an organization to render effective services to its customers. The findings further suggests that an understanding of factors involved in job satisfaction is necessary and relevant, on one hand in improving the well-being and life of significant number of people and the enterprise on the other. Thus; organizations may reach competitive levels of quality, either at a product level or a customer service level, if their personnel feel satisfied with the company. In connection to that, Chiu and Francesco, (2003) agree that the positive correlation between employee satisfaction and the quality of services offered does exist. That is to say, the level of employee satisfaction has direct influence on the quality and quantity of services rendered to the public. On the other hand, it is also true to say that the level of job satisfaction determines the willingness of the employee to leave or stay long with the organization.

However, in developing countries like Pakistan, Kargar, (2012), noted that the tenure of committed employees increases the credibility of the organization and makes available the prerequisite for the improvement and development of the organization and as a result, it leads the organization towards economic prosperity and betterment. The organizational commitment amounts to the general normative pressures that are sustained by the employees to accomplish their organizational responsibilities and the psychosomatic state that forces the employee to continue in the organization. To enhance the degree of employee commitment and their performances, it is advisable that the supervisors should be fair in their decisions and actions towards their workers (Qaisar et al, 2012). That’s why; organizational commitment has been described as a psychosomatic state that builds the workers behaviors prolonging their occupancy in an organization or alternatively not doing so.

Additionally, in Nigeria, a study on the effects of organizational commitment on employee performance by Folorunso (2014) revealed that committed employees stay long with the organization and as a result, are found to contribute much to the performance of the organization. The literature suggests that individuals become committed to organizations for a variety of reasons, including an affective attachment to the values of the organization, a realization of the costs involved with leaving the organization, and a sense of obligation to the organization (Robbins and Judges, 2008). Apart from psychosomatic state, Boehman, (2006) viewed organizational commitment as multidimensional in nature, involving an employees’ willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, the degree of goal and value congruency with the organization, and desire to maintain membership. Moreover, Chen and Hseeh, (2006) argue that organizational commitment is a bond between an employee and the employer and the more
favorable an individual’s attitudes towards the institution, the greater the individual’s acceptance of the goals of the organization and their willingness to exert more efforts on behalf of the organization.

Likewise, Naser, (2007) affirmed that when employees are dissatisfied at work, they are less committed and will look for other opportunities (turnover). If opportunities are unavailable, they may emotionally or mentally withdraw from the organization. Thus, organizational commitment becomes an important attitude in assessing employees’ intention to quit and their overall contribution to the organization. On the other hand, employee performance, therefore, is the outcome of actions with the skills of employees who perform in an organization (Prasetya and Kato, 2011). Thus, good performance is the step towards the achievement of organizational aims. As a result, Negin et al. (2013) affirm that organizational commitment can improve employees’ performance and raise organizational overall competitiveness. Hence it is advisable that more effort is required to improve the organizational performance by ensuring the presence of employee commitment.

Moreover, the study on attitudes and the influence of management practice on employee turnover in Tanzania by Mrope and Bangi (2014) indicated that organizational turnover is a challenge of all organizations today and this contribute to poor productivity of both individual employee and the organization concerned. Empirical studies done in both public and private organizations have come up with similar results. Thus, the rate of employees’ turnover in public and private sectors in Tanzania is increasing (Minja 2011, Magalla 2011). It was revealed that the decline of financial capacity in the local government authority of Tanzania among other factors is high labour turnover. High labour turnover according to Susana, (2011) in an organization indicates dissatisfaction of employees on what the organization provides in the form of needs and desires. As such, studies indicate that when employees are dissatisfied, their loyalty and commitment to the organization decreases and eventually affect negatively employee productivity.

Besides, the annual report by Arusha Lutheran Medical Centre (ALMC) (2010) which indicated that ALMC had a high turnover rate of more than 19% of nurses. Supporting the same, Magalla (2011) comments that labour turnover is becoming a solemn problem in today’s business setting in Tanzania. This situation threatens many organizations and has been termed as one of the management and organizational challenges (UNICEF Annual Report 2011, TBA Newsletter (2007), Mrara (2010), Ernest and Young Report 2012). Thus, the degree to which labour turnover is higher, most studies pointed out as one factor for low employee productivity is due to job dissatisfaction that eventually result in the decision to leave a position.

On the other hand, a study on the relationship between employee satisfaction and job performance in the Local Government of Tanzania by Jinyevu (2013) revealed that not only a positive correlation between job satisfaction dimensions and employee’s performance does exist, but also positive influence of job satisfaction on direct performance of employees. In other words, satisfied employees are highly motivated, have higher job morale and as a result they can perform better than those who are dissatisfied.

Tanzania Policy on Employee Productivity

As part of the reform program, in 1980s a new national policy on labour productivity, incomes and prices had been introduced in Tanzania. The idea of payment by results combined with a production incentive scheme has been implemented with the aim of relating salaries and wages to the increment in output (JICA 2008). The policy assumed that each individual’s remuneration should be influenced, wherever possible, by his contribution to the production of goods and services. The fact that the policy has been introduced just now does not depend, of course, on chance; but it was and it has been due to the past negative economic phenomena which contributed substantially to the crisis situation in the country (Bana, 2009).

Moreover, the study on policy implication of the development in labour productivity in Tanzania by Bana (2007) indicated that the old income and wage policy tended to concentrate almost exclusively on the reduction of income differentials without recognizing the importance of a proper incentive scheme. Thus, the role of incentives was negligent to a large extent and as a result its influence on the productive capacities of the public service employees was practically nonexistence. This is because, the system of remuneration was based on a fixed wage combined with the overtime payment in cases when the quantitative production targets were not met, and besides, the bonus paid at the end of the year distributed equally among all the employees (Sarks 2006). That is to say, the existing system favored neither individual nor group efforts to raise productivity and this is due to the fact that managers were not compelled to look carefully at the production costs, output and at the development for an overall efficiency and productivity of each individual employee.

Consequently, Vandenabeele (2009) noted that during that period, the equilibrium between the consumptive and productive attitudes of employees was completely lost and as well it affected adversely the motivational block of the workers and their productive attitudes. To this end, Tanzania Government, according to the report of the United
Nations Public Administration Networks UNPAN (2013) introduced a number of processes, tools and mechanisms in order to facilitate the institutionalization of a performance management system in the Public Service. As such, the World Health Organization (WHO) in its report (2006) points to public workers’ motivation as an important determinant of the quality of services needed to be rendered to the public. However, a growing recognition of inadequate quality of health services in sub-Saharan Africa has led to the introduction of new tools aimed at improving health workers’ performance (Lauglo, 2009). Thus, the specific tools for performance management include strategic and operational planning, client service charters, service delivery surveys, self-assessment programmes, performance budgets and the recent introduction of an Open Performance Review and Appraisal System (OPRAS).

Moreover, a study on the assessment of performance enhancing tools in the public health sector in Tanzania by Songstad et al. (2012) indicated that OPRAS was introduced in the wake of the extensive Public Sector Reform Programme (PSRP) and strategies vested in the New Public Management paradigm following result in the extensive structural adjustment policies. The New Public Management approach has increasingly been adopted in low-income countries as a strong manifestation of processes of globalization with the objective of improving employee and public sector performance. Therefore, OPRAS plays an important role in the improvement of employee productivity that eventually was expected to improve service delivery and the Public Service Act which defines OPRAS as a compulsory performance appraisal in the public sector (URT, 2011).

However, in the study on an external evaluation of the health sector in Tanzania by McCourt (2008) found that OPRAS is clearly an improvement over what was the old Closed Annual Confidential Report Systems (CACRS), which was exercised by the superior (supervisor) alone. But in actual fact, without clear job descriptions and individual targets, there is no objective basis for assessment of individual performance. The President’s Office, Public Service Management, URT (2008) agrees that OPRAS is not linked to sanctions or rewards, and that performance targets are vague or too easy to meet. Moreover, a study on improving motivation among primary health care workers in Tanzania by Manongi, (2006) concurs with the Public Service report (2005) that OPRAS is implemented without coordination with the need for training of staffs as a motivating factor to improving employee productivity.

Similarly, most studies undertaken in the context of public sector workers motivation in Tanzania and in sub-Saharan Africa link poor performance to low motivation (Songstad et al, 2011). Moreover, a systematic review of health workers’ motivation in low-income countries by Harter et al. (2009) concludes that financial rewards, career development, continuing education, hospital infrastructure, resource availability, hospital management, and recognition are core contributing factors for poor performance of employee. Thus, it is therefore important to identify factors that impact motivation, and the relation between motivation and employee performance in the public and private sector.

**METHODOLOGY**

This study employed both quantitative and qualitative approach in the sense that both closed ended and open ended instruments were used to gather data from respondents. The target population for this study was 2232 employees from different department in Muheza District. A sample of 339 which constituted 15% of the total population was randomly selected. Questionnaire evaluation was employed for collection of primary data from the respondents while interview guides were administered to officials from Public Service Management in Dar es Salaam, Dodoma and from the Regional Administrative Secretary’s Office. Most of the items in the questions were in a four-point likert scale ranging from strongly disagreeing to strongly agreeing.

**Validity and Reliability**

To test reliability a pilot study was conducted in a population with similar characteristics with the target sample. Cronbach’s Alpha (α) was used to measure internal consistency strength whereby α > .9 = excellent, α > .8 = good, α > .7 = acceptable, α > .6 = questionable, α > .5 = poor and α < .5 = unacceptable. Reliability ranged between 0.682 and 0.955 implying that all variables in the questionnaire were reliable.

From the literature, an alpha of 0.7 or above is considered to be reliable as suggested by many researchers (Kumar, 2005). Sekaran (2003) also affirms that normally, reliabilities of 0.7 range is considered acceptable and over 0.8 is good. In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient values ranged from a low of .665 to a high of .955 with an overall Cronbach’s alpha coefficient value of .789.

**Analysis and Interpretation**

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were employed in data analysis. Descriptive statistics displayed Mean Scores and Standard Deviations while inferential statistics in terms of Pearson Product moment correlational Coefficient measured relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Open ended data were interpreted...
Table 1. Correlates of Training and Development and Employees Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training and Development</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211**</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: Fieldwork, 2017

using thematic approach to enhance discussion of findings from the questionnaire.

Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

This section was guided by four hypotheses which were tested by the use of Pearson-product Moment Correlation Coefficient as follows:

H01 Training and Development does not influence employee productivity in the Tanzanian Public Service.

As Table 1 indicates, this hypothesis was intended to test correlations between Training and Development and specific aspects of employees’ productivity. The findings indicated no significant relationship between the Independent Variable, namely Training and Development and selected Dependent Variables, namely commitment, satisfaction, quality of service and labor turnover. Therefore, the null hypothesis that maintains that Training and Development do not affect employee productivity in the Tanzanian Public Service was thus accepted.

This implies that Training and Development is not a determinant of job productivity among workers in the Tanzanian Public Service. The insignificant effect of training and development on employee commitment was however unexpected because generally, providing training and development opportunities is a valuable Human Resource activity expected to enhance their self-esteem, morale, and satisfaction. Brum, (2007) and Stanca and Colombo (2008) for instance established that comprehensive training activities are positively related to productivity and reduce staff intention to leave for other employment. The indication that employees may not necessarily stay as the organisation increases the provision of training and development could be due to some other reasons that can be further explained and researched. The paramount justification may be that usually when employees are trained they acquire extra knowledge and expect to be promoted and compensated accordingly. When this expectation is not met, there is a high likelihood that the employees may decide to leave the organisation due to dissatisfaction. Conversely, the findings contradict with the previous studies by Owens (2006); Lam et al. (2009) who found a strong correlation between training and development and employee commitment and turnover. The more committed an employee is, the less of a desire they have to terminate from the organization. Hence, highly committed employees were found to have a higher intent to remain with the company along with positive attitude about their employment.

However, multiple correlations of Dependent Variables in
the conceptual framework yielded positive significant correlations between Commitment and Satisfaction of employees (Pearson Correlation .211, Sig. 0.002). Though it is a weak correlation, this might suggest that a ratio of .211 in the Pearson Correlation could mean that a unit increase in employee recognition in terms of other motivational incentives could lead to .211 times more likelihood of employees to be committed with their job and their organisations.

Additionally, the findings indicate a positive correlation between Commitment of employees and Quality of Service (Pearson Correlation .265, Sig. 0.000) and between Quality of Service and satisfaction of employees (Pearson Correlation .266, Sig. 0.000). This implies that the more committed employees are the more they can value the quality of service offered to the public. The result compares with previous studies by (Chew and Chan, 2008) who employed a Structural Equation Model to establish that motivational incentives positively predicted organisational commitment and intention to stay on a job that eventually affected positively on employee productivity. This finding is supported by Malhotra and Mukherjee (2004) who argued that job satisfaction and organizational commitment have significant impact on the quality service delivered to customers. In other words, satisfied employees are likely to be committed to their job and thereby contributing much to the organizational goals and objectives.

Generally, the findings from Table 1, one can declare that poor service delivery among public servants correlate with lack of satisfaction and therefore it should be taken as a mechanism for encouraging them to meet customer expectations. Thus, commitment of employees serve as a determining factor for the quality of services offered to the public.

H02 Promotion does not influence employee productivity in the Tanzanian Public Service

This hypothesis was tested by the use of Pearson-product Moment Correlation Coefficient as indicated on Table 3.

As Table 2 indicates, this hypothesis was intended to test correlations between promotion of employees and specific aspects of employees’ productivity. The Table indicated no significant relationship between the Independent Variable, namely promotion and selected Dependent Variables, namely commitment, satisfaction, quality of service and labor turnover. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and maintain that promotion does not affect employee productivity in the Tanzanian Public Service. This implies that promotion is not a determinant of productivity among workers in the Tanzanian Public Service. This compares to the previous studies by Prowse and Prowse, (2009) who found that employee’s promotion becomes an important ingredient to individual performance but only when it is tied to individual performance.

However, the findings contradict with the views of employees’ supervisors who through interview schedules admitted that promotion of employee should serve as a prerequisite condition for productivity. Particularly, one interviewee was quoted saying:-

"If employee recognition is used as a mandatory condition for staffs promotion, training, salary increment or demotion for those performing poorly, they will be forced to work towards the achievement of the work target, since

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Perceptions of Employees on Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ccommitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turnover Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
Source: Fieldwork, 2017
there would be no option” (Interview with Head of Department, April, 2016).

Therefore, even though promotion does not directly increase employees’ productivity, but when tied to individual performance, it increases the morale and happiness of employees that in turn may impact positively on their performance. This could be the case if performance or productivity of each individual employee is set as the prerequisite conditions for one to be promoted. This compared with the study by Mustapha and Zakaria (2013), who advised that in order to achieve the positive impact of promotion, the management of the public sectors needs to consider the connection between the appraisal and pay increases or promotions and demotion or termination.

**H03 Appraisal Recognition does not influence employee productivity in the Tanzanian Public Service**

This hypothesis was tested by the use of Pearson-product Moment Correlation Coefficient as indicated on Table 3. As the Table shows, the hypothesis was intended to test correlations between Appraisal Recognition and specific aspects of employees’ productivity. The Table indicates significant relationship between the Independent Variable, namely Appraisal Recognition and selected Dependent Variables. Particularly, there is existing positive correlation between Appraisal Recognition and Employee Satisfaction (Pearson Correlation .219, Sig. 0.002). Also, the findings further established a positive relationship between Appraisal Recognition and Quality of Service (Pearson Correlation .294, Sig. 0.000). This finding is supported by Kepner (2009) and Agbar (2010) who discovered that employee’s recognition in terms of monetary and non-monetary incentives is critical in staff turnover, satisfaction and productivity that eventually impact on the quality service delivered to customers.

Furthermore, there is also a positive correlation between Appraisal Recognition and Job Turnover (Pearson Correlation .144, Sig. 0.041). Consequently, we reject the null hypothesis and maintain that there is a significant relationship between Appraisal Recognition and three dependent variables, namely, Satisfaction of Employees, Quality of Service, and Employee Turnover. This implies that the more Appraisal Recognition takes place, the more employees are satisfied, the more the quality of service they provide and the more the Employee Turnover takes place in the organization.

The positive correlation between Appraisal Recognition and Employee Turnover might be due to follow ups involved in the appraisal processes which may result into lazy employees quitting from their jobs. The result compares with previous studies by Dhomeja (2009); Urbancove and Linhartove (2011) who found out that recognition for high performers also serves as a challenge for low performers for them to pull up the efforts toward the desired performance.

**H04 Feedback does not influence employee productivity in the Tanzanian Public Service.**

This hypothesis was tested by the use of Pearson-product Moment Correlation Coefficient as indicated on Table 4. As the Table indicates, the hypothesis was intended to test correlations between feedback and specific aspects of

---

**Table 3. Perception of Employees on Recognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: Fieldwork, 2017**
employees’ productivity. The Table indicates significant positive relationship between the Independent Variable, namely feedback and Quality of Service (Pearson Correlation .334, Sig. 0.000). This implies that if more feedback is provided to the employees, the more they can value the quality of service they offer to the public. The result compares with previous studies by Chew and Chan, (2008) who employed a Structural Equation Model to establish that motivational incentives positively predicted organisational commitment and intention to stay on a job that eventually affected positively to employee productivity. This type of correlation suggests that when more feedback is given to employees, the better the quality of their performance in the organizations and the better the quality of service offered to the public.

Therefore, as Table 4 indicated, we reject the null hypothesis and maintain that there is a significant relationship between Appraisal feedback and two Dependent Variables, namely, Satisfaction of Employees and Quality of Service. This implies that when more Feedback is given to the employee’s, the more employees are satisfied, and the greater they value quality of service they provide to the public. The result compares with previous studies by Gregory, (2009) who found out that feedback communicated to employees sharpen their understanding and as such they improve the quality of services they provide to the public.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

In the light of the proceeding analysis and discussion regarding the influence of Performance Appraisal Management Practices on employee productivity in Muheza District, the study concludes that, organizations must pay sufficient attention to its human resources so that they can improve organizational performance. The study highlights the fact that recognition and feedback are vital to employee’s performance and indeed influence employee productivity in the organization. However, surprisingly training and development, and promotion did not have a significant effect on employee productivity. It is therefore of prerequisite importance that employee productivity can be achieved through immediate feedback and recognition through tangible rewards. Based on the above conclusions, it is recommended that to improve employee productivity, training and promotion should focus on increasing employees’ commitment and it should be based on performance. Furthermore, raising employee satisfaction through recognition should be used as a tool for maintaining competent employees and screening out those poorly performing. Additionally, appraisal should take place individually in order to respond to the employees’ individual recognition needs.
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