

Supervisory and Non-Supervisory Employees Attitudes and Perceptions towards Performance Appraisal in the Malaysian Public Sector

ALAA-ALDIN A. AHMAD
*Faculty of Business, Economic,
and Policy Studies, UBD,
Gadong BE 1410, Brunei, Darussalam*

(Received 12.09.1422H, and Accepted 06.03.1423H)

ABSTRACT. The predictors of performance appraisal attitudes and perceptions among supervisory and non-supervisory employees were examined. The data were collected from 1380 supervisory and non-supervisory employees working in 7 ministries of the Federal Public Services-Malaysia. A questionnaire was used to measure respondents' perceptions regarding appraisal determinants: performance evaluation criteria, purposes of performance appraisal, appraisal interview, disclosure of annual assessment report, limitation of performance appraisal, and frequency of performance appraisal. Results of MEANS and ANOVA indicated that supervisors compared to non-supervisors were significantly more satisfied with performance appraisals and described their appraisals in more favorable terms. These significant differences between supervisors and non-supervisors reactions toward performance appraisal could have important implications for the design and implementation of appraisal systems in Malaysian public sector organizations.

Introduction

Performance appraisal is considered one of the most important activities of human resource management in both private and public sector organizations. It is through the performance appraisal process that employees can be monitored and the overall efficiency and the effectiveness of the organization can be judged.

In the public sector, the performance of employees is vital to the society. It is through these employees that the various governmental agencies carry out their policies. Any deficiency in the ability of those employees in carrying out their duties will leave negative feelings among the citizens and this in turn will bring doubts and dissatisfaction with the government recruitment process in particular and the public administration system in general.

Assessing the performance of employees is crucial for any organization. On the one hand, management needs a process through which to monitor employee's performance to improve the effectiveness and productivity of the organization. On the other hand, accurate and adequate feedback about performance through performance appraisal reviews has also been regarded as critical to an employee's ability and motivation to perform effectively in an organization (Lee and Son 1998, p. 203).

Most governments are moving away from the parochial view of looking only at the performance of their employees and toward linking the performance appraisal as a process to their strategic goals. The aim is to enhance the overall efficiency and the effectiveness of the administrative system (Orbin, 1988; Dessler, 2000). In Malaysia, the federal government has enacted New Performance Appraisal System (NPAS) under the New Remuneration System (NRS) which came into effect on 1 January, 1992. The main purpose of this system was to enhance the capability of personnel management in the civil service in terms of professionalism, quality, and productivity. This was considered part of the administrative reforms to streamline the public sector to improve its efficiency and effectiveness to provide quality services to the public (Shafie, 1996). The importance of this system was to measure the actual performance of the employee at the end of the year compared to the predetermined performance target prepared at the beginning of the year (Public Service Department, 1992, 1999).

Despite the ever-increasing amount of research on performance appraisal, including its characteristics, processes, employee satisfaction with the system and process, attitudes and perceptions of employees toward various aspects of performance appraisal systems, there has been a noticeable lack of empirical studies comparing supervisory and non-supervisory employees reactions to appraisal systems (Pooyan and Eberhardt 1989, P. 216). Most of these studies have been conducted in developed countries while relatively few have concentrated on developing countries (Mamman and Sulaiman, 1996).

Given the inadequacy of literature on employees perceptions towards performance appraisal in the public sector in developing countries, in general, and Malaysia, in particular, the present study attempts to fill this gap in the literature.

Theoretical Background

Attitudes and perceptions towards various aspects of performance appraisal systems and processes (e.g. perceptions of fairness and accuracy, appraisal determinants items, appraisal interview behaviors, appraisal satisfaction, and personal variables) have long been recognized (Landy et al., 1978; Pooyan and Eberhardt, 1989; Lathman and Wexley, 1994; Lee and Son, 1998). Previous research has attempted to identify characteristics of appraisal systems and processes that are related to employee satisfaction with the system and process. Landy et al. (1978) tested appraisal systems in general and found that employee perceptions of the appraisal processes of fairness and accuracy were a function of the frequency of evaluation, identification of goals to eliminate weaknesses, and supervisor knowledge of the subordinate's duties and performance. Investigating employees' attitudes towards various aspects of the performance appraisal system, Mount, (1984) and Pooyan & Eberhardt (1990) found that open, two-way communication, mutual trust, opportunities for ratees to participate in goal setting, the supervisor's knowledge of ratees' performance, being evaluated on

job-related factors, are significantly related to ratees' satisfaction with performance appraisals.

Other researchers have examined employees' reactions to appraisal practices. Al-Taamnah (1994) studied the perceptions of Jordanian Civil Service employees towards the appraisal system in general, and found low level of satisfaction among employees towards: 1) primary purposes of appraisal system; 2) objectivity and fairness; 3) attention paid to their complaints on the content of annual appraisal reports; and 4) communicating performance evaluation results. Alpander (1980) studied the supervisory role in the appraisal interview by comparing change in attitudes towards 12 functions of supervisory job measured prior and after 200 supervisors were exposed to a training program in appraisal interviews and found no significant change in attitude with respect to the 12 functions listed in the training program. However, with respect to the perceived degree of comfort/discomfort in communicating negative performance evaluation results and handling discipline problems, Alpander (1980) found significant change and the mean rating for the 12 functions increased by 1.3 and 1.2 respectively on a scale of 1 to 5.

In another study comparing employees' attitudes towards some aspects of performance appraisal, Chow (1999) sampled 164 Chinese from Hong Kong and the People's Republic of China. The sample was drawn from a variety of organizations and different industries and their positions ranged from director, manager, professional, section head, and supervisor. Chow (1999) found no significant differences between the PRC Chinese group and Hong Kong group in terms of internal performance attributions, however, the two groups differ with regards to other aspects. The PRC Chinese group prefer a group orientation to performance appraisal, were more predisposed to non-performance-related factors and a stronger preference for open, honest, and direct relations between supervisors and subordinates, While the Hong Kong group expressed an opposite orientation towards openness, honesty, and direct relations between supervisors and subordinates. Pooyan and Eberhardt (1989) conducted a study in a Midwestern State University in U.S.A. correlating performance appraisal satisfaction among supervisory and non-supervisory employees. The results indicated that supervisors were significantly more satisfied with performance appraisals and described their appraisals in more favorable terms compared to non-supervisors.

In Malaysia, the federal government in 1992 introduced the New Performance Appraisal System [NPAS] in order to alleviate the weaknesses of the old system and to improve the efficiency and the effectiveness of the public sector in providing quality services to the public (Shafie, 1996). He studied the Malaysian experience in implementing the NPAS and found that the public sector productivity has increased and public sector employees have shown greater commitment towards their jobs.

The present study attempts to examine the attitudes and perceptions of the employees of some selected federal departments towards the various aspects of the New Performance Appraisal System. Opinions of employees at the supervisory and non-supervisory levels could have important implications in the design and implementation of performance appraisal systems in organizations.

Objective of the Study

Limited empirical research exists regarding employees' attitudes and perceptions toward performance appraisal in the case of developing countries in general and specifically in the Malaysian public sector. Shafie study (1996) provided some insight about the Malaysian experience in implementing the New Performance Appraisal System. The study was based on the description of the principles, objectives, salary progression process, features, and feedback obtained from Malaysian Public Service Department related to implementation of the NPAS.

In this study, the author explores the attitudes and perceptions of supervisory and non-supervisory employees toward various aspects of the NPAS as implemented currently in the Malaysian public sector. One objective of the present study is to fill a gap in the existing literature on employee attitudes toward performance appraisal, especially in the case of developing countries where there is an inadequacy in the literature dealing with this topic. Also, this study represents a unique attempt to examine the attitudes and perceptions of the public sector employees in Malaysia toward the performance appraisal system.

The attitudes toward and perceptions of performance appraisals of supervisory and non-supervisory employees were compared. Responding to questionnaire items, both supervisors and non-supervisors perceptions and attitudes about how they, personally, were appraised, are compared. Any differences in their reactions toward appraisal systems could have important implications for the design and implementation of appraisal systems in organizations.

Research Questions

This research is aimed to document the attitudes and perceptions of the employees of some selected federal departments in the Malaysian Public Sector toward the various aspects of the performance appraisal system. Employees' attitudes and perceptions are assessed based on six categories established for the purpose to achieve the research objective. The following are the main questions that form the basis of this research.

1. What are the attitudes and perceptions of employees toward the performance appraisal in the Malaysian public sector?
2. Are there any statistical significant differences among the supervisory employees and non-Supervisory employees at the level of significance of 0.01 and 0.05 toward the categories (1- 5).
3. What are the preferences of civil service employees regarding the frequency of the appraisal?

Method

Population and sample of the study

The population of this study constitute only the employees of the Malaysian Federal Public Services (FPS), totaling 444,033, and representing 66.88 percent of the total number of civil service employees (excluding police and armed forces) [Public Civil Service Department, 1999]. This total represents 26 ministries, including the Prime Minister's Department and Department without Ministry. This number was categorized into supervisory level totaling 175,139 (grade 3, 4, and 5 in the *Sistem Saraan Baru Scheme*), and non-supervisory level totaling 268,894 (grade 9 and onwards in the SSB Scheme).

A simple random sample of 600 employees from supervisory category and 1400 employees from non-supervisory category was chosen to form a total of 2000 employees. This total represents 7 ministries and in choosing the sample due consideration was given to the size of each ministry*. Questionnaires were mailed to 2000 supervisory and non-supervisory employees and 1380 usable questionnaires were received which represented a total of 69% response rate (460 usable questionnaires from the supervisory category were received, which represented 77% response rate, and 920 usable questionnaires from non-supervisory category were received, which represented 66% response rate). The demographic backgrounds of the sample are shown in Table 1.

Table (1)
Demographic backgrounds of the Respondents

Demography	N=1380	%
Occupation		
Supervisory	460	33.3
Non-supervisory	920	66.7
Education		
Postgraduate	20.7	1.5
Degree	585.1	42.4
Diploma	455.4	33.0
High School	318.8	23.1
Age		
51 Above	16.6	1.2
46-50	87.0	6.3
41-45	193.2	14.0
36-40	256.7	18.6
31-35	409.9	29.7
25-30	291.0	21.1
Below 25	125.6	9.1
No. of Years in Service		
1-5 years	120.1	8.7
6- 10 years	487.1	35.3
11-15 years	358.8	26.0
16-20 years	193.2	14.0
Above 21 years	220.8	16.0

Data collection and analysis

Based on previous studies concerning attitudes and perceptions toward various aspects of performance appraisal systems, especially the work of (Landy et al., 1978; 1980); Pooyan and Eberhardt (1989); and Al-Taamnah (1994). A questionnaire that carried the questions were developed and administered on 100 public sector employees to ascertain the clarity of the questionnaire and accordingly, revisions were made to eliminate ambiguities, inadequate wording, and hidden biases. The questionnaire originally was written in English and was translated into Bahasa Malaysia. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was computed to assess the reliability of the items used to measure the

* Names of the Malaysian' Federal Ministries and those responded to the survey are found in the appendix.

attitudes and perceptions of the respondents. A satisfactory coefficient of 0.91 was attained. The questionnaire consisted of 30 items related to various aspects of the performance appraisal system, and based on the existing literature, the items were grouped into the following categories:

1. Performance evaluation criteria
2. The purposes of performance appraisal
3. Appraisal interview items
4. Disclosure of annual assessment report
5. Obstacles of performance appraisal
6. Frequency of performance appraisal

Questionnaires were mailed to 2000 supervisory and non-supervisory employees throughout the sampled ministries. This was done mainly to cut the cost of the research to an acceptable level. Supervisory and non-supervisory employees were asked to complete the same questionnaire, which was designed to assess their attitudes and perceptions regarding their own performance appraisal. Respondents were asked to return the completed questionnaires directly to the researcher in envelopes which were provided. With the exception of the last category "Frequency of Performance Appraisal", the perceptions and attitudes toward the items which formed the other five categories were measured using a 5-point Likert scale.

The differences in attitudes and perceptions toward performance appraisal were assessed using the SPSS statistical package. The means, reliability assessment, and one-way analysis of variance were calculated. The level of significance was set at the 0.01 and 0.05. The findings of the study are displayed according to the aforementioned categories.

Findings

1. Performance Evaluation Criteria

Table (2) presents the means, standard deviations, and F values for all items for both supervisory and non-supervisory samples. The table shows that there are significant differences on five of the appraisal determinant items. It is evident that the means for both supervisors and non-supervisors are not significantly different but also are generally higher for the supervisors for the items 1-4. For item 6, the mean and the differences in F value are higher for the non-supervisors

Table (3) shows three statistically significant differences between the supervisors and non-supervisors items which constitute the category of "the purpose of performance appraisal". It is evident from this Table that the means for both supervisors and non-supervisors are not only significantly different but are generally higher for the supervisors. For the rest of the items, the Table reveals no significant differences between the two groups of respondents.

Table (2)
Performance Evaluation Criteria: Means, Standard Deviations, and F Values

Items	Supervisors		Non-supervisors		F Value
	M	SD	M	SD	
My evaluation is based on					
1. The Goals I achieved	3.90	1.35	2.60	1.15	12.47**
2. Important tasks of the job	4.00	1.51	2.50	1.27	10.80**
3. My Skills and abilities	4.20	1.61	2.80	1.42	14.65**
4. My Appearance & Personal attitudes	3.90	1.42	3.30	1.37	5.14*
5. Pre- arranged goals	2.45	1.27	2.37	1.19	1.10
6. General impressions, and Personal Relationship	2.70	1.32	4.25	1.22	13.92**

* $p \leq 0.05$

** $P \leq 0.01$

2. The Purpose of Performance Appraisal

Table (3)
The purpose of performance appraisal: Means, Standard Deviations, and F Values

Items	Supervisors		Non-supervisors		F Value
	M	SD	M	SD	
1. Feedback to help subordinates improve performance	3.90	1.22	3.10	1.16	8.90**
2. Promotion and salary increments	3.75	1.19	3.80	1.14	0.68
3. Career planning & development	4.05	1.26	3.20	1.21	9.65**
4. Validating personnel & training procedures	2.60	1.08	2.30	1.13	1.08
5. Information for higher authority	2.40	1.14	2.25	1.01	0.45
6. Documentation & meeting legal requirements	3.80	1.25	2.90	1.20	10.26**

** $p \leq 0.01$

Table (4) reveals statistically significant differences between the supervisors and non-supervisors with regard to 4 items of the Appraisal Interview Items. Only for item 4 do the results show no significant differences in the perceptions of both groups of employees. Table (4) shows that the mean perceptions for the supervisors are not only statistically significant but also generally higher compared to the non-supervisors.

3. Appraisal Interview

Table (4)
Appraisal interview items: Means, Standard Deviations, and F Values

Items	Supervisors		Non-supervisors		F Value
	M	SD	M	SD	
Interview included discussion of					
1. Weaknesses in my past performance	3.00	1.02	2.30	1.05	6.88**
2. My future performance goals	2.80	1.20	2.10	1.15	6.55**
3. Specific career development goals for me	2.60	1.10	1.90	1.08	7.38**
4. Ways to improve performance	2.40	1.29	2.20	1.19	0.42
5. Strength in my past performance	3.10	1.32	2.60	1.26	9.72**

$P \leq 0.01$

4. Disclosure of the Annual Evaluation Report

Table (5)
Disclosure of the Annual Evaluation Report: Means, Standard Deviations, & F Values

Items	Supervisors		Non-supervisors		F Value
	M	SD	M	SD	
1. Having full access to the details of the report	3.50	1.25	2.90	1.17	6.24**
2. Complaints are not taken seriously by higher authority	2.90	1.23	3.00	1.29	0.54
3. Disclosure of the report build trust and confidence between you and your superior	3.70	1.31	3.60	1.26	0.44
4. Disclosure of the report provide you with an instrument to compare your performance with others	4.10	1.25	3.40	1.18	6.85**
5. Disclosure of the report will enhance your faith in the appraisal system	4.00	1.33	3.35	1.22	7.56**

$P \leq 0.01$

With regard to the disclosure of the annual evaluation report, Table (5) shows generally favorable perceptions among the supervisors and non-supervisors towards all items under this category, except for item 2. The non-supervisors show dissatisfaction with the ways higher authority handles their complaints about the results of their annual evaluation. Table (5) shows that the means for the supervisory employees are higher for all items and statistically significant for items 1, 2, 4, and 5.

5. Obstacles of the Performance Appraisal System

Table (6)

Performance Appraisal Obstacles: Means, Standard deviations, & F Values

Items	Supervisors		Non-supervisors		F Value
	M	SD	M	SD	
1. Appraisals are largely influenced by personal relationships	2.70	1.23	4.10	1.19	10.82**
2. Current appraisal is influenced by previous report	2.20	1.28	4.00	1.18	11.24**
3. There is tendency for my boss to rate all employees the same way	2.40	1.29	3.90	1.22	13.38**
4. Personal characteristics affect the appraisal rates given by my boss	2.50	1.18	4.10	1.26	12.92**
5. Appraisal system is characterized by unclear standards	2.30	1.25	3.90	1.17	11.64**

P ≤ 0.01

In Table (6), the results indicate clearly that non-supervisory employees in the Malaysian public sector agree that performance appraisal suffers from several obstacles. The results show significant differences between supervisors and non-supervisors for all items under this category. From Table (6), it is also evident that the means for both groups are not only significantly different but are generally higher for the non-supervisors.

6. Frequency of Performance Appraisal

Table (7)

Frequency of Performance Appraisals

How often should PA be conducted	Supervisors n= 460		Non-supervisors n=920	
	n	%	n	%
Yearly	120	26.1	190	20.6
Twice a year	260	56.5	620	67.4
Monthly	80	17.4	110	12.0

As in most developing countries, civil servants in Malaysia are assessed annually. But when respondents are asked about their preferences regarding the frequency of the appraisal that should be done by their superiors, the results show that most of them prefer a frequency of twice a year. Monthly evaluation and yearly appraisal were also still popular but to a lesser extent (see Table 7).

Discussion

Despite the growing amount of research investigating employee attitudes and perceptions toward performance appraisal, relatively little is known about differences in appraisal attitudes between supervisory and non-supervisory employees (Pooyan & Eberhardt, 1989). The present study set out to investigate and compare the perceptions of and attitudes toward a performance appraisal process of these two groups. Comparisons of means, frequencies, and one-way analysis of variance were used to

assess the degree of similarity and differences between supervisory and non-supervisory employees.

The results of this study indicated that there are significant differences in perceptions between the two employee groups with regard to the appraisal criteria, purposes of performance appraisal, appraisal interview, disclosure of the annual appraisal report, and performance appraisal obstacles. With the exception of the last category (Performance Appraisal Obstacles), the differences indicate that supervisors tend to perceive the performance appraisal process more positively and are more satisfied with the performance appraisal process than are non-supervisory employees. These findings are in consistent with results of other studies by Pooyan & Eberhardt, 1989 and Al-Taamanah, 1994.

Despite this overall favorable attitude by supervisory employees toward performance appraisal in the Malaysian public sector, the results show no significant differences between the two group of employees with regard to some items within each category (see Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5). A review of the two groups' responses to the evaluation criteria, purpose of the performance appraisal, appraisal interview, and disclosure of the annual evaluation report items suggests that supervisors perceive that they are receiving better evaluation than do non-supervisors. Possible explanations for these findings are that higher-level employees have greater ability and responsibility so that they are able to provide more effective performance appraisals; supervisors may be more motivated to provide sound appraisals to subordinates who are also supervisors; and finally, supervisors who are raters themselves, are more aware of the difficulties involved in the appraisal process, identify and have empathy with their own raters and, therefore, tend to be more satisfied with the appraisal process than are non-supervisors (Pooyan & Eberhardt, 1989). The other explanation for these differences is that in most developing countries the whole administrative system was set to serve the interests of the higher level employees and at the same time was not in response to the needs of those who are not performing a supervisory role. Therefore, the results reflect greater satisfaction with the appraisal process by supervisory compared to the non-supervisory employees. Research should be conducted to determine the validity of these explanations of the findings of the present study.

With regard to the obstacles of the performance appraisal in the Malaysian public sector, the results clearly indicate significant differences between the two groups of employees Table (6). From Table (6), it is evident that the means for both supervisors and non-supervisors are not only significantly different but are generally higher for the non-supervisors. All the items within this category received higher positive responses from non-supervisory than from supervisory employees. The results in this Table show that personal relationships, lack of standardized criteria, rater-bias, personal characteristics of employees, and insufficient commitment by supervisors to record-keeping of employee performance are the main concerns of the non-supervisors in the Malaysian public sector. These results suggest that non-supervisors perceive that the appraisal system in Malaysian public sector suffers from a lack of fairness, objectivity, and justice.

These findings are identical with the findings of Shafie (1996); Al-Taamanah (1994); Rosen & Gerder (1976); and Ferris et al. (1985). The possible explanations for these findings is that in most of the developing countries, the administrative system was

influenced by personal relationships, favoritism, and the absence of unclear standards to guide the system, and these in turn had negative implications not just on performance appraisal, but for the other important activities of human resource management. It is recommended that more research should be conducted to determine the validity of these explanations.

Further examination of the data in Tables (2, 3, 4,5, & 6,) respectively, reveals the fact that the non-supervisory employees show less satisfaction toward all items of the six categories which are designed to accomplish the purpose of this study. The findings of this study suggest that the Public Service Department in Malaysia should instruct all Federal Departments to set clear annual goals and objectives for their employees, to make sure that appraisal to be matched with performance levels, is objective and fair in appraising employee's performance, and to use the appraisal interview as an avenue for employees to express their view and to set up an agreeable plan for performance improvement.

It must be noted that this study merely examined and compared the attitudes and perceptions toward performance appraisal of two groups, supervisory and non-supervisory employees working in seven public sector organizations. In other words, both supervisors and non-supervisors described their perception and attitudes about how they, personally, were appraised. Any significant differences between supervisory and non-supervisory reactions toward performance appraisal could have important implications for the design and implementation of appraisal systems in organizations. To the extent that appraisal systems are applied evenly in all public organizations, these findings are likely to be applicable to other agencies as well. But the fact remains that an appraisal system is not an isolated activity within the organization. The design of an effective appraisal system often depends not only on how employees perceive the system but also on the broader organizational and managerial context (Pooyan and Eberhardt, 1989).

Summary of the results

This study aimed to fill a gap in the existing literature on employees attitudes and perceptions toward performance appraisal. Specifically, the attitudes toward and perceptions of performance appraisals of supervisory and non-supervisory employees in some selected federal agencies were compared, and the following are the main findings of this study:

1. With regard to the criteria of performance appraisal, the purposes of performance appraisal, the appraisal interview, and the disclosure of the annual assessment report, supervisors were significantly more satisfied with performance appraisals and described their appraisals in more favorable terms compared to non-supervisors. The study reveals statistically significant differences between the two groups.

2. Regarding the obstacles of the performance appraisal system in the Malaysian public sector, the results show differences between the supervisory and non-supervisory samples. For the non-supervisory samples, there was a high agreement among respondents that the Malaysian system of performance appraisal suffers from several obstacles. The means and F values for this group are higher and statistically significant compared to the sample of supervisory employees.

3. Despite the fact that the new performance appraisal system in Malaysia clearly refers to the measurement and comparison of the actual performance for the employees to the predetermined performance target, the system still suffers from fair application of objective criteria and more weight is given to non-objective factors such as personal relationships, individuals differences, and the “Halo” effect.

4. Finally, the findings of this study show that both supervisors and non-supervisors were inclined to prefer a frequency of a twice a year evaluation for their performance.

Practical implications

Based on the results of this study, the effectiveness of the performance appraisal system in the Malaysian public sector can be enhanced by considering the following suggestions.

1. Improving managers’ skills in developing measurable and clear performance objectives specialists can be imported from the private sector or using management experts within the public sector to train managers to identify clear objectives and an appropriate criteria in judging the performance of their subordinates.

2. Based on the results of this study and following from the above suggestion, the Malaysian Public Service Department should instruct all federal departments to set clear annual goals and objectives for their employees and to use a participation approach in developing them.

3. Disclosure of the annual evaluation report should be given due consideration in order to develop a positive atmosphere between the supervisors and their subordinates and to enhance faith to the appraisal system. Such practice is either not performed or not taken seriously by most of developing countries. A greater emphasis has to be placed on giving the subordinates the opportunities to discuss with their supervisors the specific targets to be accomplished and skills, knowledge and attitudes needed to meet them. In addition, and in order to create sincere feelings among the subordinates toward the appraisal system, supervisors should meet them periodically and tell them what is wrong in the performance and what are the corrective steps need to taken.

4. The results of this study suggest that too many appraisals deal with individual’s personality instead of discussing his skills/abilities and how they affect his performance in achieving his results. This indicates that the limits of authority in jobs is not clear and because it has a negative impact on objective evaluation of performance it requires attention.

5. Public managers and supervisors should be trained on how to handle a critical evaluation of an employee. This can have a significant impact on whether an employee becomes motivated or demotivated. To assist managers and supervisors in handing appraisal interview successfully, a training program should be developed and includes subjects such as how to analyze the reasons for inadequate performance, how to prepare for the appraisal interview, and how to conduct the interview (Dessler, 2000; Alpander, 1980).

6. Although there was no attempt made in this study to evaluate the pay system under the newly implemented performance appraisal system, this aspect should not be overlooked in designing and implementing any new appraisal system. In Malaysian public sector, according to (Shafie 1996, p. 1.), there is no direct link between

performance and rewards. To make sense of the performance appraisal system in this country and in most developing countries, the pay system should be tailored to the appraisal system and made comparable to the private sector. Flexible reward system based on individual and teams performance should be implemented, and the system should emphasize objectivity, transparency and fairness.

References

- Alpander, Guvence G.** (1980), "The negative performance appraisal is the hardest to deliver and the most critical", *Personnel Journal*, vol. 59, pp.217-221.
- Al-Taamnah, M.**, (1994) Attitudes of Government Employees Towards Performance Evaluation in the Jordanian Civil Service. *Yarmook University Research*, vol. 10, no. 3, Erbid, Yarmook University. (in Arabic)
- Chow, Irene Hau-siu.** (1999), "An opinion survey of performance appraisal practices in Hong Kong and the People's Republic of China", *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 32 (3), pp. 67-79.
- Dessler, Gary**, (2000), *Human Resource Management*, 8th ed., Prentice Hall International, New York.
- Ferris, G., Valerie Yates, David Gilmour, and Kendrith Rowland.** (1985), "The influence of subordinate age on performance ratings and casual attributions", *Personnel Psychology*, 38 (3), pp. 545-557.
- Landy, F. L., Barnes, J. L. and Murphy, K. R.** (1978), "Correlates of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, pp. 371-377.
- Landy, F. L., Barnes-Farrell, J. L. and Cleveland, J. N.** (1980), "Correlates of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation: A Follow-up", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, pp. 355-366.
- Latham, G. P. and Wexley, K. N.** (1994), *Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal*, 2nd edn. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Lee, Mushin and Byoungso Son** (1998), "The effects of appraisal review content on employees reactions and performance", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9:1, pp. 203-214.
- Mamman, Sminu. and Mohamed Sulaiman** (1996), "Managerial attitudes to pay system in the Malaysian public sector", *Malaysian Management Review*, 31:1, pp. 29-39.
- Manual of the Sistem Saraan Baru (SSB), Malaysia Public Service Department, 1992 (Amendment 1996).
- Mount, M. K.** (1984), "Satisfaction with a performance appraisal system and appraisal discussion", *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 5, pp. 271-279.
- Orbin, Chirstopher** (1988), "Strategic role of performance appraisal in public administration", *Public Administration*, 60, pp. 79-87.
- Pooyan, A. and Bruce J. Eberhardt** (1990), "Predictors of performance appraisal satisfaction: the effect of gender", *Asia Pacific Human Resource Management*, 28 (1), pp. 82-89.
- Pooyan, Abdullah. and Bruce J. Eberhardt** (1989), "Correlates of performance appraisal satisfaction among supervisory and nonsupervisory employees", *Journal of Business Research*, 19(1): pp. 215-226.
- Public Service Department** (1999), [Http://www.jpa.gov.my/jpai/perangkai/okt99/jpa](http://www.jpa.gov.my/jpai/perangkai/okt99/jpa).
- Rosen, B. and T. H. Gerdee.** (1976), "The nature of job related age stereotypes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, pp. 180-183.
- Shafie, Halim Bin**, (1996), Malaysia's Experience in implementing the New Performance Appraisal System, Paper Presented at the *Commonwealth Association of Public Administration and Management (CAPAM), Biennial Conference, 21-24 April*.

Appendix

Malaysian federal Government Ministries Surveyed
(Entries with an asterisk indicate a response to the survey)

Prime Minister Department
Ministry of Human Resource
Ministry of Home Affairs
Ministry of Social Welfare
Ministry of Youth and Sport
Ministry of Land and Cooperative Development
Ministry of Work*
Ministry of Health*
Ministry of Finance*
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ministry of Education*
Ministry of Information
Ministry of International Trade and Industry*
Ministry of Transport
Ministry of Defense
Ministry of Agriculture*
Ministry of Housing and Local Authority
Ministry of Prime Industry
Ministry of Science and Environment
Ministry of Energy, Telecommunication & Multimedia*
Ministry of Rural Development
Ministry of Justice
Ministry of Culture, Arts & Tourism
Ministry of Domestic Trade and Consumer
Ministry of Entrepreneurship
Department Without Ministry

اتجاهات الموظفين الإشرافيين وغير الإشرافيين نحو تقييم الأداء في القطاع الحكومي بماليزيا

علاء الدين عبد الرحيم أحمد النعيمي

أستاذ مساعد

كلية التجارة والاقتصاد والدراسات السياسية

جامعة بروناي - دار السلام - بروناي

المستخلص . تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التعرف على اتجاهات الموظفين في الأجهزة الحكومية نحو نظام تقييم الأداء المعمول به في نظام الخدمة المدنية في ماليزيا. وتضمنت الدراسة الإجابة على الأسئلة التالية :

١. ما هي اتجاهات الموظفين الحكوميين نحو نظام تقييم الأداء؟
 ٢. هل هناك فروق إحصائية بين متوسط مجموعة الموظفين المشرفين ومجموعة الموظفين غير المشرفين في مجال معايير تقييم الأداء، وأهداف تقييم الأداء، وفقرات مقابلة تقييم الأداء، وعلانية تقارير التقييم السنوي، والصعوبات التي تواجه عملية التقييم؟
 ٣. ما هي اتجاهات الموظفين الحكوميين نحو المدة التي تتضمنها عملية التقييم؟
- وشملت عينة الدراسة (١٣٨٠) موظفا تم اختيارهم بطريقة عشوائية من سبع وزارات من بينهم (٤٦٠) موظفا من الموظفين المشرفين و(٩٢٠) من الموظفين غير المشرفين وذلك للتعرف على حقيقة اتجاه كل من المجموعتين حيال نظام تقييم الأداء. وقد توصلت الدراسة إلى النتائج التالية :
١. بينت الدراسة أن هناك فروقا ذات دلالة إحصائية بين متوسط اتجاهات الموظفين المشرفين ومجموعة الموظفين غير المشرفين في جميع المجالات (ماعددا الصعوبات التي تواجه عملية تقييم الأداء)، وكانت تميل نحو المجموعة الأولى.
 ٢. وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين متوسط اتجاهات مجموعة الموظفين المشرفين ومجموعة الموظفين غير المشرفين فيما يتعلق بالصعوبات والممارسات السلبية التي تواجه عملية تقييم الأداء، لصالح المجموعة الثانية.
 ٣. بالرغم من الإشارة الواضحة في النظام الحديث لتقييم الأداء في نظام الخدمة المدنية في ماليزيا بقياس ومقارنة الأداء الفعلي للموظفين بالأهداف القياسية الموضوعية مسبقا فقد بينت الدراسة أن أهداف النظام لا تزال تفتقر إلى المعايير الموضوعية.
 ٤. بينت الدراسة أن كلتا المجموعتين من الموظفين المشرفين وغير المشرفين تفضل التقييم نصف السنوي، وإن كان هذا التفضيل يميل أكثر لصالح المجموعة الثانية.