



Walden University
ScholarWorks

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies


Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies
Collection

2019

Employee Perceptions of Fairness in Performance Appraisals and Job Satisfaction

Simon-Davies Amenyenu Nutakor
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), and the [Management Sciences and Quantitative Methods Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Management and Technology

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Simon-Davies Amenyenu Nutakor

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Jean Gordon, Committee Chairperson, Management Faculty

Dr. Robert DeYoung, Committee Member, Management Faculty

Dr. Barbara Turner, University Reviewer, Management Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University

2019

Abstract

Employee Perceptions of Fairness in Performance Appraisals and Job Satisfaction

by

Simon-Davies Amenyenu Nutakor

MPhil, Walden University, 2019

MPS, Cornell University, 2004

MPA, University of Ghana, 1999

BA (Hons.), KNUST, 1993

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Management

Walden University

May 2019

Abstract

Business and management researchers have shown that performance appraisals have continued to remain a standard component of the human resource management (HRM) function and play an integral role in contributing to employee performance and job satisfaction levels. Recent researchers indicated that employees have continued to hold negative views about the degree of fairness and accuracy of appraisals, thus rendering the process a mere routine and periodic ritual detrimental to organizational efficiency and growth. The purpose of this study was to add to what is a paucity of data on perceptions of fairness of employees and examine the employee perceptions of fairness in performance appraisals related to job satisfaction. The conceptual framework for this study was rooted in organizational justice and motivational theory. Research questions examined the perceptions of employees of performance appraisals on job satisfaction. Qualitative data were collected in this multiple case study using face-to-face interviews of 20 participants. Data were organized, coded, and analyzed for emergent themes and patterns that aligned with the research questions. Research findings showed that employee perceptions of performance appraisals are critical and remain an invaluable component of the human resource function to benefit management executives and should include basic knowledge and employee input in the appraisal design and process. Implications for possible positive social change may include enhanced insights, knowledge, and understanding of the perceptions of performance appraisals that may enhance management decisions through fair, just, and accurate employee appraisals that will positively translate to job satisfaction.

Employee Perceptions of Fairness in Performance Appraisals and Job Satisfaction

by

Simon-Davies Amenyenu Nutakor

MPhil, Walden University, 2019

MPS, Cornell University, 2004

MPA, University of Ghana, 1999

BA (Hons.), KNUST, 1993

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Management

Walden University

May 2019

Dedication

I dedicate this work to Eseli, Elinam, Awoenam, Mawusi, and Mawunyo, without whose constant support and encouragement, I would have been unable to attain this vision. To all my brothers and sisters whom I am honestly grateful for my close friends who believed in me and encouraged me to stay the course. This work is also dedicated to my parents who inculcated in me the love and passion for learning and encouraged me to share knowledge gained as an obligation to all mankind. They taught me that education is a privilege, once attained can never be taken away. Thank you for being an inspiration and the foundation of who I am today. My sincere love to you all.

Acknowledgments

A journey of this magnitude has brought many wonderful people into my life without whose support my vision and dream would not have been possible. I must first extend my sincere gratitude to my wife, Eseli, who willingly and single-handedly gave her time and spent endless hours to support the family while I embarked on this journey. Your dedication and belief in me gave me the strength, zeal, and motivation to accomplish this dream even when I had thought it impossible.

I will not remiss to extend gratitude to my committee, the two incredibly talented instructors who embody all I strived for through this journey. Special recognition is to my Mentor/Chair, Dr. Jean Gordon, who accepted and availed herself to provide invaluable advice and tremendous guidance every step of the way and patiently worked with me throughout the process. No amount of words can truly express my appreciation to you. I was privileged and honored to have Dr. Robert DeYoung, my Methodology Expert and committee member, who spent enormous amount of time to provide detailed feedback until completion. I am grateful to Dr. Barbara Turner, the University Research Reviewer for her contribution. I greatly appreciate the contribution that each of you made in the creation of this work. I learned a lot of lessons and would forever remain grateful.

A special thank you to colleagues who gave me materials to support this work especially, Mr. and Mrs. Parby for their special assistance which I cannot mention here.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge God Almighty for granting me the strength, intelligence, courage, and direction to see my dream come true to finally walk the stage of recognition in academia. To him be the Glory.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the Study	2
Problem Statement	8
Purpose of the Study	9
Research Question	10
Conceptual Framework.....	10
Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of Motivation	10
Equity Theory	11
Nature of the Study	12
Definitions.....	14
Assumptions.....	16
Scope and Delimitations	16
Limitations	17
Significance of the Study	18
Significance to Practice.....	18
Significance to Theory	19
Significance to Social Change	20
Summary and Transition.....	21

Chapter 2: Literature Review	23
Introduction.....	23
Literature Establishing the Relevance of the Research.....	24
Literature Search Strategy.....	25
Conceptual Framework.....	26
The Equity Theory	29
The Two-Factor Theory of Herzberg.....	39
Performance Appraisals, Effectiveness, and Management.....	43
Origin and Current State of Performance Appraisals	45
Benefits and Attributes of Performance Appraisal	47
Performance Appraisal Perceptions	48
Rater and Ratee Performance Appraisal Accountability	50
Employee and Supervisor/Manager Perceptions of Appraisals.....	52
Ratees' Fairness Perceptions per Raters' Distorted Appraisal Outcomes	53
Factors Associated With Performance Appraisals.....	56
Performance Appraisal Essentials.....	57
Performance Appraisal Metrics, Attitudes, and Behavioral Sensitivity	58
Performance Appraisal Feedback Outcomes	59
Job Satisfaction and Performance Appraisal Relationship	611
Job Satisfaction and its Origin	65
Factors Associated With Job Satisfaction.....	666
Summary and Conclusions	677

Chapter 3: Research Method.....	71
Introduction.....	71
Research Design and Rationale	72
Role of the Researcher	82
Research Methodology	83
Population and Setting.....	87
Sampling and Participant Selection	88
Expert Panel.....	89
Protection of Participant Rights	91
Instrumentation	93
Data Collection	95
Data Analysis	97
Evidence of Quality	98
Issues of Trustworthiness.....	99
Credibility	100
Transferability.....	101
Dependability.....	102
Confirmability.....	103
Ethical Procedures and Informed Consent.....	103
Summary.....	105
Chapter 4: Results	107
Introduction.....	107

Research Setting.....	108
Population and Sample	109
Sample Size.....	110
Instrumentation, Interview Protocol and Guide.....	111
Sampling Strategy and Participant Demographics	111
Data Collection	115
Data Saturation.....	118
Transcription.....	118
Coding of Data.....	119
Data Analysis	120
Theme 1: Perceptions of Fairness	126
Theme 2: Perceptions of Job Satisfaction.....	127
Theme 3: Perceptions of Performance Appraisals.....	129
Theme 4: Reasons for Unfair Perceptions	134
Theme 5: Recommendations to Improve Fairness Perceptions.....	137
Evidence of Trustworthiness.....	141
Credibility	141
Transferability.....	142
Dependability.....	143
Confirmability.....	144
Ethical Considerations and Procedures.....	144
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	147

Interpretation of Findings	148
Theme 1: Participants' Perceptions of Fairness	148
Theme 2: Participants' Perceptions of Job Satisfaction	149
Theme 3: Participants' Perception of Performance Appraisals.....	149
Theme 4: Participants' Reasons for Unfair Perceptions.....	151
Theme 5: Participants' Recommendations to Improve Fairness Perceptions	152
Study Results	153
Summary	154
Limitations of the Study.....	155
Recommendations for Future Research	157
Implications.....	158
Significance to Practice.....	160
Significance to Theory	161
Significance to Positive Social Change	162
Conclusion	164
References.....	166
Appendix A: Letter of Cooperation and Statement of Understanding	214
Appendix B: Letter of Cooperation from a Research Partner: Permission to use Organization, Premises and Subjects	215
Appendix C: Letter of Appreciation for Participation	217
Appendix D: Informed Consent for Participants	218
Appendix E: Interview Protocol/Guide	221

Appendix F: Face-to-Face Interview Script.....223

List of Tables

Table 1. Participant Demographics.....	113
Table 2. Frequency Table of top 10 Keywords/Terms	125

List of Figures

Figure 1. Conceptual framework of employee performance appraisal.....	35
Figure 2. Conceptual framework establishing the relationship between the fairness perceptions of performance appraisals on job satisfaction	43
Figure 3. Illustration of parent and child nodes as primary themes and subthemes based on the constructs and research questions for data analysis	122

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

Performance appraisals (PA) have remained a standard component of the human resource management (HRM) function given the widespread belief that they contribute to organizational productivity and efficiency. However, researchers have suggested that employees and supervisors hold negative views on the appraisal process and its degree of fairness (Kim & Holzer, 2016). This research is important as it may contribute to understanding the perceptions that employees hold about PAs. It may also provide a practical framework for promoting fairness perceptions of performance evaluations and how they relate to perceived job satisfaction.

This study included recommendations on how stakeholders may apply the findings as a practical measure to developing performance appraisal systems. Through the fairness perceptions of performance appraisals, employees may develop attitudes and behaviors that could positively impact individual performance and contribute to enhanced levels of job satisfaction (Dzansi, Chipunza, & Dzansi, 2016). The study is important given the number of researchers who suggested job satisfaction is a precursor of organizational promise and a fundamental organizational goal of employee's perceptions of personal commitment to fairness in the workplace (Behzad & Habib, 2015; Jonathan, 2013; Yang, 2016). The results of this study provided information that applies to human resource managers and professionals or practitioners of organizations in private, public, and government agencies.

The outcome of the study provided a basis for managers and employees to discuss the importance of work-related issues that might not otherwise be addressed. It was expected that both managers and subordinates would report the experiences as positive and relevant when an appraisal is conducted fairly. It would encourage supervisors to focus on goals and work activities by addressing existing problems and overcoming barriers to improved work performance and enhancement of job satisfaction (Ali, 2016). The study would enable agencies to provide workers with recognition for efforts and to identify staff individual training and development needs. Employees would view the appraisal interview as the only opportunity available to them for having an exclusive and uninterrupted period with the supervisor who is influential in determining job satisfaction through recognition of work achievements.

Chapter 1 serves as a roadmap to guide the readership in understanding the background, problem, purpose, and conceptual framework, nature of the study, definition of the terms, assumptions, scope and delimitations, and the limitations of the study. A concise description of the various subsections or subtopics of the critical significance of the research area within each of the major areas of the research is also provided.

Background of the Study

The current study was an effort to build on recommendations of other studies outlined in a research article on employee perceptions and the value of performance appraisals. Further research and review of the topics on perceptions of employee PAs on job satisfaction provided the basis for the need to conduct this study based on the challenges posed by the fairness perceptions of PAs on job satisfaction and its associated

purposes. This research is relevant and applies to a health care organization, based on the outcomes and investment returns of the PA systems in organizations that tend to implement the PA process.

PAs have become an essential element of the business process of measuring and managing performance and are widely considered to be a valuable HRM function (Radebe, 2015). The appraisal system has become an invaluable tool utilized by managers and supervisors to manage and motivate employees to work effectively by providing recognition and rewards such as promotion, pay awards, bonuses, or the delay of promotion of employees, based on their performance for satisfaction (Joseph, 2014; Owoyemi & George, 2013; Park, 2014). PAs have traditionally, been used worldwide as a means of measuring workers' performance, goals setting for the future, and the identification of areas of employee professional training and development needs (O'Boyle, 2013). It continues to remain one of the most crucial human resource practices with the goal of assessing employee performance and contributions intended to impact the individual positively, and the organization's long-term effectiveness (Aleassa, 2014).

Organizations adopt PA systems for several reasons including the management of employee development, selection, retention, and training (Deepa, Palaniswamy, & Kuppusamy, 2014). Some agencies apply the PA system to help estimate staffing requirements and numbers, promotion, compensation and benefits packages, bonuses, incentives, demotions, dismissals, tenure, training, development of employees and counselling needs, performance pay and rewards, and to protect the organization from employment related litigation to ensure employee competence (Cappelli & Conyon,

2016; Chouhan, Chandra, Goswami, & Verma, 2016; Deepa & Kuppusamy, 2016; Owoyemi & George, 2013).

PAs play an integral role in contributing to employee performance and level of job satisfaction with the performance appraisal method utilized (Chandhana & Easow, 2015). The appraisal process is also used for employee development purposes to communicate feedback on the strengths and weaknesses, uncover individual training needs, identify gaps in employee performance, evaluate human resource efficiency and involvement in recruitment and selection, and in reducing the number of employee grievance (Ahmed, 2015; Hauck, 2014).

The process often entails the assessment of the workers' performance, based on the judgments and views of managers and subordinates or peers, and even workers themselves (Prasad, 2015). PA will generally refer to a process by which workers' job performance is assessed with reference to quality, quantity, cost, or time. It is a systematic and periodic process used to evaluate the productivity and employee job performance about pre-established benchmarks, organizational goals, and objectives.

PAs provide human resource management with information upon which to base decisions for improving motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and productivity. Radebe (2015) contended that the appraisal phenomenon has been perceived as instrumental in enhancing the performance and development of employees, thus positively impacting service delivery. The literature revealed that the perceptions of employees constitute a critical role in the performance appraisals on job satisfaction. The fairness perceptions of performance evaluations have become the focus of performance

appraisal research. Organizations need to harness positive worker perceptions of fairness of performance assessments to cope with the animosity surrounding performance evaluation systems. Researchers have adopted the social exchange theory in studies that have explored such perceptions and how they impact work-based relationships (Bal, De Cooman, & Mol, 2013). The perceptions of both employees and supervisors of performance appraisals remain critical to the appraisal process and constituted the main issue of this study. Researchers have claimed the process is circuitous, though the perceptions of fairness assessments influence employee behavior, performance, and job satisfaction (Saunila & Ukko, 2012; Tsai & Wang, 2013).

Akkas (2015) argued that successful managers incorporate daily performance reviews and provide feedback to employees to identify areas for improvement and to measure the steps towards the desired enhanced performance. Organizations need to design a practical framework that will ensure fairness perceptions of performance evaluations on job satisfaction. To date, the value and fairness of the PA process remains questionable. Although the performance assessment interview has remained a paramount feature in the range of human resource (HR) functions for decades, there are limitations in the extent to which they improve employee attitudes (Hosain, 2016). The contention is based on prior research, despite the rhetoric of performance appraisals and its influence on job performance and commitment (Budworth, Latham, & Manroop, 2014).

Efficient performance assessment systems may not only inspire workers in improving their performance, but also contribute to the overall performance of the organizations. Yet appraisal systems in the civil service, referred to as the Annual

Confidential Report (ACR) systems, may arguably be inefficient and fail to enhance employee development and learning experiences (Purohit & Martineau, 2016). PAs are utilized to communicate to employees the value they bring to the organization; but, some argued that the rewards and outcomes do not reflect the true value and contribution of individual workers (Neu Morén, 2013). The perceived fairness of performance appraisal is mediated by job satisfaction and ultimately influenced overall commitment (Singh & Mishra, 2016).

Shrivastava and Purang (2016) emphasized in the findings of a study on performance measurement, the significance of fairness perceptions of employees in shaping employee assessment outcomes versus the intent and design of the human resource system and found that satisfaction with the evaluation system further enhances job satisfaction. Although the evaluation system has been deemed as an indispensable management tool for providing support for decision-making, still numerous undertakings have failed to achieve the desired impact. Workers' reactions to a performance appraisal, and the process of review, have been acknowledged to have a considerable effect on the whole outcome, accuracy, fairness, and success (Iqbal, Akbar, & Budhwar, 2015).

The assessment reviews have failed to transform individual perceptions about the work performed. Dissatisfaction with the process has also been linked to work dissatisfaction, reduced organizational commitment, and higher intentions of quitting the job (Dusterhoff, Cunningham, & MacGregor, 2014). Despite the widespread use of performance appraisals worldwide, there remains growing criticism of the effectiveness of the concept in improving performance. The frequency with which the evaluation of

performance must be conducted has also remained a source of controversy and constant debate in both management practice and research (O'Boyle, 2013). The ineffectiveness or failure of performance evaluations has drawn criticism since the cost of implementing PA systems outweigh the benefits and some argue that resources would be better utilized by developing accurate and efficient approaches to communication for evaluating performance to reflect on job satisfaction (Vasset, 2014). Jääskeläinen and Sillanpää (2013) reported contradictory views on the challenges and underlying cause for the unsuccessful development of appropriate performance appraisal systems.

There is substantial proof in the existing management literature on the connection between employee fairness PA perceptions and job satisfaction. Earlier researchers revealed that performance evaluation knowledge has a significant effect critical to worker attitudes involving job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and confidence in workplace management (Sumelius, Björkman, Ehrnrooth, Mäkelä, & Smale, 2014). This gap has led to the performance appraisal practice being considered by some to be a yearly ritual of mere form filling exercises. Although various researchers have emphasized the apparent importance of performance evaluations, contemporary researchers are unable to furnish a whole structure for assessing the effectiveness of the system of PAs (Iqbal et al., 2015). Its influence in enhancing employee fairness perceptions, and its relationship to effectiveness and efficiency, have also been overlooked in current research (Saunila & Ukko, 2012). Most employees continue to perceive the evaluation system as unfair, inaccurate, and a mere annual ritual (Sanyal & Biswas, 2015). The situation has resulted

in the need for research to explore employees' fairness perceptions of the process of PAs and how they influence organizational-level outcomes.

Problem Statement

PAs have remained a standard component of the human resource management function because organizations benefit significantly from their application, as fairness perceptions may contribute to job satisfaction in terms of job performance in high-performing organizations (Harrington & Lee, 2014; Kuranchie-Mensah & Amponsah-Tawiah, 2016). Yet, employees and supervisors have expressed negative reactions to the process due to the absence or lack of its effectiveness (Ekpe, Daniel, & Ekpe, 2013; Kim & Holzer, 2016). Although implemented worldwide (Monsur & Akkas, 2015), the fairness perceptions present management scholars with a dilemma (Kromrei, 2015; Stepanovich, 2013).

Perceptions of appraisals have not been sufficiently fair to improve job satisfaction with only 6% of employees perceiving them as fair and effective (Teckchandani & Pichler, 2015). The fairness perceptions of appraisals decrease after reviews in approximately 60% of cases (Teckchandani & Pichler, 2015). According to Teckchandani and Pichler (2015), the process has more often left both supervisors and employees dissatisfied, although the main goal of PA is to provide feedback for improving performance and align employee performance with organizational objectives. Goh (2012) argued that 70% of appraisal initiatives have failed despite empirical proof that employee perceptions and managerial practices shape individual behaviors (Taneja, Srivastava, & Ravichandran, 2015).

The general business management problem was that unfair perceptions of PAs could create challenges (Kampkötter, 2016). The specific research problem was that employees and executives agree that appraisals have failed to accurately reflect professional abilities and performance (Swanepoel, Botha, & Mangonyane, 2014). This lack of understanding of employee perceptions of evaluation systems provided the justification for this case study. Although there is prior research on PAs, there is a paucity of literature investigating the perceptions of employees of performance evaluations on job satisfaction, thus calling for the development of a comprehensive performance appraisal system for all workers and the need for this study (Bhurtel & Adhikari, 2016). I investigated employee perceptions of performance assessments on job satisfaction.

Purpose of the Study

The goal of this research was to examine how employee perceptions of PAs can be improved to enhance job satisfaction by exploring the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisal systems on job satisfaction within a healthcare organization. This case study approach was intended to offer deeper contextual insight into the perceptions of fairness of evaluation processes on reported levels of job satisfaction in health care organizations. PA was described as “a structured formal interaction between a subordinate and superior in the form of a periodic interview (annual or semi-annual) to evaluate work performance” (Manoharan, Muralidharan, & Deshmukh, 2011, p. 722). The study was geared towards providing information that may be used by managers in healthcare organizations to improve PA systems to enhance the levels of job satisfaction as a critical performance indicator because researchers have

shown that perceptions of the PA process are influenced by factors related to individual levels and relationships (Sumelius et al., 2014).

Research Question

I developed the following research questions based on the conceptual framework of the study. The central research question was: What are employee perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals on job satisfaction in healthcare organizations? The related subquestion was: What are the reasons that lead to unfair perceptions of performance appraisals?

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study was rooted in Adams's equity theory (1963, 1965), and the two-factor theory of motivation (Herzberg, 1959). Hamlett (2014) described the organizational justice theory as the study of fairness at work. It concerns employees' perceptions of fairness within an organization since organizational justice has a positive influence on PA satisfaction (Bin Abdullah, Anamalai, Ismail, & Ling, 2015). According to the theory, there are three components to justice: distributive, procedural, and interactional justice that interacts with employee levels of job satisfaction (Hamlett, 2014).

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation

Herzberg (1959) developed the two-factor theory of motivation, also known as the dual-factor or motivation-hygiene theory. The theory argued that two factors affect the motivation and satisfaction of employees (Herzberg, 1959; Ozguner & Ozguner, 2014). Herzberg posited that motivating employees is a two-step process based on *job content* as

the motivation factor and *job context* as the hygiene factor (Bogicevic, Yang, Bilgihan, & Bujisic, 2013; Herzberg, 1959). Herzberg's model proposed that a continuum exists ranging from no satisfaction to satisfaction while a second continuum exists ranging from dissatisfaction to satisfaction (Herzberg, 1959; Worlu & Chidozie, 2012). Herzberg also identified three types of employees: satisfied, dissatisfied, and those with an absence of dissatisfaction or no satisfaction (Bogicevic et al., 2013; Herzberg, 1959).

When the motivation needs are fulfilled based on workers' perceptions of accuracy and fairness with a performance assessment, they would not result in worker dissatisfaction, but to satisfaction or the absence of satisfaction. When the motivation needs are not achieved due to a lack of perceived fairness and accurate perceptions of fairness of their appraisals, they would lead to worker dissatisfaction or no-satisfaction. The unavailability of hygiene needs would lead to worker dissatisfaction, but their attainment would result in worker no-satisfaction. The assumption is that if employees could achieve good performance on the job and accomplish goals through the fairness and accurate perceptions of their performance assessments, they would be more likely to experience job satisfaction (Masum, Azad, & Beh, 2015).

Equity Theory

The equity theory is a model used to explain employee perceptions about fairness issues (Rowland, 2013). It describes the thought processes that employees utilize in determining the legitimacy or legality of managerial decisions. According to Adams (1963, 1965), fairness refers to how much people become aware of or compare, themselves to the situations of other people. Adams's equity theory contended that a key

determinant of job satisfaction and performance is the extent of equity or inequity recognized by a worker in the workplace. Perceived fairness refers to a person's assessment of whether an endeavor versus the results received is just, acceptable, and practicable (Tseng & Kuo, 2014).

The essence of the model involves a general comparison of an employee's assessment of the fairness of personal circumstances through a comparison with individuals in a similar circumstance (Folger, 2013). The focus of this study may help close the gap in existing literature on employee perceptions of fairness of the performance evaluation process and how it influenced job satisfaction. The two theories constituted the conceptual basis of this qualitative exploratory multiple case study.

Nature of the Study

A qualitative exploratory case study design was employed to gather in-depth contextual data on the employee perceptions of PAs on the levels of job satisfaction. A multiple case study was employed as the primary technique to serve as a blueprint for ensuring the reliability of the study (Yin, 2014). The data gathering procedure involved face-to-face interviews with individual employees and human resource professionals to form the unit of analysis within the organization as a single case in determining the case with the use of structured and semistructured, open-ended interview questions validated to afford participants the opportunity to convey their views and present detailed elaboration on data not previously envisaged as relevant. The interviews were recorded, coded, and analyzed for accuracy with the verbatim transcription of accounts of participants.

Data were analyzed by describing the case, and themes identified to advance detailed information (Yin, 2014). A nonrandom purposive sampling method was adopted with an estimated sample size of a minimum of 15 to 18 participants or at which saturation occurred. The research approach also included in-depth analysis of the interview transcriptions after each interview session to produce satisfactory sampling outcomes to ensure the accuracy of data, analysis, and the testing of participants' understanding of the phenomenon through honest responses. The research protocol involved a set of comprehensive guidelines and procedures that were utilized in conducting the study, the research instrument, and the guidelines for analyzing data. Data obtained from the interviews and observations were coded using the NVivo software of qualitative analysis to ensure the secure identification and discovery of emerging themes and patterns for analysis.

Ethical considerations for the study included instituting sufficient measures to guarantee the protection and safety of participants. Participants were informed about the objectives of the investigation because it involved the study of human subjects, including any interventions that may likely affect the voluntary participation of the sampled employees in the interview process. There was full disclosure prior to receiving informed consent to protect the dignity of participants including their confidentiality. Interpretation of data was conducted following the qualitative approach in selecting the case(s) to ensure the reliability of the study.

Definitions

Fairness/equity/justice: The notion that a decision or action is morally right according to ethics, equity, or law and consists of events and situations in the everyday lives of individuals across a variety of contexts (Tabibnia, Satpute, & Lieberman, 2008).

Job performance: Job performance was described as actions required and identified by the workers' job description consequently authorized, evaluated, and recompensed by the employer and the individual's ability to successfully perform within the framework of normal constraints and available resources (Jamal, 2007).

Job satisfaction: By job satisfaction, reference was made to a pleasurable positive state of mind or emotional, affective response towards diverse facets of one's job because of the appraisal of one's work or work experience (Körner, Wirtz, Bengel, & Göritz, 2015; Nazir, Akram, & Arshad, 2014).

Perception: This referred to the state of being, ability, act, or process of becoming aware or the ability to understand using the mind, senses, discernment, intuitive recognition, or acknowledgment in relation to rational, moral, or ethical values, or insights that involved acquiring, receiving, selecting, transforming, and organizing information supplied or received by our senses and sensory stimulation into a consistent and relevant picture of the real-world situation (Norman & Kabwe, 2015).

Performance appraisal feedback: In the context of this research, PA feedback was used to refer to the communication of corrective assessment information that provides helpful information or criticism to an employee to improve performance as an opportunity for providing constructive dialogue to help identify employee-training needs

with the results used to ensure the fair distribution of rewards as a key factor of equity perception which entails individual progress to help clarify roles (Pittman, 2003).

Performance appraisal/evaluation/measurement/assessment: For the purpose of this research, the terminologies are used interchangeably, and described as a structured formal interaction between a supervisor and subordinate in the form of an annual or semiannual periodic interview for evaluating work performance through a review to identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats involving the steps of observing and assessing employee performance, recording the assessments, and providing feedback to employees (Agbola, Hemans, & Sumaila, 2011; Kampkter, 2014; Swanepoel et al., 2014).

Performance management: In the context of this research, the terminology was defined as a continuous strategic and integrated process used to identify, measure, and develop the capabilities of individuals or teams, in alignment with the strategic goals of the organization for sustained success as part of the management philosophy through coordinated strategies (Lutwama, Roos, & Dolamo, 2017; Mahapal, Dzimbiri, & Maphosa, 2015).

Performance rating: Used as the criteria to differentiate between good and poor behavior (Dusterhoff et al., 2014).

Ratee: This term, which was also used interchangeably as *appraisee* or *evaluee* was used to refer to a person (usually the worker, employee, or subordinate) who is being evaluated or assessed by another person (usually a manager, supervisor, or superiors) or

about whom a judgment is being made in an appraisal review or interview to discuss the employee's progress, aims, and needs at work.

Rater: This term, which was used interchangeably as *appraiser* or *evaluator*, referred to a person (usually a manager or supervisor) who evaluates or determines the rating of the other person (usually the worker or employee) in an appraisal review or interview to discuss the employee's progress, aims and needs at work.

Assumptions

The study was grounded on four fundamental assumptions. It was assumed that participants would understand the research questions and provide appropriate responses to them. It was expected that participants would answer the interview questions with honesty and truthfulness to reflect their actual perceptions of PAs, devoid of the fear of victimization of their supervisors. It was also assumed that participants would be knowledgeable enough and possess the requisite work experience to participate in the research project. Lastly, it was assumed that participants' perceptions of PAs were meant to impact policy as a change management tool and not as a mere routine or ritual.

Scope and Delimitations

The extent or scope of this exploratory qualitative case study was intended to be limited to employee perceptions of fairness associated with PA in influencing job satisfaction. The choice of participants was based on the proximity of the organization to the researcher and called for the scheduling of face-to-face interviews. The interview questions were purposely designed based on the qualitative methodology and intent within the context of the research questions. It is hoped that members would go the extra

mile by volunteering additional information as performance appraisals were often based on personal experience with the phenomenon.

Organizational policies on performance evaluations such as monetary adjustment considerations, the timing of the study, and delivery of results remained out of the scope of the study. Demographic characteristics such as gender, age, time of employment, marital status, economic status, and other organizational considerations (compensation, promotions, vacation, or annual, and sick leave) remained beyond the scope of the study. The research was designed to focus on workers who were employed at one of the several sites of a conglomerate or owned by a parent organization and conducted throughout a limited time within the course of the study. Information concerning the perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals and the impact on employee job satisfaction were obtained via structured and semistructured, open-ended, face-to-face interview questions.

Limitations

The study was designed to use an exploratory qualitative multiple case study. As the researcher, I was the principal instrument for gathering data, analysis, and interpretation. My subjectivity and biases as the researcher were acknowledged during the data gathering process, analysis, and interpretation (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). I maintained a reinforced consciousness of the self to minimize the subjectivity and biases regarding the tendency to be subjective and impartial or unbiased during the entire process of data collection. Another limitation of the study was the estimated modest sample size of 15 to 18 participants until saturation based on only one organization and of multiple employees forming the cases in the group as a multiple case

(Yin, 2014). The exception was that the study assumed the form of a cross case analysis instead of several groups as multiple cases to allow for easy generalization (Yin, 2014).

The collection of self-reported data based on the proposition that information gathered in the field accurately represented and reflected the actual situation to inform all organizations following the analysis for easy generalization also posed as a limitation of the study. The reason was that self-reported data are believed to face credibility concerns regarding whether the study can attain the proposed objective of furnishing an alternative framework for the existing performance appraisal process.

Significance of the Study

I intended for this study to offer a deeper contextual understanding of employee fairness perceptions of performance assessments on job satisfaction. Researchers have stipulated that a connection existed between performance evaluation and job satisfaction. I examined the current state of performance evaluations and its potential contributions to advance knowledge in the management discipline. I assessed the contribution of accurate and fairness perceptions of performance appraisals and management of the process on job satisfaction. The evaluation of the significance of the research was intended not only to reduce the gap in the management literature but also explore the connection between the perceptions of the phenomenon of performance appraisal and job satisfaction.

Significance to Practice

In the research outcome would be a likely contribution of an alternative framework for management and human resource departments and professionals in organizations and agencies to assess workers to improve the implementation of effective

management decisions such as promotions, allocation of merit rewards, compensation, training and development needs, transfers, and terminations (Khan, 2013). A study on the impact of performance appraisal justice on the effectiveness of pay-for-performance systems established that perceived fairness of appraisal criteria was significantly and positively associated with performance efficiency (Kim, Bongdam-eup, & Gyeonggi-do, 2016). The results of the study are intended to also offer greater insights into the PA process and with recommendations regarding employee selection criteria for professional training and development needs.

The results of the study could serve as an indication to workers that the organization is interested in genuine employee performance development (Elliott, 2015), and impact positively on individual employee commitment, job satisfaction, and wellbeing (Bin Abdullah, Anamalai, Ismail, & Ling, 2015; Demir, 2016; Yang, 2016). It could also present an opportunity for both managers and subordinates to identify and acknowledge individual employee training and development requirements by linking them to performance results and future career goals of workers (Anitha & Saranya, 2014). The study may also serve as a consistent training needs audit for the whole agency or establishment. The performance measurement data could be utilized in monitoring the attainments of the institution's induction and recruitment practices to measure the general quality of the labor force, its improvement, or decline (Yadav & Sushil, 2013).

Significance to Theory

Results of the study may contribute to practical insights of the perceptions of fairness of employee performance evaluations on job satisfaction by providing new data

and information to fill gaps within the conceptual framework based on the application of organizational justice and the motivational theories. The outcome of this study has the potential of aiding scholarly research on employee fairness perceptions of PAs on job satisfaction including adding to the body of knowledge in the literature. The study could provide information on how to ensure fairness and equity of performance assessments and the possible elimination of inaccurate and unfair workers perceptions of the performance appraisals.

Significance to Social Change

The topic may have depth and potential for facilitating positive social change as the outcome of the study may generate credible data on best practices for measuring the performance of employees for improved management decisions, policy formulation, and guidance for top management executive. The results could serve as a policy document to guide managers in all fields of specialization. Information may also be provided to organizations and agencies with ample evidence for improving on the fairness perceptions of PA on job satisfaction. Additional insight into the perceptions of fairness of performance evaluations on job satisfaction could also be furnished in the results of the research in support of the performance management literature to add to the body of knowledge and impact positive social change.

An important benefit of this multiple case study would be an improvement in communication among management and employees, determination and provision of a career path for employees, encouragement of hard work, performance improvement, and improvement in the decision-making capabilities of organizational management (Khan &

Singh, 2016). The findings of the study would stimulate and advance social change by helping HR professionals, practitioners, managers, and organizations to gain more understanding of how employee perceptions of PAs could be conducted to ensure improved job satisfaction.

Summary and Transition

I explored the perceptions of fairness of employees of PA systems on job satisfaction in a healthcare organization. The PA literature was largely representative of quantitative studies conducted from the perspective of management; however, there was a need also to understand performance evaluations from the worker's perspective or both manager and worker perspectives using a qualitative approach. Organizational leadership must understand how to sustain the values of achievement and exploit them for the mutual benefit of employees and management. Because further education and training have been contended to have the capability of enforcing better job performance and improve employee engagement, emphasis should be placed on their design and values (Cappelli & Conyon, 2016).

The data collected have the potential of furnishing information towards understanding employee perceptions of fairness of appraisals on job satisfaction through the current research. This qualitative case study was needed to bridge the gap in the current literature and intended to explore the perceptions of fairness of employee PAs on job satisfaction in a healthcare environment.

Chapter 2 of the study included a review of current and extant seminal literature on PAs to understand why and how performance appraisals are undertaken. I examined

PA as an instrument for ensuring accountability and managing change for organizational growth and development and provided an overview of the theoretical foundations of the phenomenon. The chapter also includes a description of some of the methods used to obtain feedback, and factors that impacted performance appraisal outcomes about job satisfaction. Further challenges associated with the implementation of the phenomenon such as raters, ratees, and their fairness perceptions were examined. The review of the literature revealed further that though the appraisal exercise continued to evolve, the little or paucity of the literature indicated that employee perceptions of its fairness had remained inaccurate and unfair despite its use to facilitate organizational goals.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

PAs have continued to dominate discourse in the management literature and continue to remain a major concern in organizations as they are central to the HRM function (Arogundade & Olasunkanmi-Alimi, 2015). It is a basic and indispensable component of performance management which involves a systematic evaluation of employee job performance and setting standards as part of the business process (Radebe, 2015). Performance evaluation policy has been regarded by HRM professionals and organizations as an effective career development management tool for managers and employees that guide employees through corporate advancement.

Appraisals enable employees to obtain a clearer understanding of expectations for progression (Bhurtel & Adhikari, 2016; Mathew & Johnson, 2015). However, an effective PA policy and system have presented employees and managers a challenge in contributing to motivational, cognitive, and behavioral factors (Akinbowale, Lourens, & Jinabhai, 2014). PA is an essential instrument for effective management, although little has been explored to assess its impact on employee attitudinal outcomes (such as job satisfaction), growth and development because of a perceived development, as well as lack of its fairness and inaccuracy (Buvaneswari & Mujeeb Rahman, 2015). Earlier researchers revealed that an organization's performance management system was hindering its effectiveness and this situation called for a new process to improve trust in responsible supervisors at every level (Hauck, 2014). Although it has been regarded as problematic, PA is deemed necessary in organizational management because when

employees perceive it to be fair, it produces positive behavior and vice versa (Ibeogu & Ozturen, 2015).

Organizations are continuously searching for a bias-free and integrated performance assessment and management systems to achieve business excellence, attain organizational goals, and to sustain and survive competition in the long-run (Sanyal & Biswas, 2015). Effective appraisals depend on the perceptions of employees of their appraisals to be fair regarding both procedure and interaction with their respective appraiser. Achieving the highest possible performance standards involves evaluating staff performance and responding appropriately to performance issues while simultaneously providing corrective feedback (Clarke, Harcourt, & Flynn, 2013).

This chapter is an overview on the literature search strategy, literature establishing the relevance of the research, conceptual framework, historical perspective of performance appraisals, and the perceptions of employees about job satisfaction. Other sections of the chapter include performance appraisal feedback outcomes and methods, rater/ratee accountability of performance appraisals, a review of the research methodology, rationale for using a case study design, and a summary of the chapter.

Literature Establishing the Relevance of the Research

The literature establishing the relevance of this research include information obtained from the in-depth review, synthesis, and analysis of the literature presented further in this chapter and the literature review conducted about performance appraisals. The reviews of the performance management literature which framed the relevance and justification for conducting this research (Sanyal & Biswas, 2014). Recommendations

have been made that further qualitative research on the perception and values of performance appraisals be conducted, as workers and top management executives in organizations needed to better understand and design improved performance appraisal systems.

Literature Search Strategy

The purpose of this literature review was to analyze current research on performance appraisals. Information for review of the literature was obtained by utilizing several libraries and electronic databases including search engines. The databases included scholarly and peer-reviewed journals, websites, theses, and dissertations that were available electronically, and reference lists of relevant articles, as well as research documents. The principal electronic databases that were utilized for the review included Academic Search Premier, EBSCO, ABI/INFORM, ProQuest, Psyche INFO, LexisNexis Academic, PsycARTICLES, Emerald Insight socINDEX with full text and publishers' databases such as Springer, Elsevier JSTOR and ISSN, all of which were maintained from the Walden University database.

Boolean search terms such as *perceptions* and *fairness, performance appraisals* and *fairness, performance measurement* and *fairness, performance evaluations on job satisfaction, employee perceptions of performance appraisals, performance appraisals,* and *employee perceptions, performance assessments,* and *employee perceptions on job satisfaction, equity fairness perceptions* were utilized in searching the databases. These search terms and keywords included variations that evolved throughout the iterative search process. The initial search was based on phrases such as performance

measurement, performance assessment, performance evaluation, and performance appraisal.

Following this search method, the items that emerged were examined in terms of relevance. Relevance in this context means that the database would select items and prioritize them based on their relevance to the search terms or key terms. I scanned and selected those that met my needs or those that met my reading interest in relation to my study. Within the selected articles, other keywords would be suggested and those were then entered into the search engines along with date ranges.

Google Scholar was also used extensively to supplement the researched databases through the creation of alerts based on several search criteria that returned a lot of related recent articles and academic sources that were not revealed in the searches within the academic databases. With the information gathered from Google Scholar, the publication data would be entered into the Walden Library databases to confirm the document's existence and standing as an academic, peer-reviewed, refereed, or scholarly work. The databases were searched from inception through 2018 for relevant and latent peer-reviewed published citations specifically for the last 3-5 years to ensure the analysis of recent articles related to the research topic to meet the 85/15% requirement for the dissertation.

Conceptual Framework

Merriam (2009) contended that the conceptual framework affects every aspect of the study from determining how to frame the problem and the purpose of how the data are collected. Ravitch and Riggan (2012) explained that a conceptual framework enables

the research to make reasoned defensible choices, match research questions with those choices, align analytic tools with research questions that thereby guide the data collection, analysis, and interpretation (Monaghan, Sanders, Kelly, Cogen, & Streisand, 2011). Without a conceptual framework, there would be no way of making reasoned decisions during the research process (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Maxwell, 2005).

Equity theory, perception theory, organizational justice, and the two-factor theory constituted the conceptual frameworks of this study. The theories provided the framework for assessing the complex divergent views regarding the fairness perceptions of employees about job satisfaction. The theories provided critical relevance in business practice to management research (Devlin, Roy, & Sekhon, 2014; Khaldoun, Ababneh, Hackett, & Schat, 2014; Kim, Lin, & Leung, 2015).

The literature about organizational justice is concerned with the knowledge and understanding of the relationship between people's perceptions of fairness, behavior, and attitudes at the workplace, as applied to performance assessments (Kim et al., 2015). Employees' work commitment has also been associated with the outcome of performance assessments regarding organizational justice (Bobocel & Mu, 2016). There is empirical evidence concerning the interaction between distributive, procedural and interactional perceived justice, and satisfaction that called for the need to focus on distributive justice to nurture satisfaction because distributive justice moderates the relationship between satisfaction with loyalty (Bahri-Ammari & Bilgihan, 2017).

Perceived organizational injustice increases employees' tendency to engage in organizational deviance (Balogun, 2017; Kim et al., 2015). It was expected to have several studies that began in the 1980s demonstrating a robust understanding between fairness perceptions and organizational commitment, although organizational justice was found to partially influence job satisfaction (Karakose, 2014). Organizational justice (distributive, procedural, interactional, or interpersonal) influences performance appraisal satisfaction (Karakose, 2014).

Job satisfaction and trust in workers towards PA are needed for improved performance (Bin Abdullah, Anamalai, bt Ismail, & Ling, 2015). Workers who are satisfied with their jobs were more likely to be innovative, creative, and initiate breakthroughs to enhance their job performance while on the contrary, employees who are dissatisfied with their jobs became irritable, tense that often led to inefficiency and other negative effects on the process of performance assessments (Usop, Askandar, & Langguyuan-Kadtong, 2013).

This research was framed mainly within the organizational justice theory (Adams, 1963, 1965) and the two-factor or dual motivational theory (Herzberg, 1959). These theories became the overarching theories and the basis of a complex set of processes that constituted the conceptual framework of the study as a means of stimulating, preserving, and directing human behavior, attitude, and perceptions (Khaldoun et al., 2014). Understanding the connection between the two theories was important to this study and may support arguments that motivation is a basic condition for the success of the PA

process. A highly-motivated workforce is indispensable to the attainment of sustained high-performance outcomes (Harrington & Lee, 2014).

Organizations with more satisfied and contented employees tend to be more effective as happy employees are more likely to be productive workers (Pajibo & Adjabeng, 2015). Researchers have argued that to motivate employees, organizations and employers could encourage employees to work efficiently through PAs based on individual and group performance relating to reward systems, internal promotion based on merit and other types of incentives to support and sustain the interest of employees (Nzoka, 2015). These theories were chosen because they are considered the most relevant under constant research aimed at reflecting the conceptual underpinnings and methodological framework adopted to demonstrate the comparative findings of the exploratory dimensions to cover the research on the perceived fairness of PAs. The theories reviewed were developed in the middle of the century between the 1950s and 1960s and utilized as the basis for the conceptual framework.

The Equity Theory

Adams's equity theory involves organizational justice-distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Devlin et al., 2014; Khaldoun et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2015; Worthington & Devlin, 2015). The theory states that people will be better motivated if they are handled or treated equitably and de-motivated if they are treated inequitably (Kuranchie-Mensah & Amponsah-Tawiah, 2016). It is a theory that describes relational satisfaction regarding justice perceptions of fair or unfair distribution of resources within interpersonal relationships, which has continued to remain a major

concern for social scientists since the 1960s (Agyare, Yuhui, Mensah, Aidoo, & Opoku Ansah, 2016; Indriani, 2015).

Adams, in developing the theory, propounded that employees seek fairness regarding their contribution to an organization and what they gain in return specifically from the organization in terms of what they think other employees' contribution have been and what the organization offers in return to those employees remain unfair (Agyare et al., 2016). Bobocel and Mu (2016) referred to this theory as involving people's perceptions of fairness of outcomes received from the organization (distributive justice); people's perceptions of the fairness of procedures by which decisions are made (procedural justice); and people's perceptions of the quality of information and personal treatment received from decision making agents (interactional justice). According to Bobocel and Mu, management theorists have identified procedural and interactional justice as directly relevant to the study of the fairness of the PA process while distributive justice has relevance in team-based appraisals such that procedural justice deals with rules and formal processes and the degree to which they are perceived to have been followed.

The findings of a study revealed that job satisfaction mediated the relationship between procedural and distributive justice and turnover intention, as both have significant impact on worker's intention to leave a job (Masum et al., 2016), while interactional justice had no significant effect on job satisfaction or turnover intention (Bayarçelik & Findikli, 2016). Workers who perceived less than fair distribution of extrinsic outcomes experienced heightened intention to leave, compared to those who

perceived fair distribution hence overall satisfaction partially mediated the relationship (Hurst, Scherer, & Allen, 2016). If workers suffer low job satisfaction, their dissatisfaction relatively threatens their job performance (Moghadam, Peiravian, Naderis, Rajabzadeh, & Reza Rasekha, 2014). It has also been contended that if an employee likes his or her job, then it could be said that the employee is satisfied with the current job and if he or she dislikes the present job then it could be said that he or she is not satisfied with the present job (Saqib, Khan, & Khan, 2015).

Adams's equity theory becomes particularly relevant to this study on the perceptions of fairness of PAs. Tahar-Kedem (2014), utilized Adams's equity theory along with Herzberg's two-factor theory, to investigate the underlying assumptions of whether motivation is essential in creating new lifestyles that calls for the need to find out how increased understanding of the perceptions of PAs may facilitate the development of a more accurate, efficient, and effective PA processes or systems to attain ultimate success in performance evaluations and management of employees at the workplace in the various organizations. It could also be a tool of guaranteeing human rights and the prohibition of discrimination at the workplace (Kim & Holzer, 2016).

Drawing on the equity theory, it was hypothesized in a study that the perceptions of workers about their ability to contribute relative to peer bias negatively influenced their satisfaction with the outcomes of the PA process (Kobussen, Kalagnanam, & Vaidyanathan, 2014). Equity, trust, and transparency were considered essential elements of management and governance (Wu, Ma, & Yu, 2017).

The perceptions of fairness, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are believed to be connected to citizenship behavior (Raza et al., 2015). The perception of employees about fairness in the workplace is referred to as organizational justice. Organizational justice could be evaluated through distributive justice (related to the outcomes), procedural justice (related to the process), and interactive justice (related to the interpersonal interactions (Faheem & Mahmud, 2015). Adams (1963) indicated that unfair treatment impacted employees negatively, and increased the chances of deviant behavior in the workplace (Mathew & Johnson, 2015).

Organizational justice. Organizational justice is central to understanding employee's perceptions and reactions to the entire performance management process through PA (Govender, Grobler, & Joubert, 2015). Justice is based on ethical and moral principles, and respect for human values susceptible to justice, using fair value procedures (Delshad, Kolouie, & Ali, 2016). Current trends in the management literature emphasized the role of justice in the employee performance evaluation process because increased employee performance tended to represent an important objective of organizations to sustain business success (Rusu, Avasilcăi, & Huțu, 2016). A holistic system of evaluating employee performance becomes necessary for various reasons including the challenges of the process, and the complexity of its assessment towards job satisfaction (Lyde, Grieshaber, & Byrns, 2016).

There is substantial research that examined the impact of organizational justice perceptions on employee behavior and the role of the effectiveness of managers as organizational justice involves employee's perceptions of fairness with which employees

are treated by the organization (Paramanandam, 2013). Any negative behavior towards the appraisal system that arises from employee perceptions is viewed as the source of conflict and unhappiness. When employees perceive appraisals to be fair, it generates positive behavior and vice versa. On the contrary, employees' feeling of injustice during decision-making and implementation may result in psychological challenges including anxiety, stress, and depression (Turhan, Köprülü, & Helvaci, 2016). Injustice seemed to be more detrimental to white-collar workers than to blue-collar workers due to the different kinds of relationships with their supervisors within the organizational context (Herr et al., 2015). Herr et al. (2015) explained that it meant that the relationship of white-collar workers tended to be more strongly associated with expectations and obligations beyond the formal contract. Sometimes the relationship became even stronger only among women employees of the organization (Ford, 2014).

The results also supported procedural justice as playing a dominant role over distributive and interactional justice. Employees who perceived themselves or peers as recipients of organizational justice to the greater extent reported greater benefits and expressed higher levels of acceptance and better evaluation outcomes that supported procedural justice as playing a dominant role over distributive and interactional justice (Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, & Ting Ding, 2017).

Researchers have highlighted the significant role of performance appraisals in strategic human resource management within the organizational context. Rusu et al. (2016) presented a model of a conceptual framework of employee PA that utilized the contextual factors within the human resource management function. The model in Figure

1 illustrates the role of organizational justice factors, performance criteria, and standards, consensus building agreements, feedback outcomes and employee development and training as a basis for a customized, flexible, and meaningful employee performance appraisal systems and processes to enhance individual and organizational overall performance.




Figure 1. Conceptual framework of employee performance appraisal. Adapted from the Annals of the University of Oradea: Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering.

The entire view of respondents in another study conducted, showed a positive rating towards distributive justice, procedural justice, and interpersonal justice in performance appraisal, while rating positively, the PA metrics that defined high satisfaction with the appraisal system (Ibeogu & Ozturen, 2015). Employees place great emphasis on justice due to its relevance for important reasons, as fairness ensures that rewards are predictable and controllable (instrumental reasons), shows that ratees or recipients are valued and respected (relational reasons), and that fair treatment is a moral imperative owed by every worker (moral reason; Galanakis et al., 2015). It is not surprising that the fairness perceptions of work outcomes, procedures, and interpersonal considerations could determine employee behavior about job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and attitudes such as citizenship behavior and job performance (Yang, Bauer, Johnson, Groer, & Salomon, 2014).

As empirical support, subjectivity increases fairness perceptions when the entire focus on subjective measures is relatively low, but subjectivity reduces fairness perceptions when the entire emphasis on subjective measures is relatively high (Voußem, Kramer, & Schäffer, 2016). The practical implication is that supervisors of employees could boost employee performance through the proposition of utilizing organizational justice with an emphasis on their fair interaction with subordinates and teams (Khan, Anjum, Ul Amin, & Aftab, 2016). Scholars are of the view that the level of employees in an organization tended to influence their fairness perceptions while those at high levels have high perceptions of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice (Githui & Wario, 2013; Tsai & Wang, 2013).

Perceived justice and trust among employees could influence the effectiveness of the execution of the PA process and their trust towards management, and the organization tends to have a direct effect towards improving job satisfaction among employees (Bin Abdullah, Anamalai, bt Ismail, & Ling, 2015). Previous researchers on the interaction patterns between procedural and distributive fairness generally supported the fair process and impact that fair procedures and processes tended to ameliorate negative reactions to adverse decision outcomes (Lilly & Wipawayangkool, 2017). Distributive and procedural justice have a more significant influence on the ethical behavior of workers of organizations than informational and interpersonal justice (Shah, Anwar, & Irani, 2017); so, workers' perception of organizational justice thus became regarded as one of the main features in obtaining insights into human behavior in the organizational context (Rahman, Haque, Elahi, & Miah, 2015).

Perception theory. The theory explores the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals at the workplace. It becomes critical to consider how workers perceive information collected about people, processes, and outcomes, and how their understanding impacts their decision making. According to Norman and Kabwe (2015), perception is about acquiring, receiving, selecting, transforming, and organizing information supplied or received by senses that could be described as a process whereby people choose, organize, and interpret sensory stimulation into a consistent and relevant picture of the real-world situation. Perceived fairness is a critical dimension of PA for employee motivation and job satisfaction (Iqbal et al., 2015). Norman and Kabwe maintained that although some workers considered the same sensory input as one or the

another, they perceived it differently and identified three main factors that influence perceptions: Factors in the situation (the social setting and time), factors in the perceiver (behavior or attitudes, motives, interests, and experience), and factors in the target (proximity, sounds, motion, and size).

If the perceiver has negative past experiences, behavior or attitude, little interest, or perceived value towards the performance management system then perception is likely to be negatively impacted and vice versa. Gatewood, Field, Barrick, and Ostroff (2015) revealed that human resource practices and outcomes of PAs depended on the perceptions of employees to concretize the view that if ratees and raters perceive the whole appraisal system negatively, then its outcome may highly likely be negative. The findings of a study that explored the effects on individual workers' perceptions of the validity, feasibility, and procedural and distributive justice in performance appraisals in subsidiaries of multinational corporations, using a multiple case study design with interview data from 33 supervisors and professionals in six subsidiaries of three organizations revealed that perceptions of the performance appraisal process were driven by a number of factors related to the unit, individual levels and relationships (Sumelius et al., 2014).

According to the results of research, passive leadership exerted an indirect adverse influence on employee perception of justice through cognition-based trust (Holtz & Hu, 2017). The implication of this is that passive leadership may pose a serious challenge to effective supervisor-employee relations, as employees may not trust a supervisor who displays passive leadership style or traits and lack of trust that could

make employees perceive the supervisor as unfair. A study conducted on the effect of justice on employee performance, revealed that there is collective performance, trust, and organizational commitment among employees where positive perception of organizational fairness prevailed in organizations (Devlin et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2015; Niazi & Hassan, 2016; Worthington & Devlin, 2015). The main component of perceptions, for the purpose and relevance of this study, would emphasize the relationship between perceptions and decision making within organizations.

The Two-Factor Theory of Herzberg

Tahar-Kedem (2014) used the two-factor-theory of Herzberg to associate hygiene or sources of job satisfaction, with aspects of job context and indicated that dissatisfiers were more likely to constitute part of the work setting itself rather than the nature of the work itself including factors such as interpersonal relations, technical quality of supervision, organizational policies and administration, and base wage or salary. Herzberg advised that managers devote special attention to the satisfier factors such as a sense of achievement, feelings of recognition, a sense of responsibility, the opportunity for advancement, and feelings of personal growth and development to improve motivation. Tahar-Kedem also noted that the satisfier factors dealt with what people do in their work as part of job content. Herzberg also argued that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction both have a direct impact on motivation and productivity, and that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are influenced by two separate drivers called motivating factors and hygiene factors.

Through enhancements in what people are asked to do in their jobs, Herzberg contended that job satisfaction and performance could be enhanced. Satisfied employees generally demonstrated higher job performance over time than did unsatisfied employees because job performance is a significant contributor to individual's satisfaction with their work (Alessandri, Borgogni, & Latham, 2016). The employee work environment is associated with job satisfaction and their intent to stay, as positive conducive work environments improve job satisfaction (Al-Hamdan, Manojlovich, & Tanima, 2016). Applying Herzberg's two-factor theory in a study on the role of employee voice and job satisfaction, the findings of a cross-sectional design, which utilized questionnaires obtained from 300 nonmanagerial workers of a large private organization revealed that a positive relationship existed between the voice of employees and job satisfaction because the acknowledgment of employee's voice-enable a motivational environment in improving job satisfaction levels (Alfayad, Suriani, & Arif, 2017). The findings implied that organizations needed to provide support and reinforce workers' expression of ideas that could lead to organizational efficiency and effectiveness based on performance appraisals.

Tahar-Kedem (2014) further utilized Adams's equity theory for making social comparisons with the notion that perceived inequity is a motivating condition such that when people believe they have been unfairly treated in comparison to others, they would be motivated to eliminate the discomfort and restore a perceived sense of equity under the circumstance that led to it. Since motivation is the essence to organizational effectiveness

and a predictor of performance and job satisfaction (Dutt, 2016), a motivated employee produces results efficiently and effectively to add value to corporate success.

The relationship between organizational justice and employee job satisfaction differed between full time and part-time employees (Omeluzor, Tinuoye, & Akpojotor, 2016). However, employees who perceived themselves or peers as recipients of organizational justice to the greater extent reported greater benefits and expressed higher levels of acceptance and better evaluation outcomes that supported procedural justice as playing a dominant role over distributive and interactional justice (Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, & Ting Ding, 2017).

Motivators such as recognition, appreciation, and good work conditions are generally considered extrinsic hygiene factors, achievement of challenging tasks, relationship with coworkers, trust, and recognition by senior management, finding and reconfirming previously established theories of motivation developed differently were all found to be more influential than pay (Agwa & Salem, 2015). What might be considered a motivation for an employee or group of workers might not be motivational for another employee or group, based on the context of the important factors that influenced motivation (Gelard & Rezaei, 2016).

The PA process is believed to exert influence on the present and future performance of employees on the one hand, and the processes of their promotion, training, transfer, motivation, and discharge on the other (Riratanaphong, 2014; Shiekhah, Sarhan, Abbad, & Istaiteyah, 2015). According to Shiekhah et al. (2015), work experience has a statistical significance and relationship with the perception of employees

regarding fairness treatment. Shiekhah et al. found that there was an impact of the personal characteristics on employee perception towards the objectivity of PAs to confirm the employee belief that performance appraisal outcomes were not objective.

The results of the study were extended to agree with another research which also discovered that employees' low perception of the PA system objectivity affected their different levels of perception about their performance development, regardless of their personal and job-related characteristics. The relationship between organizational justice, job satisfaction, and commitment has been widely researched in recent times and several studies support the notion that the fairness perceptions of employees of their PAs are primarily related to employee motivation, commitment, and job satisfaction in their organizations (Salleh, Amin, Muda, & Abdul Halim, 2013). It is also believed that organizational cynicism influenced employee job satisfaction, as both are inevitably linked to each other to establish the relationship between employee job satisfaction, continuance, and commitment, thus becoming recognized as a well-known fact (Khan, Naseem, & Masood, 2016).

The aim of this section of the research study was to gain deeper insight and more clarification on the applicability of the two identified motivational theories postulated by Adams and Herzberg to obtain answers for the research question regarding perceived fairness of PAs on job satisfaction. Based on the review and synthesis of the literature, the conceptual framework guiding the present study has been presented in Figure 2 to demonstrate the relationship between employee perceptions of performance appraisals on job satisfaction. The model predicts what the fairness perceptions of employees of

performance appraisal would have on job satisfaction. It also predicts that the satisfaction of performance appraisals mediates the relationship between the fairness perceptions and job satisfaction as the continuous monitoring and management of individual employee competencies should be the focus of HR departments. The model represented in Figure 2 may also serve as an important tool in attracting and retaining talent through appraisals as a strategic and innovative HR practice to drive and manage employee potentials (Sanyal, Biswas, & Ghosh, 2016).




Figure 2. Conceptual framework establishing the relationship between the fairness perceptions of performance appraisals on job satisfaction.

Performance Appraisals, Effectiveness, and Management

PA is a procedure for assessing employee performance based on preset standards and an assessment of the employee's contribution and ability (Chang, 2015). It is one of the most important HRM functions and forms an integral part of the HRM processes and

should be perceived by all employees as fair. Saha (2015) extended this definition by adding that performance should be compared to a set of standards that must be communicated to workers. As a tool for performance management, there is the need to make frantic efforts at implementing effective performance management practices requiring considerable improvement in the levels of adopting PAs with fair perceptions in organizations to improve work performance and job satisfaction (Haase & Franco, 2016; Wickramasinghe, 2016).

PA is a means of ensuring that personal goals align with an employer's objectives and values to achieve high levels of job satisfaction and intention to remain within their current organization (Bednall, Sanders, & Runhaar, 2014). The effectiveness of PAs remains a vital issue in the theory and practice of human resource performance management (Iqbal et al., 2015). The justification provided for implementing a performance evaluation system is to help improve workers' performance and enhance the overall institutional effectiveness (Arthur, 2015).

Further research and review of the performance management literature revealed the problems, challenges, and purposes advanced in this topic. In-depth review of the literature on performance appraisals revealed that the perceptions of performance appraisals play a role in employee job satisfaction. Similarly, several studies have shown that the impact of PAs on employee attitude and behavior is through the satisfaction of performance assessments (Zopiatis, Constanti, & Theocharous, 2014). The roles of ratees (employees) and raters (supervisors) in supporting or hindering ratees perceptions of PAs on job satisfaction became the bane or focus of this research. The research plan included

an investigation of the outcomes of PA fairness perceptions of employees on job satisfaction.

There was a set of approved open-ended interview questions and initial interviews with human resource practitioners to gain insight into their perspectives of PAs, based on experience compared to those of employees about job satisfaction and how perceptions hindered or promoted job satisfaction. The purpose of the study was to help alleviate the challenges associated with the inaccurate, unfair, and negative perceptions of PAs of workers in organizations.

It is intended in this study to address a lack of knowledge and understanding of the perceptions of fairness of PAs by exploring perceptions in relation to enhanced motivation, job satisfaction, and benefits and rewards (Riratanaphong, 2014). The purpose of this qualitative exploratory case study was to explore and understand employee perceptions of PA systems and how they are associated with job satisfaction within a healthcare organization. The study may add to the body of knowledge on the philosophical underpinnings of the significance of the fairness perceptions of PA of employees about job satisfaction.

Origin and Current State of Performance Appraisals

PA (merit rating) is one of the oldest and most universal practices in the workplace (Iqbal, Ahmad, Haider, Batool, & Ul-ain, 2013). According to Iqbal et al. (2015), people used it to judge others as well as judging themselves. Because of the aggressive competition confronting business organizations each day, there was the need to develop more competencies to meet with the globalization challenges of implementing

innovative human resource management practices. It originated as a basic technique of income justification and used to determine whether the wage or salary of a worker was justified (Chetana, Pattnaik, & Mohapatra, 2015).

Organizations need to emphasize employee reaction and satisfaction towards PAs for desired behavior and attitudes to attain organizational goals eventually. Chetana et al. (2015) suggested that positive employee reactions are critical for an effective PA process to develop the trust of employees in organizational systems, as perceived accuracy and acceptability of performance appraisals have a positive influence on trust management (Denkyira, 2014). There are two methods of PAs, the traditional and modern (Mehrotra & Phillips, 2013).

The history of PA has remained dominated by the need to assess employee performance in organizations (Sing & Vadivelu, 2016). PA systems evolved in different forms in the form of instruments, or tools, systems, and applications used in both private and public-sector organizations as a means of evaluating the performance of employees. The origin of PAs has been traced to date as far back as the 1800s during the establishment of the Robert Owen's in Scottish cotton mills, where superintendents used colored pieces of wood to assess the performance of workers (Al Fazari & Rahman Khan, 2016; Saeed & Shah, 2016).

The history of traditional PA was argued to also have its roots in the early 20th century and could be traced to Taylor's pioneering Time and Motion studies, although the appraisal concept was adopted by the U.S army during the First World War in the form of merit rating to involve a man-to-man rating system for the evolution of military personnel

from where the concept was further adopted by the business world with restriction to hourly-paid workers (Iqbal et al., 2013). Despite the laudatory goals, the traditional PA often remained ineffective in improving the individual's work performance and has remained questioned (Budworth et al., 2014).

As a top priority in today's changing environment to encounter competition; however, the modern PA approach is based on skills improvement, learning abilities and future development and growth of employees by aligning their performance with organizational needs (Chetana et al., 2015). Employee performance could be reviewed to assist in the determination of who may need training, the kind of training required to enhance job performance, and when appraisal should be undertaken appropriately to become an effective instrument for providing feedback to workers by managers (Ohene Afriyie, 2015).

Benefits and Attributes of Performance Appraisal

PA is about evaluating employees' past and current performance relative to performance standards that exist in academic and practitioner literature (Daga & Kappor, 2014). Daga and Kappor (2014) identified the benefits of PAs to include several factors such as facilitation of communication, enhancement of employee focus through promoting trust, goal setting and desired performance reinforcement; performance improvement and the determination of training needs. Daga and Kappor, also considered that attributes that should be considered in undertaking PAs and methods are several and fall in two main categories as personality traits (personal qualities and demonstrated qualities). The personal traits identified included adaptability, appearance and bearing,

decisiveness, dependability, drive and determination, initiative, ingenuity, integrity, and maturity. Others included tenacity, stamina, verbal, and written expressions. The demonstrated performance qualities included professional knowledge, administrative ability, and responsibility for staff development, delegation abilities, foresight, motivation, morale, and control.

Performance Appraisal Perceptions

While researchers recognized the significance of the fairness perceptions of PAs in successful organizations, a major challenge that confronts HRM practitioners is having accurate, fair, and effective PA systems (Dewettinck & van Dijk, 2013). However, little is known about the organizational and psychological factors that influence employees' fairness perceptions of PAs, as most studies have focused on structural factors instead of cognitive or psychological perspectives (Harrington & Lee, 2014). Research conducted in Great Britain showed that 80% of employees were dissatisfied with their PA system while only 10% indicated that their organizations' formal PA system helped them improve their performance (Aleassa, 2014).

Tsai and Wan (2013) gathered data through interviews and showed that employee perceptions of PA accuracy and outcomes were affected by certain cultural characteristics and management tradition of the organization (Tsai & Wang, 2013). Perceived fairness refers to a person's judgment of whether an effort vs. the outcome obtained is acceptable, reasonable, and just and that an unfair outcome distribution, on the contrary, could lead to negative consequences. Perceived unfairness held a negative impact on customer satisfaction while other researchers further found that an unfair treatment could lead to

customer switch and customer revenge (Tseng & Kuo, 2014). According to Adams (1963, 1965), fairness refers to how much people are aware of and compare themselves with other people's situations. People would attempt to maintain fairness by comparing the (inputs and outputs) that others would bring to (and receive from) the same behavior.

If the ratio between these inputs and outputs is equal, people would perceive the given situation as fair. Effective PAs depend on workers' perceiving their job evaluation to be fair both in terms of procedure and interaction with their respective appraisers, as the results of a research suggested that certain issues had been causing some sense of unfairness and most of this injustice in the PAs were procedural (Clarke et al., 2013). Employees who benefit from an effective PA could gain rewards and have a clearer understanding of their career path (Balcioglu & Nihinlola, 2014).

The idea suggested that customers would expect to pay the same cost when obtaining the same benefits from the same transactions. If people noticed that others were getting more benefits for their inputs, they would be dissatisfied, and that could result in an unfair feeling. Previous researchers on consumer behavior have found that unfair treatment could lead to negative consumer reactions (Pichler, 2012), as a situation perceived as just, could lead to higher employee legitimacy than situations perceived as unjust (Gouveia-Pereira, Vala, & Correia, 2016). One of the critical factors that drive potential acceptability and success of any PA system is the ratee's reaction to the appraisal system, as the acceptance or rejection of the evaluation system may depend on perceptions of its fairness (Harrington & Lee, 2014). The more employees perceived their

PA and system as fair, the more they reported higher levels of trust and satisfaction with the appraisal system (Rafferty & Jimmieson, 2016).

Empirical research justified the significant impact the reactions of employees have towards PA and motivation (Kuvaas, 2011). Employee perceived reactions including perceived fairness, accuracy, acceptability, and satisfaction of performance appraisal are important in determining employee job motivation (Gelard & Rezaei, 2016), while the perceived ineffectiveness of PA has no significant impact on the determination of the motivation of employees' influence in determining employee motivation (Buvaneswari & Mujeeb Rahman, 2015). The findings of a study showed that only perception of PA fairness had an impact on employees' ethical decision making (Goksoy & Alayoglu, 2013).

The findings of another study revealed that perceived managerial trustworthiness reduced the effect of the relationship between overall fairness and perceived supervisory trustworthiness of performance assessments and, pay-for-performance was significantly related to both forms of perceived trustworthiness (Chughtai, Byrne & Flood, 2014; Kong & Barsness, 2016). There is an impact of the personal characteristics of employees' perception towards the objectivity of PAs as employees always believed that PAs have not been objective enough (Shiekhah et al., 2015).

Rater and Ratee Performance Appraisal Accountability

The purpose of PA is to improve the contribution of employees towards the attainment of organizational goals and objectives. However, appraisers and appraisees do not respond favorably to PA systems unless they found it equitable, while it has been

acknowledged that PA has not helped in providing the desired results (Abdelhadi, Jamal, & André, 2015; Dusterhoff et al., 2014). Measuring the accountability of and quality of employee effectiveness vis a vis that of the accountability and effectiveness of raters has been a well-researched and lengthy history (Lyde et al., 2016).

Although rater accountability has been acknowledged for its potential critical characteristic of performance rating because of discrepant outcomes in the performance management literature, its impact on performance ratings has remained unclear (Harari & Rudolph, 2016). Consistent with expectations, Harari and Rudolph, in a study using meta-analytic methods to synthesize findings of performance assessments across 35 samples in addressing rater accountability revealed that the influence of raters on PA ratings varied such that accountability substantially influenced ratings only when raters are held accountable by the ratee versus a superior, consistent with identification and justification of assessment manipulations (Harari & Rudolph, 2016).

The results of another study showed that the identity and role of supervisors differed significantly and determined the implications for PA standardization to embrace cultural diversity (Nair & Salleh, 2015). It has been revealed that if users (ratee and rater) did not approve, keep up, and perceive psychometrically comprehensive PA as fair or just, it would not fulfill its objectives and subsequently failed as employees who perceived their performance appraisal to be fair would consciously or subconsciously contribute positively in response to organizational needs and goals (Nair & Salleh, 2015).

Ensuring that managers engage in fair behaviors during performance evaluations is critical for the effective functioning of organizations, as the lack of available self-

regulatory resources could lead to assessment gaps resulting from employees' ability to accurately appraise the fairness of their behavior or performance which could be hampered (Whiteside & Barclay, 2016). A survey of 330 employees with two case examples drawn from qualitative interviews supported and illustrated that the perceived performance evaluations in which the circumstances, nature, and quality of an employee's job were subject to unfavorable assessments by superior authority were due to the negative assumptions and misapprehensions associated with PAs (Snella Yi, & Chak, 2013).

Prior researchers have minimally examined the relationship between PA of individual employees and their behavior beyond the utilization of efficiency-based assessments as appraisals may not only induce, but also lessen dysfunctional employee behaviors (Johansen & Christoffersen, 2016).

Employee and Supervisor/Manager Perceptions of Appraisals

PAs have remained a significant measuring tool in developing the capabilities of employees in organizations and must be given serious consideration (Sing & Vadivelu, 2016). In a study involving customer service representatives, Birkenmeier and Sanséau (2015) found a strong relationship between employee perceptions of supervisors/managers and employee trust in supervisors/managers, compared to a weak correlation between the perceptions of supervisors/managers and job performance (Snella et al., 2013). Supervisor support and the moderating role of fairness perception relationships plays a substantial role in increasing employee job satisfaction (Farndale, 2013; Qureshi & bin Ab Hamid, 2017).

Accountability pressures have generated PA controls in assessing and improving work conditions with the trade-offs presented by the extent of performance and the lack of consensus on the exact factors that could improve the outcome of PA on job satisfaction (Amirkhanyan, Meier, O'Toole, Dakhwe, & Janzen, 2017). Research on factors such as quality, feedback, source, link of the annual confidential report (ACR) system with other HRM functions, and administrative effectiveness found the overall appraisal system to be ineffective and perceived to be a subjective yet ritualized system in the absence of a constant feedback loop (Purohit & Martineau, 2016).

Ratees' Fairness Perceptions per Raters' Distorted Appraisal Outcomes

As one of the most comprehensively researched topics in organizational/industrial research, the main issues have evolved around rating errors, rater training, appraisal feedback, and reactions to the appraisal process (Taneja et al., 2015). The motivation of managers to provide accurate performance evaluation of employees has remained an unexplored area of study in public administration and management calling for a rater motivation model (Park, 2014). Park (2014) contended that whereas some academics and human resource practitioners perceived the PA system as a motivational tool, others viewed it as a source of employee de-motivation bringing its role in employee motivation into dispute. There has been empirical evidence to establish that ratees' perceptions and those of raters regarding performance feedback were found to not often be the same, as feedback content should receive equal priority and fair treatment of employees (Zhan, 2016).

A study conducted to examine the perception of public sector employees towards the fairness of performance appraisals and its influence on commitment, based on data obtained through a survey of 425 government employees, showed that perceived fairness of PAs influenced employee commitment towards the organizations through the mediating factor of satisfaction consistent with efforts by organizations to establish more accountable and transparent decision making process in organizations (Salleh et al., 2013). Harrington and Lee (2014) contended that fair and effective PAs were a necessary tool in organizations for several HR development functions such as improving employee performance, employee development capabilities, identifying high achievers for the distribution of rewards such as merit pay, promotion to create a psychological contract with employees. When PA is inclined towards politics and became biased, then chances to switch organizations or leave the current organization by employees increased (Aziz, Saif, Qureshi, Khan, & Khan, 2013; Nawaz, & Pangil, 2016; Salleh, et al., 2013).

According to Khan (2013), employees' perception of unhealthy work environment (such as an inequitable PA) negatively correlated to job satisfaction, employees' perception of PA systems plays a critical role in job satisfaction (Aziz et al., 2013). It might be argued that employees' perception of supervisors' personal commitment to fairness in the workplace and their acceptance of implementing change culminates in the conviction that they are concerned with their common interests that may hinder or otherwise lead to job satisfaction (Yang, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2016; Yukl, 2013). The possibilities of inequality determine equality feedback and outcomes as a benchmark for injustice (Bergh, Nilson, & Waldenström, 2016).

Previous research has revealed that under different conditions of the rater (sad or pleasant), and at different levels of interpersonal influence towards ratees (low or high), raters distorted employee rating outcomes (deflated or inflated respectively), and this shaped ratees' fairness perceptions in such a way that ratees who received inflated rating outcomes due to raters' high interpersonal influence and pleasant mood influence perceived more interpersonal and distributive fairness than ratees who received deflated ratings due to raters' low interpersonal influence and sad mood (Razzaq, Iqbal, Ikramullah, & Van Prooijen, 2016). There is considerable variation in cultural values within the country as people could be individualistic or collectivist. The results of a study showed that rater self-construal has significant impact on overall PAs so that raters with a high interdependent self-construal tended to show a preference for interdependent ratees, while raters on high interdependent self-construal do not show a preference for a specific type of ratees when conducting overall PAs (Mishra & Roch, 2013).

Such a finding may serve as an integration of the value for improving the knowledge and understanding of how rater-centric rating anomalies occur and subsequently determine and shape ratees' perceptions of fairness of their PA outcomes as far as perceived fairness of the PA process had a predictive impact on employees' attitude and organizational commitment (Gul & O'Connell, 2013). It behooves raters to provide objective and unbiased ratings or feedback on employees despite the lack of an accurate PA checklist and the managers' subjective opinions. Employee feedback received regarding performance related behavior, could serve to reward positive behavior, shape goals, increase awareness of the employees' challenges, provide a sense of efficacy, and

enhance motivation for job performance (David, 2013; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2017).

Factors Associated With Performance Appraisals

The formal use of PA systems is meant to help create accuracy, consistency, objectivity, and completeness of information to impart the perceptions of procedural justice based on the amount of subordinate voice involved in the performance evaluation process (Hartmann & Slapničar, 2013). Begum, Hossain, and Sarker (2015) identified six factors that influenced performance evaluations as the PA process, rater accuracy, communication, interpersonal factors, and training. Begun et al. contended that PA effectiveness could be influenced by these factors and maintained that the fairness in the measurement of PAs remained the main factor of effective PAS, resulting in the need to adopt a more systematic appraisal process to improve business performance and employee job satisfaction (Ali & Opatha, 2013). By evaluating individual employee performance, areas of relative strength could be identified and reinforced, while areas of weakness could be addressed in a manner consistent with improving performance (Adeyinka, Dagauda, & Mohammed, 2015).

It has also been contended that in a proper PA, accuracy, and fairness in evaluating employee's performance remained critical, and the organizational objectives must be resolute from the beginning before undertaking an effective performance management system (Begum et al., 2015). The findings of a study revealed that even if there was a problem with the accuracy of PA system in measuring the performance accurately, or due to rater error in the evaluation process, the employees' PA would not

be affected and could positively impact employees' motivation and satisfaction (Al Fazari & Rahman Khan, 2016). Self-assessment methods could be utilized and enhanced through the use of a clearly defined criteria; a systematic approach; instruction, cues, and feedback; and opportunities for revision and improvement, as job satisfaction is a significant predictor of organizational efficiency and effectiveness that also predicts the attitudes and behaviors of workers (Jiang et al., 2016).

Efforts to reduce evaluation biases while simultaneously engaging performers in structured self-assessment create an opportunity for transforming the annual PA process from a dreaded event to an improved performance outcome (Kromrei, 2015). The results of a study indicated that employees were satisfied with all factors in the performance evaluation system (Ullah Khan, 2013). The most paramount among these factors include a manager or rater support which had the least damage with the assessment process to meet the highest damage, based on the conclusion that feedback and managers' support variables had higher priorities on performance outcomes (Jamali, Hamidianpour, & Ahmadi, 2015).

Performance Appraisal Essentials

Ahmed (2015) identified 10 essential elements of a good PA system as focusing on the purpose of appraisal, standardization of variables for measuring performance, gathering information towards obtaining better results, assessment for complete production cycle and transparent policies, and the standardization of the appraisal process. Other essentials included training for raters/appraises, open communication, integration of PAs with the organization's goals, consistency, and management

commitment. Abdullah (2015) suggested four main constructs in defining the most influential context variables on rater judgment and behavior that potentially influence PA as management concerns, clarity of purpose of PAs, accountability, and the adequacy of PA instruments.

Performance Appraisal Metrics, Attitudes, and Behavioral Sensitivity

Developing high-quality PA operational metrics remains a challenge because designing metrics require the right degree of content to make it meaningful particularly to both employees and supervisors who will utilize the metrics (Evans & Tourish, 2015). Results of research have shown that when employees were involved in the development and design of PA metrics, managers perceived the metrics or benchmarks to be of a better quality and employed those metrics the more to evaluate and reward employees while at the same time, employees perform only higher when those metrics were used for their evaluation purposes (Groen, Wouters, & Wilderom, 2016). If not well designed with the involvement of employees, the metrics become more often prone to distortions, as there appears a variation in the extent to which PA could be consequential and the extent to which it appears to be primarily ceremonial (Yates, Woelert, Miller, & O'Connor, 2016).

PA interviews have continued to remain central to how employees are scrutinized, sometimes penalized, or rewarded by supervisors (Linna et al., 2012) and at the same time, castigated as inefficient or even harmful to the individual employee and organizations, hence the need to explore the paradox of the assessment metrics (Evans & Tourish, 2015). It is critical to also understand the relevant attitudes between genders concerning PAs, as a study revealed evidence to support the notion that regardless of the

gender of the supervisor, male subordinates scored higher on Problem Solving and Collaboration across Departments while female subordinates scored higher on the variable drive to learn, unless the genders of the pairs remained the same for it to be highly significant (Smith, Nagy, Bilsland, & Nhung, 2016). Gender, age, and educational level of employees were found to be moderators to the relationship between the facets of employee performance and job satisfaction (Valaei & Jiroudi, 2016).

Performance Appraisal Feedback Outcomes

Employee PA remains an important aspect of HRM, as it is designed to evaluate the job performance and productivity of individual employees based on established criteria and organizational objectives through the communication of feedback (Chang, 2015). An effective PA system and good feedback process could play a vital role in an organization by enhancing employee motivation, engagement, and job satisfaction, as most organizations today lack effective PA systems primarily because the way PA is carried out and received tended to promote a culture that discouraged the effective PA phenomenon (Rizvi, 2017). Due to the challenges confronting organizations because of unfair and inaccurate perceptions of PA outcomes and poor feedback culture, Kampkötter (2016) explored the perception of employee fairness of performance appraisals on job satisfaction.

This PA feedback involves the process of communicating the outcomes of employee evaluations, and many organizations conduct several forms of PAs to evaluate the competency, work attitude, and performance of employees. Employee commitment to change could be improved by creating adaptive organizational systems and processes,

increasing formal and informal communication, and enhancing the transformational role of management during change (Appelbaum et al., 2017). The primary goal of PA is to provide feedback to employees and organizations are increasingly using feedback from various sources such as peer output, customer feedback, and input from supervisors in 360-degree appraisals (Chetana et al., 2015).

Feedback is of such critical importance for informing employees about areas where correction action is required (Boud & Molloy, 2013). According to Yeong Ng and Han (2015), the attitudes of managers are important to PAs. Some managers have contradicting attitudes toward PA feedback while other employees used the appeal process as a weapon of resolution of appraisal discrepancy outcomes. Elliott (2015) claimed that appraisal feedback had a strong influence on employees, increased job satisfaction, performance practices and, offered opportunities for improvement. Feedback is described as actions taken by the employee's supervisor to provide information regarding task performance which involves a two-way discussion of employee's past performance as a basis for administrative decisions. Some of these administrative decisions include promotion, salary adjustment, transfer, termination and employee training, and development to align the employee's performance with organizational goals (Budworth et al., 2014).

As an important aspect of HRM, scholars had also argued that appropriate appraisals not only afford employees the opportunity to contemplate their work performance but also provide feedback on employee job performance as a vital means of communication (Chang, 2015; Samal, 2015). The results of a study conducted

demonstrated that employees' commitment to change, in an organization, could be improved through creating increasing formal and informal communication, creating adaptive organizational systems, and enhancing the role of transformational leaders during the change (Appelbaum et al., 2017). Employee commitment to change could be improved by creating adaptive organizational systems and processes, increasing formal and informal communication, and enhancing the transformational role of management during change (Appelbaum et al., 2017).

Researchers argued that many organizations gather information on whether policies, programs or practices achieve the desired performance outcomes in the form of feedback but often did not use the information. Even when the information was used, it was inaccurate, inconsistent and the original idea or desired behavior behind the implementation was not reflected in the observed behavior (Taylor, 2014). Sharma and Sharma (2017) proposed that using human resource analytics related negatively to subjectivity bias in performance appraisal systems, thereby influencing employee perceived accuracy and fairness which further impacted positively on employee job satisfaction with the appraisal system and subsequently increased employee willingness to improve performance and strategy (Ohene Afriyie, 2015).

Job Satisfaction and Performance Appraisal Relationship

Job satisfaction has been regarded as one of the essential components in the life of an employee of an organization by managers and continues to remain a multidimensional construct that consists of several facets (Fila, Paik, Griffeth, & Allen, 2014). It has become a topical issue of considerable interest among management practitioners and

scholars in recent times because it reflects on the attitude and behavior of workers and a way of displaying human behavior at the workplace (Ahmad & Bujang, 2014). Although considered a primary component by which the effectiveness of an organization's human resources is evaluated, job satisfaction still represented one of the most complex aspects of the management challenge that confronts today's managers in managing workers, and has not received the attention it deserves from neither managers nor scholars and practitioners (Pan, Shen, Liu, Yang, & Wang, 2015; Puttevar, Askhedkar, & Handa, 2016).

It is known to emerge from several considerations such as the elements of the organizational environment, attributes of the work, human resource practices, PAs, and the personal attributes of the employee (Fogarty et al., 2014; Prasad, 2015). Job satisfaction has significant ramifications for the behaviors and attitudes of workers, as it predicts behavioral outcomes such as employee performance, absence, lateness, and turnover (Lopes, Chambel, Castanheira, & Oliveira-Cruz, 2015). Generally, the terminology would be considered as one of the factors of obtaining the overall pleasure of the performed job (Bayram & Dinç, 2015; Pajibo & Adjabeng, 2015). It is measured in several ways and by existing benchmarks. A frequently used measurement tool is the Job Description Index (JDI), which has the merit of analyzing five critical elements such as the present work, remuneration, promotions, supervision, and coworkers constituting the target of several validations and reliability studies (Lopes et al., 2015).

Job satisfaction describes the extent to which an employee is pleased, satisfied or comfortable with their job and how people derive contentment and fulfillment from their

work that reflects the attitudes and feelings of people about their work. Satisfied and committed employees remain crucial for organizational success (Aslam, Aslam, & Saleem, 2015). Job satisfaction remains an important issue for both employees and employers as studies suggest that satisfied employees are less likely to leave, remain absent, and represent higher productivity, higher profits, and higher shareholder value (Khan, 2015). A job provided the financial basis for workers' life and described to differentiate it from work as the task undertaken in a specific setting. A job is more generally used to achieve personal goals about the individual's career (Ali, 2016). Satisfaction, on the other hand, refers to the contentment felt after the fulfillment of a need so that the employee becomes satisfied when his or her expectations or desires are fulfilled (Ali, 2016).

As one of the most effective indicators of vocational happiness and determinant of work attitude (Zhang, Wu, Miao, Yan, & Peng, 2013), job satisfaction is considered a positive or pleasurable emotional state that results from the assessment of employees' job or job experiences and response to individual task like the physical and social conditions of the workplace. Job satisfaction has become valued as a critical subject of increasing interest by policy-makers, top management executives and higher authorities (Ali, 2016; Mangundjaya, Utoyo, & Wulandari, 2015; Nazir et al., 2014; Wulandari, Mangundjaya, & Utoyo, 2015). Encouraging job satisfaction and organizational commitment remain one of the most critical potentials of enhancing organizational performance towards attaining sustainable competitive advantage in the global workplace (Kasemsap, 2017).

Employees constitute a key element and asset of any organization by which mode, all means of production are handled. The happier employees are within their job, the more satisfied they are said to become (Mehrad, 2014). Pursuing and enhancing individual employee job satisfaction, work performance, commitment, and fair behavior is required for attaining organizational excellence (Sawitri, Suswati, & Huda, 2016). It has also been contended that apart from organizational justice among several factors that influenced job satisfaction positively, most importantly is organizational support which is considered the strongest (Rowland, & Hall, 2012), hence improving the perceived fairness of performance appraisals through organizational support becomes crucial in enhancing the level of job satisfaction of employees (Pan, et al., 2015).

Since performance management remains an inseparable phenomenon as part of the organizational control system (Mahapal et al., 2015), it should be able to influence worker's behavior and motivate them to act in the company's interest because employee job satisfaction toward existing systems is basically driven by the perception of justice at their workplaces (Brata & Juliana, 2014). A study of 115 workers from various corporations found a positive correlation between job satisfaction and motivation with the PA system of the organization including negative constructs about PA objectivity, transparency, cultural system, feedback, performance impact, attrition, and compensation (Prasad, 2015).

The findings of research have indicated that there is a significant relationship between diversity management on job satisfaction and perceived group performance when dealing with workers' performance issues (Aydan, 2016). The cultural context

within the organization could also influence the employee's level of job satisfaction as a construct that could be described differently within different cultures (Kok Seng & Wai, 2016). This development strengthens the contention that organizations must design and administer their performance appraisal systems with care, frequency, and use it more as a development tool to improve effectiveness in creating job satisfaction and productivity (Mathew & Johnson, 2015; Prasad, 2015).

Job Satisfaction and its Origin

Several studies related to job satisfaction in recent times have had organizations increasingly realize its value and therefore, become a primary focus in organizations (Motlou, Singh, & Karodia, 2016). The issue involving job satisfaction was initiated since the emergence of scientific management by Taylor in 1911 with the introduction of the piece rate system which linked affluence with organization's prosperity towards increasing employee productivity (Ali, 2016). According to Ali (2016), the concept of job satisfaction was much touted when the Hawthorn studies were conducted in the late 1920s and early 1930s accomplished by Mayo. It has both positive and negative feelings of employees towards work, based on their performance assessments. Job satisfaction is described as the degree to which employees like or enjoy their jobs (Ouyang, Zhou, & Qu, 2015).

Numerous studies conducted establish the relationship and the impact of job satisfaction on job performance and efficiency (Bayraktar, Araci, Karacay, & Calisir, 2016). However, job dissatisfaction is believed to cause mental and physical discomfort, instability, lack of social cohesion and imbalance (Moghadam et al., 2014). It has been

contended that a work environment with honest, trustworthy, and well-treated employees encourage good relations and minimizes conflicts that tend to influence employees' job satisfaction positively (Khan, Naseem, & Masood, 2016). Job satisfaction is often expected to be high in an organization that values respect and is well managed (Ordu, 2016). The results of an empirical study on academic and nonacademic staff's job satisfaction showed that workers who were satisfied with their jobs demonstrated a higher level of commitment and more unlikely to change their jobs (Kok Seng & Wai, 2016).

Despite this laudatory objective, the traditional performance assessment is frequently ineffective for improving a person's job performance, and it was found that employees who had a poor experience with their appraisal interview were more likely to be dissatisfied with their job, and have low organizational commitment (Bobocel & Mu, 2016). Similarly, in a recent 4-year longitudinal study with a sample of more than 6,000 public-sector employees, it was found that a poor performance evaluation experience had a negative effect on employees' perceptions and attitudes (Johansen & Christoffersen, 2016). Even more troubling is research showing that when employee experiences are positive, appraisal interviews still resulted in negative attitudes and lower organizational performance (Budworth et al., 2014).

Factors Associated With Job Satisfaction

Empirical studies in China have revealed that leadership management, organizational climate, evaluation orientation, job stress, salary, organizational justice, demography, working characteristics, perceived organizational support, gender, salary, occupational stress, years of work experience, work field, and perceived organizational

support were some factors that influenced job satisfaction (Liu & Onwuegbuzie, 2014). Job satisfaction is appreciably related to job performance, as well as others such as quality of life, stress, burnout, anxiety, and turnover intentions (Alexopoulos, Palatsidi, Tigani, & Darviri, 2014; Alsaireh, Quinn-Griffin, Ziehm, & Fitzpatrick, 2014).

The situation for encouraging a performance-oriented culture for success, survival, and sustaining competition are required, hence the need for integrating performance related issues to motivate and retain talent geared towards job satisfaction through employee fairness perceptions of their assessments (Singh & Mishra, 2016). Other researchers also established five main factors as capable of influencing employee job satisfaction to include work environment, remuneration, fairness, promotion, and training to serve as a stimulus for employee productivity and the delivery of quality service (Omeluzor et al., 2016). The impact of job satisfaction could result in good relationships between workers and the organization to increase beliefs at the workplace, and ultimately culminate in productive communication in performance in the organization (Pandey & Khan, 2015).

Summary and Conclusions

The literature supports claims that PAs should be a systematic and periodic process, instead of an annual ritual used to evaluate an employee's job satisfaction productivity, and commitment about certain pre-established criteria and organizational objectives (Senyah, Boateng Coffie, & Adu-Parkoh, 2016). Improving employee job satisfaction and work performance requires change-related perceptions (Warokka, Gallato, & Moorthy, 2012), and the individual's disposition relevant to change (Cullen,

Edwards, Casper, & Gue, 2013). Based on the robust review and synthesis of the existing literature on PAs, the study made a case for an integrated framework on the subject. Several research gaps surfaced in the review of the literature. The first gap was that limited research existed on the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction. Few studies have been conducted on how the perceptions of fairness of PAs influence job satisfaction, specifically in healthcare organizations. Finally, a limited role existed regarding the specific role of the fairness perceptions of employees on the PA process about job satisfaction (Dutt, 2016).

To achieve this objective, the review derived an expanded view of PAs. The chapter additionally highlighted critical areas on the review and synthesis of the literature on specific areas such as historical perspectives and current state of affairs of performance evaluations, benefits and attributes of performance appraisals, perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals, rater and ratee performance appraisal accountability, ratees' fairness perceptions per raters' distorted appraisal outcomes, factors associated with performance appraisals, job satisfaction and performance appraisal relationship. Other areas covered include the historical perspectives of job satisfaction, factors associated with job satisfaction, performance appraisal metrics, attitudes, and behavioral sensitivity and lastly, performance appraisal feedback and outcomes.

From the conceptual or theoretical perspectives, and given the extensive literature reviewed thus far, the present study would help generate a new form of enquiry into the performance appraisal process following the ideas espoused in the review of the literature

regarding both the traditional and modern techniques and approaches of worker's evaluations in social research (Singleton & Straits, 2005).

This study will contribute to the literature by strengthening researchers' conceptual and practical understanding of the main perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals on employee job satisfaction. The study offers insights concerning how employees could improve their perceptions. Cullen et al. (2013) claimed employees needed to improve their perceptions by minimizing their perceived uncertainties regarding their performance appraisals and other processes and identify other employees who needed assistance to adapt to workplace changes.

Chapter 3 of the study is the research methodology, design, and rationale that was applied, and the scientific procedures adopted to empirically examine the phenomenon of the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction. Efforts were made to explain the importance of the exploratory case study approach to exemplify the ethical concerns and procedures that were undertaken to explore the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction.

Other topics included defining the data measurements and analysis methods, issues of trustworthiness, and a summary and conclusions. The study will help fill the gap in the literature on the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction. A qualitative method and multiple case study design inquiry were used to conduct this study because the boundaries between the phenomenon of the perceptions of performance appraisals of employees on job satisfaction are often not clear (Skibba, 2006; Yin, 2014). The qualitative exploratory multiple case study also supports the

collection of data from multiple sources to present a rich and in-depth information on the phenomenon under investigation (DiGangi, Jannasch-Pennell, & Yu, 2011).

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative exploratory multiple case study was to explore the perceptions of fairness of employee PAs on job satisfaction within a major healthcare organization in the United States. The findings of this case study may help bridge the gap and draw parallels between the inconsistencies in the existing literature. The research findings may assist in understanding the role of employee perceptions of PAs as an indispensable instrument for improving employee job satisfaction. Recommendations were made on how the process could be implemented to reflect accurate and fair outcomes for decision making in organizations that benefit both employees and management (Dewettinck & van Dijk, 2013). Although organizations may agree that PAs are a function of performance management overall, ambiguity surrounded the application and processes involved. An effort was made to ascertain whether the performance outcomes were fair and contributed to enhanced perceptions of job satisfaction (Buvaneswari & Mujeeb Rahman, 2015).

Perceived fairness, in the context of this study, was used to refer to an individual's perceived judgment of whether there was a fair balance between exerted effort and achieved outcomes. Where an imbalance between effort and outcome existed, perceptions of unfairness and other negative consequences could emerge. Perceived unfairness might have a negative impact on employee job satisfaction, while other researchers found that even employees may switch to the competition or other organizations to satisfy needs

where a sense of unfairness was perceived (Shih, Yu, & Tseng, 2015; Tseng & Kuo, 2014; Wu, 2015).

Chapter 3 is an explanation of the proposed research methodology and design for the current research in detail. This chapter is a summary of the purpose statement, the rationale for adopting a qualitative multiple case study approach, and sampling frame. This section also described my role as the researcher, data collection, and coding procedures, data management, and intended analysis. The section on ethical considerations addressed the ethical treatment of human subjects as required by the Belmont Report (Friesen, Kearns, Redman, & Caplan, 2017). The chapter includes an acknowledgment of and measures that were taken to minimize error caused by researcher bias, as well as issues concerning credibility and reliability. Theoretical content was maintained through the conceptual framework to ground the results and helped interpret the findings (Yin, 2014). Chapter 3 concludes with a summary of main points and transition to the next chapter.

Research Design and Rationale

The central research question that guided the study was: What are the employee perceptions of performance appraisals on job satisfaction? The related subquestion was: What are the reasons that lead to unfair perceptions of performance appraisals?

These research questions were designed in relation to the conceptual framework rooted in organizational justice theory (Adams's equity theory, 1963, 1965) and the two-factor or dual motivational theory (Herzberg, 1959), and the literature review for the study. The research was developed to be qualitative based on the formulated central

research question. Qualitative researchers must be thoughtful and purposive in their selection of the appropriate methodology to increase trustworthiness to maintain scholarly research, credibility, and reputation (Seidman, 2013; Yin, 2014). Both professional and clinical knowledge rely extensively on qualitative research and many researchers who undertook qualitative research wanted to improve how things worked by showing empathy and advocacy to reveal special characteristics, such as interpretive, experiential, situational, and paternalistic tendencies (Stake, 2010). This professional and clinical knowledge fell within the purview of the study on the perceptions of employees of PAs on job satisfaction.

Qualitative research is suitable for use in a situation where the goal is to explore a case, or a limited number of cases in detail, allowing case-specific information to draw comparisons between individual cases (Bean, 2007). The approach must also be effective in exploring complex phenomena, to uncover the researcher's experience of the phenomenon (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The qualitative method was used to identify contextual factors that influence the phenomenon of interest as experienced by the participants. The essence of using qualitative method was to reveal not only how the phenomenon was used, but also why it was utilized in organizations (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Stanfield II, 2006).

The qualitative exploratory multiple case study was used for the current research as this method typically deals with collecting data within a natural setting (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006; Stanfield II, 2006) to gain in-depth insights and understanding of the

phenomenon on PAs through systematic gathering of descriptive data grounded in diverse and complex sources including historical records, documents, and field data (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011). This qualitative exploratory multiple case study would help provide an understanding of the perceptions of employees from the participants' perspective, thus requiring the use of a qualitative approach (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). Qualitative studies tended to provide detailed revelations of phenomena by investigating how people make meaning of their experiences (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtler, 2010). Qualitative research could represent the perspectives of people clearly, paying attention to real-world contextual situations (Yin, 2014), thus further supporting the use of a qualitative approach for this research (Miller, & Salkind, 2002).

The current research included recommendations on a variety of data collection techniques for qualitative studies (Maxwell, 2013; Merriam, 2009; Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014; Yin, 2014). The qualitative approach was appropriate for this study as the goal of the study was to derive meaning and understanding through a rich description and interpretation of the perceptions of employees of their PAs on job satisfaction. A qualitative study is an inductive process in which researchers become the primary instrument for gathering and analyzing data (Merriam, 2009). For this study, data were analyzed using an inductive approach to uncover emerging themes, patterns, and concepts. Qualitative approaches have been used extensively and applied in the social sciences and other fields of research where experimental designs were not often possible (Merriam, 2009). The qualitative perspective was particularly suitable because the

purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of employees based on their work experience and knowledge of performance appraisals in relation to their job satisfaction.

Thoughtful planning is usually required when choosing a case to gain a deeper understanding of the topic, the merit of using different methods, and how to relate to participants in the field (Leavy & Simons, 2014; Simons, 2012). Several qualitative traditions and paradigms were considered in selecting the design to determine the appropriate procedures and methods utilized for the study. The philosophical assumptions and concepts informed the choice of theories that guided the research to make the theories apparent or explicit in qualitative studies (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011; Mertens, 2010).

The exploratory qualitative multiple case study was utilized as it aligned with the research question for the study. A case study is designed to explore phenomena contextualized within specific frameworks, boundaries, or parameters (Hatch, 2002). A case study is the in-depth investigation of a bounded system with one setting (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2014). The employees of the healthcare organization constituted the bounded system. The method permitted deep insights into understanding employee perceptions of performance appraisals and job satisfaction. The decision to use a multiple case study design as the form of inquiry stemmed from the lack of literature and its topical nature. The case study design is an acceptable form of critical inquiry and has gained much traction in the field of research as a valid research procedure (Flyvbjerg, 2011; Yin, 2009, 2014).

Yin (2009, 2014) described a case study as a form of in-depth empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between the context and the phenomenon are not obvious or clear. There have been common misconceptions about case study design that indicate that theoretical knowledge is more valuable than concrete case study knowledge and cannot generalize from a case study. A case study is also considered a pilot process used for the development of a quantitative study with a bias toward verification, and that knowledge may only become applicable to broader populations (Flyvbjerg, 2011; Stake, 1995, 2010; Yin, 2014).

The issue concerning generalization could be improved over a period through replicating the case or cases within the case study (Stake, 1995, 2010; Yin, 2014). The bounded system needs to be defined and may be comprised of a single unit of analysis such as a class, institution, organization, project, or program, and in some cases, it may be subelements and instances within the case (Simons, 2012). The goal of the current study was to explore and understand the context of employee perceptions of PAs on job satisfaction. The topic remains a contemporary issue that is underrepresented in the literature; this study met the criteria that warranted employing the case study design.

Three main existing conditions have been outlined for justifying the use of case study in research. These conditions include: type of research question, no researcher control over behavioral occurrences, and focus on contemporary situations (Yin, 2014). All these conditions meet the criteria for the current study. I had no control over the environment or context of the study under which the participants were assessed at the

workplace. The central research question for the study was used to establish the context of the study on the perceptions of employees of performance appraisals on job satisfaction and established within the conceptual framework and literature review.

Yin (2014) claimed the case study design has distinct levels and must link the research questions with the unit of analysis. Yin outlined five main steps for undertaking a case study design: developing appropriate research questions, stating any propositions, identifying the unit of analysis, linking data to the propositions and research questions, and establishing criteria for interpreting findings. To obtain meaningful results, the researcher must select the right method for the line of research inquiry appropriate for the study (Yin, 2014).

A research design is a systematic plan that links the components of a study to address research questions and draw conclusions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Saldana, 2011). The selected design for this study served as a logical framework in relation to the literature review and the conceptual framework to help gather, analyze and, interpret data relevant to the central research question. Five approaches to qualitative research design inquiry were explored to determine the most suitable design appropriate and relevant for the study. The forms of design inquiry considered were: phenomenological, narrative inquiry, ethnography, grounded theory, and case study (Yin, 2014).

Phenomenology is a qualitative research design inquiry employed to investigate lived experiences using a generous sample size to help the researcher obtain detailed information and insights on an event or situation (Bak, 2011; Moustakas, 1994; Van Manen, 1990). The phenomenological approach was not appropriate for the current study

on the perceptions of employees of performance appraisal on job satisfaction as the focus is not related to the consciousness or cognitive representations and the objects of direct experience (Anderson & Spencer, 2002).

Narrative inquiry is useful in determining the life stories or lived experiences of individual people. Researchers utilize the narrative form of design inquiry on very small sample size to access rich data with the purpose of learning from the lived experiences or life stories of people (Bak, 2011; Clandinin, & Connelly, 2000; Riessmann, 2008). The narrative form of design inquiry was suitable or relevant for the current study because it requires the collection of data based on the reports of individuals' lived experiences or life stories.

An ethnographic study explores culture rather than describing an understanding of the situation, issues or events related to the study (LeCompte, & Schensul, 1999).

Ethnography involves the engagement of researchers in long periods in the field to provide a narrative discourse (Bak, 2011; Thomson, Petty, Ramage, & Moore, 2011); Wolcott, 2008). Researchers who are unfamiliar with the culture of the target population tend to abandon the research when the narrative inquiry is used (Bak, 2011; Fetterman, 2010). Having explored the several approaches of inquiry and the viewpoints of diverse researchers and extant literature, ethnography was not selected for the current study.

Grounded theory methods consist of systematic but flexible guidelines used in the collection and analysis of qualitative data to construct theories from the data themselves (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). It is a rigorous but lengthy process in which the researcher's views help to interpret the data (Charmaz, 2014; Jones & Alony, 2011).

Researchers use grounded theory research design to emphasize the process of analysis and development of theoretical categories to build a series of requirements and checks into qualitative inquiry through an iterative means of successive analytic data collection procedures and series of research rather than focus solely on the results of a study (Charmaz, 2006, 2008; Dunne, 2011). The theory begins with an inductive logic; but, moves into deductive reasoning as researchers seek to understand emergent empirical findings (Dunne, 2011; Rosenthal, 2004). The grounded theory requires long-term engagement in the field through on-going observations including interviewing which will exceed participant access, funding, time thus requiring more resources for a doctoral study (Glesne, 2011). To use grounded theory, the suggestion is that social situations should constitute the unit of analysis using three sociological circumstances such as situational, social world/arenas, and positional cartographic maps for collecting and analyzing qualitative data (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Charmaz, 2006; Maxwell, 2013; Stake, 2010).

The grounded theory depends on reflexivity of researchers, recognition of problem representations, questions of legitimacy and authority, and repositioning the researcher away from the analyst to the knowledge participant to form the basis of the grounded theory discourse (Brimhall & Engblom-Deglmann, 2011; Charmaz, 2006). The theory deals with several characteristics including process or action which serves as the focus of the researcher in developing a theory, and memos as part of the theory (Brimhall & Engblom-Deglmann, 2011).

The case study method of inquiry is used to examine smaller samples and focuses on a case within real life, contemporary setting, or context (Stake, 2010; Yin, 2009, 2014), and meets the requirements for answering the current research question. Of the various qualitative research designs (narrative, ethnography, grounded theory, phenomenology, and case study) considered, only the exploratory case study design inquiry fits appropriately the purpose of this qualitative study. The multiple case study design was the most suitable and best-fit approach to address the research questions on the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction to help provide effective strategies based on employee performance reviews.

A researcher chooses a case study design to examine what is to be studied (a case within a bounded system, bounded by time and place (Stake, 1995, 2010; Yin, 2014) or a comprehensive strategy of research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Merriam, 2009), using multiple approaches to collect data based on face-to-face interviews (Moustakas, 1994). The exploratory qualitative multiple case study design was used to explore the employee perceptions of performance appraisals on job satisfaction in the healthcare organization.

The design of this multiple case study would involve the use of structured and semistructured interviews to reflect the research questions on the perceptions of employees of performance appraisals on job satisfaction to uncover employee perceptions based on responses to performance reviews and outcome experiences of employees to improve job satisfaction (Dumight & Qu, 2011). Participants would provide in-depth responses through face-to-face interviews using open-ended interview questions, procedures, and protocols (Janesick, 2011). The open-ended questions would enable

respondents to provide in-depth information and insights related to the research questions on their perceptions of performance appraisals on job satisfaction. The information that would be gathered would be utilized and applied to existing knowledge and literature.

The choice of the exploratory qualitative multiple case study was intended to differentiate it from an explanatory qualitative case study that seeks to affirm a causal relationship between variables to explain the occurrence of the phenomenon (Miller & Salkind, 2002; Yin, 2014). A clearer understanding of the objectives of this study and its underlying motivation will help in shaping the design decisions to ensure relevance and significance at the scholar-practitioner level (Maxwell, 2013).

The multiple case study design inquiry was employed for this study to address the central research question. The choice of the case study design was based on the purpose of the research and the kind of data to be gathered. The design is one of the preferred strategies because the research questions focus mainly on what questions as a justifiable rationale to develop pertinent propositions for further inquiry (Yin, 2014). Case studies are also likely to be the preferred strategy, when, how or why questions are posed when the researcher has little control over events and the emphasis is on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context (Simons, 2012; Yin, 2014).

The case study method of inquiry is the qualitative technique that can illustrate certain topics within the evaluation of the research to explore situations in which the intervention being measured has no clear, single, or specific set of outcomes (Yin, 2014). The research plan will guide the study in the process of gathering, analyzing, and interpreting data including observations during the interview to draw inferences that

describe the domain of generalizing interpretations to a larger population or any different situations (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). Information was collected from each eligible employee as the case and several such individual employees as cases (bounded case) to make it a multiple case study (Yin, 2014). The cases would constitute the case study. The use of multiple sources of evidence for the study permitted me to address issues of a broader range of historical behavior or attitude based on employee perceptions of performance appraisals to provide a converging basis of the inquiry, using the process of triangulation (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Maxwell, 2013; Stake, 2010).

Role of the Researcher

Several roles are assumed by the qualitative researcher during the study. The role of the researcher is critical as a matter of gradation from the impersonal to personal as the researcher becomes the principal instrument observing the action, and the contexts often deliberately play a subjective role in the study with the use of personal experience in advancing correct interpretations (Stake, 2010). The role of the researcher remains vital to the research. This role included being responsible for collecting data from participants with minimal bias, analysis, and interpretation of findings related to the perceptions of employee fairness of performance appraisals on job satisfaction. During the research process, there was a selection of the research design, development of data collection instruments, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and recommendations.

The process involved strict adherence to Walden University guidelines for qualitative dissertation and the requirements of the Institutional Review Board (IRB; Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). I helped inform and reflect personal and professional

experiences and beliefs in this study as both appraisee and appraiser that may have a bias on the study. My role in the data collection procedure was that of a participant and participant-observer during the interview process, including the possibility of randomly examining some performance appraisal reviews of employees of the organization.

Research Methodology

This exploratory qualitative multiple case study was framed within the context of fairness perceptions of employee PAs on job satisfaction in a healthcare organization. Qualitative research is a method of inquiry and tradition employed in many different academic disciplines including the social and natural sciences (Palinkas et al., 2015; Yin, 2014). The method is used for research where the study topic is intended to explore a phenomenon due to the nonexistence of theories to explain it. This approach enables the researcher to discover and provide a narrative of the perspectives of research participants and generally assumed to be selected purposefully to yield cases that are information rich (Palinkas et al., 2015; Singleton & Straits, 2005).

I examined how employee assessment reviews and outcomes could be utilized to inform, impact, and sustain decisions in organizations. The goal of quantitative research methods was to investigate experimental hypotheses and existing theories that involve large samples of numeric data used by researchers to predict or explain the relationship between factors and variables to measure results (Thomson et al., 2011; Trochim, 2001). The three types of methods researchers use for conducting a study are quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods, depending on the nature of the problem or issues to address within a natural setting).

Quantitative research is noted to be specifically dependent on numeric data and instrument-based questions to approve or disprove hypothesis while participants answer closed-ended questions (Yin, 2014). Based on the arguments of Thomson et al. (2011), quantitative research was not suitable for this study because a quantitative study does not provide in-depth insights and understanding about the phenomenon on the topic involving employee perceptions of performance appraisals on job satisfaction. Although a quantitative methodology would have permitted the gathering of data for standardized questions, the method did not facilitate the in-depth, face-to-face, open-ended questioning desired to uncover the interviewees' perceptions of fairness of performance appraisal outcomes related to employee job satisfaction.

A mixed methodology focuses on the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data for a study and researchers who use the mixed methods of research combine the elements of both quantitative and qualitative methods of research to obtain detail understanding of the study (Duffy & Chenail, 2009). Researchers also use the mixed methods to gather data sequentially while posing confirmatory questions; but, the approach typically takes longer to complete and involves triangulation to convert both statistical analysis and the coding of open-ended questions to answer the research questions (Bak, 2011). A mixed methods approach was not be appropriate for this study because the method involves the inclusion of both quantitative and qualitative data which was not the focus of the current study.

Qualitative research methodology emphasizes the use of a form of design inquiry for the most suitable and best possible option to learn from the employees' experiences

(Stake, 2010), and would be used to explore the perceptions of employees of performance appraisals on job satisfaction. The exploratory qualitative method for the current study was selected because the method requires the use of interviews to gain in-depth insights and understanding of the perceptions of employees of the phenomenon of PAs (Rowley, 2012). The qualitative methodology is consistent with the purpose of the current research.

Qualitative research uses rigorous data collection procedures and techniques to collect multiple data and details about things while spending adequate time in the field to establish a good standard of qualitative research (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Common characteristics of qualitative research includes having a natural setting, having the researcher as a key instrument, use of multiple methods, carrying out complex reasoning through inductive logic and deductive logic, having participant meaning, emergent design, reflexivity, and the provision of holistic accounts of a study (Hatch, 2002; Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Qualitative research entails the exploration of a single phenomenon and the procedures are characterized by emerging and inductive reasoning, shaped by the researcher's experience in collecting and analyzing data as things are studied in their natural setting to interpret phenomena to make meaning (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Educational studies or evaluations are best undertaken from a qualitative perspective to capture the in-depth understanding of the problem and answers to research questions (Merriam, 2009). Quantitative researchers, nonetheless, make methodological and other choices based partly on personal preference but usually manage to gather data objectively instead of subjectively (Stake, 2010). The qualitative research approach was utilized to

examine the problem of the perceptions of employees of PAs on job satisfaction. The research question aligns with the use of the qualitative approach with the goal of understanding human behavior in its natural context (Lodico et al., 2010; Merriam, 2009).

While researchers use qualitative research to gain an understanding of people's experiences to establish various truths and social constructions of the real world (Pitman, 1998), quantitative research method is used to explore the positivist paradigm to establish the existence of only one truth (Mathie & Carnozzi, 2005; Merriam, 2009). Quantitative or mixed methods of research may not be helpful in addressing the goal of this study. As a result, qualitative research was deemed as more appropriate (Malina, Norreklit, & Selto, 2011), relevant and a more beneficial approach to learn and understand employee perceptions based on personal and professional work experiences to determine unique approaches to social science studies (Herzberg, 1959; Yin, 2014).

The multiple case study method and design would be adopted because the approach relies primarily on human understanding, unlike quantitative thinking which depends significantly on linear measurements, attributes, and statistical analysis (Stake, 2010). The qualitative method would be employed for the study where little research or theory currently exists on performance appraisals and fairness perceptions. This study would explore the data and identify any emerging theories. Employing this exploratory qualitative method would enable a researcher to ascertain what should be the employees' perception of PA outcomes on job satisfaction. It would also ensure the determination the employee experiences with the existing performance appraisal system in the organization

to ensure that the outcomes serve a true reflection of the prevailing evaluation system (Masum et al., 2015).

Population and Setting

The population and setting for this exploratory qualitative multiple case study was a healthcare organization situated in the western part of the State of Maryland located in the Baltimore-Washington Metropolitan area. Participants are gatekeepers of information, and their selection and setting should be linked (Hatch, 2002; Seidman, 2013). A well-constructed multiple case study design should demonstrate the researcher's ability to focus on participant safety and confidentiality before, during, and after an investigation using vigorous techniques to protect individual participant rights (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2014).

The participants included a population of selected employees who fulfill the criteria or meet the qualification of at least 1-year work experience with the organization with at least one performance appraisal. The objective was to interview 15 to 18 participant employees of the organization until saturation. Two or more replications of a case study are sufficient, provided the theory is straightforward, and the degree of certainty is excessive (Yin, 2014). The sample size for the study was to be 15 to 18 selected from a single healthcare organization in the Baltimore-Washington Metropolitan area located in Western Maryland, U.S.A. The study data may help management to improve decision making for a more effective performance appraisal system. Permission was obtained from management or human resource department for access to allow

participants to be selected from a current staff list or database that was provided by the healthcare organization.

Sampling and Participant Selection

Qualitative research usually requires purposive sampling with small sample sizes based on the assumption that the researcher wants to understand, uncover, and obtain in-depth insights (Merriam, 2009). Interviews would discontinue once data saturation has been reached, and this is anticipated to occur when no new information is generated following interviews with 15 to 18 participants (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Merriam, 2009; Seidman, 2013; Thomson et al., 2011). This sample would represent the population for this qualitative case study including the selection of individual employees or interviewees as the unit of analysis. The individual employees of the organization would be contacted via e-mail and phone.

Participants were selected based on their experiences and insights surrounding the perception of employee performance appraisal fairness outcomes on job satisfaction. Participants were informed that their names and all other information would remain confidential. Participants were given a summary of the research report on completion of the study. I utilized a local healthcare facility for easy access. The limitations posed by the sampling method for the study were outlined in the concluding parts of the research. An effort was made to recruit a balance of a cross-section of employees within the healthcare organization, including supervisors and managers.

The participants comprised both male and female adult employees who have been employed by the organization for at least 1 year and have undergone performance

reviews at the workplace in the organization to make up for affirmative action and equal opportunities for all selected participants. Consent forms and questionnaires were disseminated to participants 2 days before the interview. I telephoned all participants to confirm the date, time, and venue for the interview. Participants were engaged in conversations and follow-up questions to develop a working relationship.

Participants who were employed with the company and had undergone PAs per the established criteria for the study were selected using a purposeful sampling technique (Glesne, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Suri, 2011). Potential participants were sent an e-mail describing participant expectations and purpose of the study. E-mails were also sent to potential participants to invite them to participate in the interview in-person, face-to-face or by teleconference, depending on their availability. Based on responses to the e-mails, potential participants who fell within the criteria specified and the variation of the stipulated categories were selected and invited via official invitation letters, the postal mail, or e-mail to participate in the study.

Expert Panel

A panel of three experts provided content credibility by reviewing and approving the interview questions listed in Appendix F to align with the problem statement, purpose statement, and research questions guiding the study. I contacted the panelists via email to review the appropriateness of the interview questions in accordance with the purpose statement, problem statement, and the research question (see Appendix E). Once the expert panel members had indicated their interest to be part of the

review panel, I sent them a copy of the problem and purpose statements as well as the interview and research questions (see Appendix E).

The expert panel reviewed the interview questions within the purview of the problem statement, purpose statement, alongside the central research question and related sub-question for this study. The panel of experts consisted of industry experts who were subject matter experts with high professional expertise, knowledge, and experience in research, management, and international cooperation in healthcare. The experts had published research articles regarding management policy, program implementation, human resources, change management as well as industry leaders and consultants in the field of healthcare and performance management.

The expert panel consisted of two men and one woman. Expert Panel Member One was a consultant, practitioner, speaker, trainer, and author dedicated to helping organizations achieve and maintain sustainable competitive advantages with structured programs, such as those in performance management. Expert Panel Member Two was an author, management leadership expert, human resource management practitioner and consultant, and speaker, who had spent the majority of their career in employee management policy reviews. This expert panel member rose through the ranks to become a leading expert and had published several books to her credit on human resource management programs including performance management and implementation. Expert Panel Member Three was a healthcare practitioner and expert, researcher, program implementation, monitoring, and evaluation expert with considerable experience in continuous employee performance evaluation and management improvement policy

implementation, capacity building, and sustainability of programs. This panel expert had implemented performance management programs in numerous industries, including healthcare, publications/media, government, nonprofits, telecommunications, and airlines. This expert panel member had taught undergraduate and graduate level courses in Management, Marketing, Healthcare Policy, Program/Project Management, Monitoring, and Evaluation, and published several articles and books in the area of healthcare management excellence and performance evaluation practices.

I designed the questions for the interview process. The expert panel reviewed the participant interview questions to align with the research questions, purpose statement, and problem statement. The expert panelists made no changes to the research question, problem or purpose statements approved by the IRB, but recommended several revisions to the original interview questions to align with the research questions. I incorporated the suggestions from the expert panel into the nine revised interview questions (see Appendix E). A copy of the revised interview questions (see Appendix E) was sent to the expert panel members for final review. The expert panel did not offer any additional changes to the questions (see Appendix E) and gave their assent to the final interview questions.

Protection of Participant Rights

I ensured that participants were informed of their privacy and the precautions that were taken to protect the confidentiality of data to enable them to decide on the adequacy of the protection and acceptability during the informed consent process (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Merriam, 2009; Seidman, 2013). Permission was sought from the Chief

Executive Officer (CEO) of the healthcare organization through the human resource department before conducting any form of data collection regarding the research, following the receipt of approval from Walden's IRB (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). Participants who agreed to participate in the study were issued brown envelopes containing consent forms to assure participant confidentiality before the data collection process.

A hard copy of the consent forms bearing the signature of each participant was retained and secured in a file cabinet and locked with a key for 5 years. All other documents were scanned and secured on an electronic file on my personal computer. Participants were assured that there would be no foreseen risks associated with participation in the study and that there will be no pressure or coercion to participate in the interview or response to questions. Participants were made aware that they could have withdrawn at any time for any reason and their data would not be utilized. Teleconferences were arranged for participants who were available for the face-to-face interview at times convenient to them to allow greater participation.

Participants were provided a description of the data collection procedures. Issues related to confidentiality, the interview procedures, and protocols to protect the rights of participants in addressing ethical issues were explained to participants (Simons, 2012). Participants were assured of the confidentiality of data that would be gathered and would be informed that data gathered would be encrypted and secured to avoid any risks to them. Numbers were assigned to participants or pseudo names used instead of their real names (Janesick, 2011; Seidman, 2013). Participants were encouraged to answer

questions honestly and truthfully, and to the best of their ability, based on prior experience, perceptions, knowledge, personal or professional beliefs.

Participants were informed that they may withdraw from participation in the study at any time for any reason during the process of data collection as part of the ethical considerations (Simons, 2012). E-mails and all forms of correspondence were password-protected to ensure that nobody can gain access to information that needs to be protected from users accessible via computers and encrypted to prevent unauthorized use or access. Securing the information will guarantee confidentiality and anonymity to protect all the participants or respondents of the study.

Instrumentation

Interviews constituted the main form of instrumentation using the researcher as the main instrument (Stake, 2010). Multiple methods of data gathering procedures were considered for this exploratory qualitative multiple case study (McLeod, 2010). The instruments for the design involved the use of primary sources of gathering qualitative data through interviews and observations as part of the strategies for the study (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009, 2014), instead of relying on a single source of information (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). An interview guide was developed with interview questions designed in relation to employee perceptions of performance appraisals on job satisfaction based on the reviewed literature to reflect the central research questions to acquire data for the study (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012).

The use of several techniques permitted data triangulation to ensure reliability and validity of the study (Yin, 2009, 2014). In this study, structured and semistructured

interview questions were employed to extract pertinent information from interviewees of various departments of the healthcare organization. This approach helped improve decision making associated with the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction. This qualitative study may be used to obtain a better understanding of the complexity of the phenomenon on the perceptions of employees of performance appraisals on job satisfaction to help inform policy, decision making, and enhance professional practice (Stake, 2010).

A qualitative researcher must carefully utilize relevant questions to interview participants after practice, planning, preparation, listening and serious note-taking (Sullivan & Terjesen, 2011). Sullivan and Terjesen (2011) claimed this qualitative approach provides an in-depth contextualized understanding of the phenomenon. The in-depth structured and semistructured interviews would have a time span of 30 or 60-minutes and may provide comprehensive insight and information on the phenomenon of performance appraisals (Sullivan & Terjesen, 2011).

The interview session was recorded using a tape recorder and written notes (Stake, 2010; Sullivan, & Terjesen, 2011). A well-planned interview session was implemented to obtain detailed and credible information. The interview process was utilized to obtain new themes and patterns relevant to the study. The interview was transcribed, and data coded into themes and patterns using the NVivo software for qualitative research to develop codes that would utilize key words and concepts from all interviewees. The analysis of data provided additional understanding of keywords and

emergent themes (Sullivan & Terjesen, 2011). The same data collection instruments were administered to all participants (Janesick, 2011).

Data Collection

Data collection entailed a series of interrelated activities with the main goal of gathering substantial data and information to answer emerging research questions (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Rubin & Rubin, 2012). The data collection procedure was explained to participants including exit strategies if required and included in the consent form. All information gathered from participants during the interview including recordings and notes were protected and secured throughout the study. I served as the main instrument during data collection. The research design focused on the process and the interview methods that were utilized to process feedback from the research respondents. The focus was intended to explore the fairness perceptions of performance evaluation outcomes on job satisfaction. The information and data that were obtained from the study might provide insights into the perceptions held by employees about performance appraisals to help contribute new knowledge on the phenomenon on performance appraisals.

Janesick (2011) described the interview process as the most rewarding aspect of qualitative research. An interview protocol or guide would be used in obtaining information on employee perceptions of performance appraisals about job satisfaction to determine the effectiveness of the performance appraisal process applied in the organization. (Appendix E). All potential interview questions derived from the central research question which constitutes part of the main framework of the study and were open-ended, all-embracing, and explicit enough to stimulate in-depth conversation and

honest responses (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Interviews and teleconferences were one-on-one and face-to-face, and follow-up meetings took place as necessary (Glesne, 2011). Interviews took place after (a) receiving approval from IRB; (b) explaining the purpose of the study to participants including how the results will be collected, collated, and utilized; and (c) distribution and receipt of signed confidentiality and consent forms from all participants.

The interviewees were arbitrarily assigned pseudonyms or numbers to protect their identities and the interview questions were developed prior to undertaking the data collection to ensure the credibility of the study (Merriam, 2009) after which the interviews were scheduled, conducted, and transcribed. Interviews and field notes complied with protocols (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). A face-to-face, one-on-one interview was conducted at predetermined intervals at a location that was agreed upon within the organization using an interview script. (Appendix F). All selected participants were scheduled and interviewed. The participants were contacted to discuss the nature of the interview and invited to sign a form to confirm the scheduled date, time, and venue for an interview. The interview protocol, including the format and procedures, was disclosed to participants prior to conducting the interview (Kvale, 2006). Questions that would require additional probing were utilized to obtain insights into employee perceptions to adequately address the central research question guiding the research.

All raw data, reports, research files, consent forms, and interview transcripts are safely secured and locked in a filing cabinet for 5 years to safeguard and assure confidentiality, anonymity, and the protection of participants' rights during the study. All

electronic files, including consent forms, research data, and interview transcripts are saved on CD-ROM disks for protection and locked in a file cabinet for 5 years.

Recognizing the need to balance quality detailed interviews with a cross-section of participants of the organization (Glesne, 2011), a purposeful sample consisting of 15 to 18 participants was used for the study. Data were gathered and analyzed several times to identify any overlapping themes, patterns or concepts that would recur to ensure that each interview question is treated adequately and effectively (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012).

Data Analysis

Data analysis involved a systematic search for trends, patterns, and themes. Protocols and procedures determined the organization of the data that were collected for effective analysis. Data obtained from interviews were arranged or organized into categories and interpreted, synthesized, and coded for emerging themes, patterns, and concepts (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Miles et al., 2014). The data were uploaded into NVivo qualitative data analysis software and analyzed using coding and memoing within the case, and multiple case analysis from the questionnaires and interviews from the case history of the participants of the study (Yin, 2009, 2014). Coding was applied to organize and analyze the gathered data.

A thematic coding system was used to uncover the emerging trends, themes, patterns, and concepts based on the inductive analysis of data for the study. There was a two-step process involving the creation of initial codes and for creating focused codes for the data analysis process. Emerging common themes, trends, patterns, and concepts were categorized through focused coding using NVivo (Miles et al., 2014). The emerging

themes, patterns, and concepts were coded in color depending on several factors such as evidence of actuality, total occurrences in all the data sources, and the relationship with the central research questions guiding the research and in alignment with the interview questions (Seidman, 2013).

Field and journal notes were taken during the interviews and succinctly summarized to provide supplementary data for coding based on the themes, patterns, or concepts during the process of data analysis (Janesick, 2011). Responses to the interview questions were tallied to evaluate their merits and demerits consistent with the recurring themes, patterns, or concepts of all the interview questions. The codes were reduced to themes and represented in the form of narratives and spreadsheets or tables (Miles et al., 2014). The electronic copies of each respondent's interview transcripts were developed into spreadsheets including the corresponding responses of the participants of the study. The spreadsheet was utilized to compare participant responses during data analysis and subsequently coded to unearth any emerging themes, patterns, or concepts to be used for analyzing the data (Janesick, 2011).

Evidence of Quality

Evidence of quality was ensured throughout this exploratory qualitative multiple case study. The multiple perceptions that were received from the respondents of the study based on the 15 to 18 participant responses provided avenues for follow-up interviews to refine all the responses and reviews to serve as a strategy for member checking to ensure the quality and accuracy of data (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Maxwell, 2013; Stake, 2010). After analyzing and organizing all the data, I followed up with participant

validation for the veracity of the transcript to confirm the accuracy of data and information captured (Janesick, 2011; Seidman, 2013).

All the data that were collected will contribute to addressing the central research question on the topic on the perceptions of employee fairness of performance appraisals on job satisfaction which necessitated the invitation of participants to share and discuss their perceptions on the topic and also provide suggestions and recommendations for refinement of the study's outcome to ensure trustworthiness and fidelity consistent with the established IRB rules and regulations of Walden University.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Qualitative research must be trustworthy based on considerations such as credibility, dependability, transferability, and objectivity to achieve the purpose for which the study is undertaken (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2010). Merriam (2009), contended that it is critical for qualitative research to be trustworthy and researchers must develop findings that reflect the values of trustworthiness and the study must be rigorous so that the results are accurately represented. The following sections describe the constructs and techniques that are intended to be used to improve the trustworthiness of this exploratory qualitative study.

I needed the opportunity to explain and clarify any biases that may be required for dependability and reliability to ensure trustworthiness and credibility of findings of the study to participants (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). There was no intention to have any future or pending personal, professional, or contractual relationships with any participant or employee at the time of writing this dissertation. Merriam (2009) argued that

qualitative researchers must assume an interpretive rather than a positivist philosophical approach in their investigations that should guide decision making (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011). My beliefs and biases about employee perceptions were shaped and informed by personal and professional experience.

The credibility of the research becomes paramount and were established through prolonged engagement of participants and their responses including the triangulation of multiple data sources (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Maxwell, 2013; Stake, 2010).

Triangulation is used to increase care in data collection and interpretation (Stake, 2010).

There were follow-up interviews with participants to cross-check and verify the credibility and accuracy of data (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Maxwell, 2013; Stake, 2010). Member checking is described as the most critical technique utilized to establish the credibility of a study (Lincoln et al., 2011). Triangulation methods of the sources of information and data would be employed through the utilization of multiple data sources to achieve validity (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Maxwell, 2013; Stake, 2010).

I ensured that there were data integrity controls throughout the data gathering process to avoid any biases and to preserve the accuracy of information. The data were coded and analyzed using NVivo software. The qualitative multiple case study was utilized to obtain in-depth information using open-ended interview questions (Yin, 2014).

Credibility

Credibility is described as the alignment of the research findings with reality (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Merriam, 2009; Maxwell, 2013; Simons, 2012). Merriam (2009) suggested that researchers adopt and apply triangulation, member checking, peer

reviews, and audit trail techniques to improve the credibility of a research. Triangulation was displayed through the collection of data based on different sources and methods as a check on one another to see if the different methods with different strengths and limitations will support the conclusion. The sources that were used included interviews of direct care staff, administrative team, notes, journals, document review, and the center records (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Maxwell, 2013; Seidman, 2013; Simons, 2012; Stake, 2010). Triangulation is a strategy utilized to compare and cross-check data through observations carried out at various intervals, times, and places.

Alternatively, triangulation could involve interview data collected from separate individuals or diverse groups and settings holding different perspectives, using a variety of methods (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Simons, 2012; Stake, 2010). The strategy was used to reduce the risk of chance associations and systematic biases to allow a better assessment of the generality of explanations that would be developed and to increase the confidence in the evidence that would be gathered (Maxwell, 2013; Stake, 2010).

Transferability

Merriam (2009) described transferability as the degree to which a study's findings can be made applicable to other situations. To enhance transferability of qualitative research, Merriam suggested that techniques that provide rich and detailed descriptions typical of the sample be utilized. This in-depth descriptive strategy refers to the rich and detail representation of the setting, participants, data collection, and analysis procedures, and the findings of the study that will be conducted (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012).

Although generalizability may not be the intended goal of this research, the issue of

transferability was addressed in ways that will enable the readership to determine whether and to what degree the phenomenon on the perceptions of performance appraisals on job satisfaction in this specific context can be transferred to another context (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012).

The richness of the descriptions and the amount of detailed information provided an element of shared experience in communicating to the readership a realistic or holistic picture that will lead to the likely applicability of the findings to other situations under similar conditions as depth, richness, and detailed description provides the basis for the claim of a qualitative account's relevance in some broader context for transferability (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Simons, 2012).

Dependability

Dependability is described as the degree to which research findings are made replicable or replicated (Merriam, 2009). Dependability is used to refer to whether the processes and procedures used to collect and interpret data can be tracked. I provided detailed and thorough explanations of how the data were to be collected and analyzed to constitute the audit trail. This included the coding of several interviews to establish inter-rater reliability as the process of checking on the consistency between raters will likely reduce the potential bias of a single researcher collecting and analyzing data (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) suggested that triangulation, peer review, and keeping an audit trail are critical in achieving dependability of a study.

The audit trails would enable the maintenance of research journal containing a detailed description of the issues, ideas, and challenges that will be encountered in the

field during the data collection and analysis process, and the decisions that would be made. In addition to triangulation, the audit trail strategy would remain critical in addressing the issue of trustworthiness of the research using a journal in which all works will be tracked and recorded during the data collection process and how the decisions will be made throughout the research process on the perceptions of employees of performance appraisals on job satisfaction (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012).

Confirmability

Confirmability in qualitative research simply refers to the objectivity of the study. Merriam (2009) recommended the use of reflexivity to enhance objectivity where reflexivity refers to the process of reflecting critically on the self as the researcher. During reflexivity, any assumptions, biases, and proclivities that would be held about the research and interpretation of findings would be explained. Reflexivity was utilized by examining any assumptions and biases while following stringent data collection and analysis protocols and procedures to minimize biases on the perceptions of employees of performance appraisals on job satisfaction as participants were listened to carefully during the data collection process (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012).

Ethical Procedures and Informed Consent

The ethical procedures for the conduct of this multiple case study specifically included a nondisclosure agreement and an explanation of the purpose of the study and informed consent for each person to be interviewed and observed. The interviews were conducted on the principle of confidentiality. The use of data was negotiated with participants on specific criteria to ensure accuracy, fairness, and relevance. Participants of

the study were required to sign informed consent forms prior to the issue and completion of the instrument and data gathering (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Simons, 2012).

The consent form spelled out information regarding the background of the study, voluntary nature of the study, benefits, and risks associated with the study, and confidentiality (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Simons, 2012). The consent form included an explanation of how the participants may be reached to seek clarification on responses and the signing of a statement of consent by both researcher and participants of the study. (Appendix D). Permission was obtained from the IRB, participants of the study, and the healthcare organization after review prior to the issue of the consent forms (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012).

Data obtained from the interviews were transcribed immediately following the conclusion of each interview using a systematic coding process and NVivo software to identify emerging themes and patterns (Janesick, 2011, 2011; Miles, et al., 2014). The process also included reading over field notes several times, coding of keywords or key terms, themes, patterns, and interpretation of participant behaviors. All data gathered were secured electronically and locked in a filing cabinet after the transcriptions (Janesick, 2011). The NVivo software was used to arrange and organize data for (Miles, et al., 2014).

I had no prior or existing personal or professional relationships with any of the employees or supervisors/managers whose views may influence the study's outcome. I relied on established relationships and mutual respect for participants of the study while conducting the study with truth and fidelity and would use experience not as a

commitment only to individual values but a commitment that individual values would be considered during the study (Stake, 2010). A transparent atmosphere was created, and it was ensured that participation in the study is voluntary (Simons, 2012). My previous experience as an appraisee and appraiser of employee performance could raise concerns and create uneasiness in participants, so I assured participants that issues of confidentiality, integrity, accuracy, reliability, and validity related to data collection will be strictly adhered to for the ease of potential concerns (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Seidman, 2013; Simons, 2012).

Summary

This chapter provided an overview and a description of the research methodology and design inquiry on the perceptions of fairness of employees of performance appraisals on job satisfaction. A multiple case study design inquiry was chosen for this qualitative research study. Yin (2014) maintained that case study research is appropriate to explore and understand real-world situations by collecting and analyzing multiple sources of evidence to provide a rich description of the phenomenon being investigated. This chapter included a description of the role of the researcher, the study population, procedures of recruitment and participant selection, sample, size, and instrumentation. Other topics included data collection, data analysis plan, evidence of quality, ethical considerations, and issues of trustworthiness.

This chapter presented the justification for the qualitative approach as the most suitable research methodology and the multiple case study as the most appropriate design inquiry to obtain data and information on the perceptions of fairness of employees of

performance appraisals on job satisfaction. Data from the study may provide insights and understanding on the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction based on the 15 to 18 participant responses until saturation. Each participant will contribute to the data gathering process by participating in the interviews to assess sustainability and implementation of performance appraisals and its fairness perceptions about job satisfaction.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

Presented in this chapter are the data collected, analysis of results, and findings of the study based on the research questions, conceptual framework, the primary themes and sub-themes from the literature reviewed and results from the analysis of the data. The chapter is organized in the following sections: research setting, population, sample, sample size, instrumentation, sampling strategy, participant demographics, data collection and analysis, study results, and summary. This research was conducted within two main constructs of Adams's equity theory (Rowland, 2013; Tseng & Kuo, 2014), organizational justice theory (Hamlett, 2014; Govender et al., 2015), perception theory (Norman & Kabwe, 2015; Iqbal et al., 2015) and the two-factor theory of motivation (Herzberg, 1959; Ozguner & Ozguner, 2014). These theories are specific to employee perceptions and behaviors.

Gaining insight into the perceptions of employees based on their lived experiences of PAs and job satisfaction remained central to the study and contributed to posing the following central research question: What are the employee perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals on job satisfaction in healthcare organizations? The following related subquestion was used to support the overarching research question: What are the reasons that lead to unfair perceptions of performance appraisals? The data collection and analysis were derived from 20 participants of a healthcare organization situated in the western part of the state of Maryland located in the Baltimore-Washington Metropolitan area who met the established criteria of having worked with the

organization for at least 1 year and experienced performance appraisals within the organization.

Each of the participants shared information through face-to-face, one-on-one interviews on their perceptions and experiences regarding PAs on job satisfaction in the organization within which they were employed. Results include insights obtained from direct quotes of the participant interviews, member checking and triangulation. Exploring participants' perceptions of fairness of PAs as their lived experiences yielded diverse and multiple outcomes and findings related to the overarching research question and subquestion posed with underlying similarities to research circumstances and premises consistent with qualitative studies as presented in the review of literature and the conceptual framework of the study.

Research Setting

The interviews were conducted at various times that were convenient to each participant at an agreed upon secured location with permission granted by the organization (Appendix B) to use an old one-story office building owned but previously used by the organization before relocating to the new facility. This building was located several blocks away from the new facility and not being used presently. This location was safe, well-secured, and the floor was vacant. Participants were not visible to other people or public. Efforts were made to ensure reasonable accommodation for every participant regarding scheduling and choice of venue. The strength of a qualitative design is that the research must occur in the participants' natural setting, where the natural setting is

described as an organization's facility, private office or the home of the individual (Klassen, Creswell, Plano Clark, Smith, & Meissner, 2012).

Conditions that may have impacted the interviews included one participant whose scheduling followed two continuous shifts of 16 hours and another scheduling of the interview during her lunch break. In the instance when the interview was held following two continuous shifts of 16 hours, the participant could have been exhausted, filled with anxiety to complete the interview and go home to rest or attend to some chores as that was particularly suggested before the start of the interview. In a second situation where the participant had to go to a second job following the interview it was possible this participant might have just wanted to go to get to work on time. In all the situations, the interview process and outcomes were similar in nature and duration, as all participants were engaged earnestly to avoid sleepiness and monotony. In all the scenarios, participants seemed relaxed during the entire duration of each session of the interview and responded freely and openly.

Population and Sample

This study focused on the perceptions of fairness of PAs of employees on job satisfaction. The population was a healthcare organization with diverse employee levels and qualifications which included administrative/management personnel and nurses of the organization in the western part of Maryland located in the Baltimore-Washington Metropolitan area. Evidence for a case study may arise from several sources such as interviews, documents, archival records, direct observation, participant-observation, and physical artifacts (Yin, 2014). The primary data source for this study included the

interview of participants that represented the two main employee groups:

Administrative/Management staff and nurses and the direct participant-observations during the interviews. The other data sources were documentation describing the PA process and procedure of the selected organization based on the literature reviewed and the journal notes. Data collection was restricted to open-ended questions in structured and semistructured face-to-face interviews as designed originally.

The participants fully met the established criteria of having been employed with the organization for at least one year and experienced performance appraisals with the select case organization. Each participant was interviewed based on the interview protocol and guide approved by the IRB. The questions for all participants provided the basis for the data collection and analysis of the sample population and allowed the study design to purposefully have the same selection design for each employee and the same questions on the interview protocol and guide. Participants responded based on their experience with performance appraisals and were recruited from the selected organization as approved by the IRB.

Sample Size

The sample frame was a purposive sample of active participants who met the established criteria of having worked for at least 1 year and experienced performance appraisals. For this study, participants were purposefully selected to gain in-depth insight and perspectives to identify the variation in perspectives among the employee. A total of 20 employees were recruited and interviewed to saturation per established criteria.

Instrumentation, Interview Protocol and Guide

The interview protocol facilitated the data collection from participants who agreed to participate in the study. The interview guide used was designed to simplify questions, arranged logically, and produced natural responses. The guide for the study constituted questions related to the following themes (a) perceptions, (b) fairness, (c) job satisfaction, (d) performance appraisal, and (e) any questions or comments that participants had to share relating to the study.

Sampling Strategy and Participant Demographics

Following acceptance and approval of cooperation through the letter of cooperation for the research partner (Appendix A) and subsequent IRB approval, fliers were posted on the notice boards of the organization and together with e-mails sent to potential participants of the selected case organization inviting them to participate in the research, followed by phone calls. Participants for the interview were selected through responses to e-mail solicitation and phone calls to employees of the select case organization. In the e-mails were flier attachments with copies posted on the notice boards to garner recruitment and participation based on the purposeful sampling procedure of the population of the case organization's employee database or staff list/roll. The initial call for participants for recruitment yielded 12 responses over a period of 6 weeks.

Several follow-up requests yielded eight additional responses for selection and recruitment by the established criteria of having worked for at least 1 year and experienced performance appraisals. Out of this later recruitment, two people withdrew

their participation with the explanation that other engagements would not allow them. Only two people did not meet the established criteria for inclusion although several people expressed interest in participating in the study to share their views as the topic to them sounded captivating and interesting so long as the research was related to their job satisfaction; but, the nature of their shift and time of commute would not permit them. Following the withdrawals, two additional recruitments were made to augment the number to reach saturation.

The established inclusive criteria for participation in the study stipulated that participants would have been in the employ of the organization for at least, a period of one year and would have experienced performance appraisals at the selected case organization. Twenty individuals participated in the study comprising two administrative personnel and 18 nurses out of a total staff strength of 48 employees from the organization. The nurses who participated in the study were Certified Nursing Assistants (CNAs), Geriatric Nursing Assistants (GNAs), Licensed Practical Nurses (LPNs), and Registered Nurses (RNs).

No more details specific to individual demographic information were collected as it was deliberate to keep demographic details to a minimum to ensure participation and assure anonymity. Following the initial introduction was a brief discussion of the limited demographics. Each participant was given the option to opt out of sharing the demographic information or shared demographic information about (a) age group/range, (b) sexual orientation (male or female), (c) designation/nursing qualification, (d) qualification/highest level of education, and (e) years of work experience (Table 1).

Demographic information was obtained from the participants before recording the interview. I ensured that the participants were relaxed and comfortable and addressed any questions or concerns before their participation in the interview, following all initial discussions about collecting demographic data.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Participant	Age Group Or Range	Sex (Male/Female)	Highest Nursing Qualification	Highest Ed. Qualification	Years of Work Experience
1	45-50	Female	RN/MSN	College	18
2	50-55	Male	RN	College	25
3	55-60	Male	CNA	H/S	22
4	55-60	Female	LPN	H/S	28
5	20-25	Female	CNA	H/S	3
6	40-45	Female	LPN	College	12
7	25-30	Female	CNA	H/S	5
8	35-40	Female	CNA	H/S	12
9	30-35	Female	LPN	H/S	10
10	40-45	Female	LPN	College	12
11	25-30	Female	GNA	H/S	8
12	50-55	Female	LPN	College	22
13	55-60	Female	RN	College	28
14	45-50	Female	LPN	H/S	15
15	40-45	Female	LPN	H/S	15
16	40-45	Male	GNA	H/S	12
17	15-20	Female	GNA	H/S	2
18	45-50	Female	LPN	College	20
19	40-45	Female	LPN	College	20
20	60+	Female	GNA	H/S	18

I recorded the sessions using an Olympus digital voice recorder WS-853 and a backup Sonny ICD-B600 digital voice recorder with the permission of participants and took researcher notes for the reflexive journal as part of the data collection process for cross-checking or member checking and subsequent verification after the interviews (Berger, 2015). Each interview session lasted between 28 and 40 minutes. The audio recording of each session was transcribed verbatim and transferred onto a Word document immediately following each interview session. The data transcripts were reviewed several times for any major omissions and errors and forwarded to each participant for cross-checking and verification to ensure the accuracy of responses and facts.

I used transcript verification to ensure that data were transcribed correctly to provide a true reflection of the interview responses and proceedings. Following the completion of the reviews to confirm accuracy, I input data into the NVivo 12 Pro Qualitative Analysis software (QSR). The interview and recording of each session were concluded with appreciation to participants and the sharing of contact information to allow for follow-up questions and the clarification of responses or decisions of withdrawal from the study for any reason after their departure.

Participants were assured of their privacy and confidentiality with the understanding that data collected would be retained for 5 years following the interview with the encryption of electronic files including all other information securely locked up in a private location by the IRB requirements. All folders such as recordings, excel spreadsheets, NVivo Qualitative Software analysis, and all paper materials and encrypted

drive of files from the study were all locked up and secured in a private location. The data collection from the face-to-face interviews took approximately 6 weeks to complete to reach volume and saturation.

Data Collection

The interview, as part of the data gathering process, was undertaken in the following order including activities preceding the interview, opening conversation, actual interview phase, ending the interview, and data saturation. In conducting the interview, I verified and confirmed the job title and length of service of potential participants with both employees and the organization to ensure that the participants met the established study criteria. Once the criteria of length of service of at least 1-year experience had been met, and the job title confirmed, I proceeded with the interview by asking the interview questions.

The data collection was conducted in accordance with the requirements of the IRB as approved. Recruitment of participants was based on the targeted approach with the use of e-mail contacts and the distribution and posting of fliers followed by phone calls based on the staff list. Participant selection for the study was made voluntary based on the established criteria, with self-reported verification. The 20 participants who volunteered to participate in the study met the set criteria of having worked with the identified healthcare organization for at least 1 year and experienced performance evaluation or appraisal. As participants were enrolled, everyone was assigned a unique code for identification (ex. PT1, PT2, PT3). This identifier was cross-referenced on a master list that was maintained by only me.

Following each person's consent to participate in the study, I met with each participant after accepting to participate to schedule a meeting time and venue as convenient to them. After a brief introduction during the scheduled face-to-face meeting to start the interview, I reviewed the consent form with the participant, provided clarification to any questions and obtained their informed consent for participation in the research by signing the consent forms provided. Each participant was given a copy of the consent form to keep for their records. The interview then began with each participant at a time, once informed consent was obtained from each participant.

Two digital audio recorders comprising an Olympus digital voice recorder WS-853 and a backup Sonny ICD-B600 digital voice recorder were set up to assure the possibility of any mechanical or electronic errors or failure during the interview to serve as a backup. A sign with the inscription "Interview in Progress" was placed outside the door of the conference room door to ensure no disturbance or intrusion to ensure privacy and confidentiality. After all arrangements were concluded, I met with potential participants at the agreed time and designated location or venue. On meeting the participant, I reviewed the purpose of the study with them and reiterated that participants might stop or withdraw from the study at any time without any consequence. Participants were asked if they were ready to commence the interview after a reminder that the interview was being recorded. I asked permission from participants to begin recording the interview and indicated that the recording had begun in each case. I restated the participant's identifier and purpose of the interview for the record.

The interview questions were posed in order of the interview protocol and guide with allowance made for participants to share any additional information pertinent to the study. The interview protocol was relied upon extensively and utilized to redirect the focus of the interview to keep the process on track. At the end of the interview, I asked participants if anyone had any questions, information, concerns or comments related to the study that they were likely to share. I thanked participants for their time and sought their permission to end the recording if there was no question or concerns and ended the interview after informing participants.

The recorder and all documents were then secured immediately in a brown envelop and bag, scanned and secured on an electronic file, with backups retained, in a file cabinet and would be kept for a period of 5 years to ensure the protection of participant privacy. I used reflective journal notes in documenting views, opinions, perceptions, and feelings of participants relating to the study to monitor the data collection process to maintain interest in the study. The interviews were conducted and concluded without incident.

I shared contact information with participants immediately following each interview session so that they could be contacted to answer any follow-up questions that required further clarification or concerns that they might have about the study. Audio recordings of the interview proceedings and all other data and information including reflexive journals, and interview notes were recorded using the unique identifiers of the participants only to avoid bias or prejudice. Privacy concerns regarding coding and secure data management were assured. Participants were informed and assured that the

researcher would be the only individual or transcriber to handle all information and recorded data files about the research and would be identified only by the assigned unique code or identifier.

Data Saturation

Data saturation is a terminology in qualitative research used widely to describe the point at which no new information, coding, or themes emerge from further qualitative data with the ability to replicate the study and the sample size is considered at the point at which data saturation occurs (Kerr, Nixon, & Wild, 2010; Fusch & Ness, 2015).

Qualitative research is enhanced when internal validity is supported by saturation (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Per Kerr et al., 2010, it is at this point that enough data would have been gathered to facilitate a complete and credible analysis of data. Data saturation was achieved with 20 participants.

Transcription

Interviews were transcribed to capture verbal data that had been recorded. Analysis required several playbacks and careful listening of the two digital audio recorders and translated verbatim (Widodo, 2014). The recorded responses or transcripts were saved with participants' special codes or identifiers to identify each file. Each file was then transcribed into a Microsoft Word document with the responses tagged with participant codes and questions labeled appropriately. The transcriptions were reviewed several times using the audio file to ensure accuracy and to obtain in-depth insight and information in preparedness for data analysis.

Coding of Data

The transcribed data were coded along with the reflective journals notes taken immediately following data collection. Both reflexive journal notes and transcriptions were transferred into NVivo 12 Pro, a qualitative software program that allows qualitative researchers identify and assess information that produces in-depth narrative coded data that translates into themes, patterns and trends to provide insight and understanding of the data captured to help in the analysis and findings of the study.

The transcripts were verified by comparing the digital voice recordings with the transcribed interviews and subsequently transferred to a draft spreadsheet, together with the interview questions and participant responses and condensed into a word document for accuracy. The data were verified several times with the digital audio recordings to ensure accuracy of transcripts and the information stored in text files. The text files were uploaded into NVivo 12 Pro for analysis with identification of relevant and significant data, based on participant responses to the interview questions. Notes were taken of recurring answers that were made by two or more study participants and all pertinent information gathered from raw data was uncovered using the NVivo 12 Pro code manager.

I used both deductive and inductive coding methods that aligned with the constructs and conceptual framework from which the research questions emerged to provide the main category of primary themes and subthemes. I applied, followed, and reviewed the coding process multiple times to identify additional themes that emerged from responses and labels of the interview codes to obtain similar categories in content

and context. The codes were then linked following the several levels of coding to uncover the identical nodes and classifications to permit extensive or substantial coding of data for analysis. This coding effort resulted in uncovering the predetermined nodes and emergent nodes leading to the major nodes as primary themes and subthemes (Figure 3). Further detailed evaluation and extensive coding permitted the coordination and combination of the primary themes and subthemes into both parent nodes and child nodes and subsequently finalized into the five main nodes based on the research questions within NVivo 12 Pro. These nodes correspond to the constructs of the parent and child nodes (Figure 3).

Data Analysis

The analysis of data was conducted following the identification of vital themes, patterns, concepts, and repetitions for recurring perspectives from the divergent respondents of the study. The data gathered were then analyzed based on a suggested approach designed for a qualitative case study by Magolda (2007) as follows:

- Grouping participant experiences within the framework of the phenomena under study.
- Listening to recordings, taking notes, and constructing a structure for the coding after a follow-up with participants to confirm verification of transcripts.
- Examining, and validating interview transcripts.
- Describing the importance of the phenomena.
- Identifying key statements in the transcripts.

- Categorizing the critical statements into various units.
- Obtaining a grouping of themes and conducting the analysis.

The analysis consisted of groupings of like terms indicated by the responses, categories, and labels based on participant's viewpoints. The data analysis included developing a coding scheme as the goal of data analysis is to determine repeatable regularities to depict patterns, themes, and concepts. The interview responses of participants were examined to determine the themes and patterns which were subsequently grouped and counted to find out the percentage of occurrence or times a response was obtained. The information gathered was then compared with previous studies to affirm the repetition of patterns uncovered or to determine new patterns.




Figure 3. Illustration of parent and child nodes as primary themes and subthemes based on the constructs and research questions for data analysis.

A description of the procedure used for analyzing data and applied in the context outlined in the approach for the study was based on the research questions below.

The overarching research question and related subquestion this study sought to address are:

1. What are employee perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals on job satisfaction in healthcare organizations?

2. What are the reasons that lead to unfair perceptions of performance appraisals?

To answer the research questions, a qualitative design was utilized for the study. Twenty participants were selected, and face-to-face interviews were utilized for the data collection. In addressing these questions, this study explored the perceptions of fairness of employee PAs on job satisfaction. A total of 20 participants from the healthcare organization were interviewed for this study. One participant had the RN/MSN nursing qualification, four had GNA, two had RN, four had CNA, and nine of them had the LPN nursing qualification (Table 1). One of the participants was aged 15 to 20 years (19 years), thirteen were aged 20 to 50 years, and six were aged 50 and above. Eight of the participants had completed college while twelve only completed high school. Three of the participants had 1 to 5 years of experience in the health sector, two had 6 to 10 years of experience, six had 11 to 15 years of experience, four had 16 to 20 years of experience, and five had 21 or more years of experience in the sector.

Discussions centered around participants' perception on fairness, job satisfaction, performance appraisals, reasons for unfair perceptions of PAs, and recommendations to improve the fairness perceptions of PAs. Perceptions sought from participants on PAs were about their knowledge of PAs perceptions, fairness of PAs and its effect on job satisfaction of employees. A Word document illustrating the alignment of responses to the interview questions by the research questions and constructs is provided in the discussion of the results.

Summary of Emergent Primary Themes and Related Subthemes From Interviews

Theme 1: Perceptions of Fairness

- Equality Devoid of Bias
- Transparency and Justice

Theme 2: Perceptions of Job Satisfaction

- Contentment
- Conducive Working Environment
- Reward/Incentives
- Job Security

Theme 3: Perceptions of Performance Appraisals

- Knowledge
- Perceptions on Performance Appraisals
- Fairness (Fair/Unfair)
- Fairness of Performance Appraisals Ensuring Job Satisfaction

Theme 4: Reasons for Unfair Perceptions

- Bias
- Technical Capacity of Appraisers
- Failure to Follow Laid Down Procedures
- It Happens only once Yearly
- Lack of Feedback to Appraisers
- Lack of Motivation and Reward
- Poor Communication/Relationships

- Poor Design or Application of Performance Appraisals

Theme 5: Recommendations to Improve Appraisal Perceptions

- Employees Ownership in Goal Setting and Appraisals
- Consider Work Conditions
- Employees Should be Encouraged and Given Second Chances
- Encourage Communication and Feedbacks
- It Should be Rewarding
- Equality and Objectivity
- Provide Training/Coaching

Table 2

Frequency Table of top 10 Keywords/Terms

	WORD	COUNT
1	Performance	288
2	Appraisals	163
3	Perceptions	136
4	Employees	113
5	Appraisal	108
6	Fairness	106
7	Employee	104
8	Satisfaction	92
9	Work	88
10	Unfair	82

Samples of participant responses on the various issues on their perspectives on the perceptions of performance appraisals on job satisfaction are presented below based on the respective primary themes and subthemes.

Theme 1: Perceptions of Fairness

Equality devoid of bias. Most participants, representing 78% of employees, viewed fairness as a construct that was embedded in adherence to rules and regulations that applied equally to people without any biases under a given condition. It was emphasized that equality meant that everyone, regardless of their background and characteristics such as gender, race, and color was treated with the same yardstick without any discrimination. Fairness to the participants meant equal treatment of all employees, devoid of partiality, bias, nepotism, favoritism, or discrimination of any kind. PT 3: “Fairness to me means treating everyone equally without any bias so that if you are evaluating people you need to be fair to everyone by using the same yardstick or assessment method for all the employees equally.”

Transparency and justice. In the work place, transparency was considered a key factor in ensuring that employee evaluations were fair, without bias, and conducted without special considerations for specific people. Participants also described fairness as justice because it reinforced workplace values.

PT 5: “Fairness to me means transparency of evaluations, equality, and impartiality of the assessment so that the outcome is a true reflection of the work output.”

PT 13: “Fairness would be treating or reviewing an employee’s performance, based on objective facts and not jaundiced by any personal animosities or relationship with the employee.”

Theme 2: Perceptions of Job Satisfaction

Contentment. Majority of participants, representing 86% of employees interviewed viewed job satisfaction as a situation where employees were contented and happy with their jobs. Job satisfaction was considered as a feeling of accomplishment where employees carried out their responsibilities without reservations, knowing that their contributions were valued, and expectations from the job were fulfilled.

PT 12: “Job satisfaction is the contentment one experiences with their job. It is not only about the benefits or remuneration but the fulfilled feeling one has with the ability to looking forward to waking up and going to work.”

A key component of job satisfaction expressed was employee contentedness. Embedded in satisfaction were good relationships with coworkers and the superiors, good remunerations, financial stability of the organization, opportunity for growth, company values, favorable work schedules, and job security.

PT 16: “Job satisfaction may mean the feeling of contentment or pleasure that a worker may experience on the job especially, when your goals are achieved, and you are commended by your employer or management.”

Conducive working environment. Some participants, representing 68% of the employees believed job satisfaction was linked with having a favorable working environment at workplaces, which include the availability of required tools, remuneration, workload, fair treatment, and availability of opportunities for career development. A positive work environment also contributes immensely to how employees feel about their jobs.

PT 9: “Job satisfaction is when one enjoys what they do, they like the environment they work in and they believe they are adequately paid for what they do.”

PT 1: “It is when an employee is treated with fairness, not victimized, enjoys equal opportunity and rewarded accordingly. Employee feels satisfied working.”

Reward/incentives. Participants also believed that well rewarded employees find satisfaction in their jobs. Reward could be in the form of increased pay, progression in career, promotion, respect or appreciation given to employees for doing their jobs to motivate them and improve performance.

PT 4: “It is when a well remunerated person finds fulfillment and contentment with his job.”

PT 8: “To me, job satisfaction means everything you like about the job that makes you happy at the end of the day and this may include rewards, incentives and pay.”

Job security. Participants believed employees obtain job satisfaction from knowing that their jobs are secured. They feel satisfied and secured knowing that there is stability at their place of work.

PT 10: “I know one aspect of job satisfaction is not reward-related but rather job security. Some of us obtain job satisfaction knowing the company is stable and not going anywhere.”

PT 18: “I feel this is the most important aspect of a job, and having a stable company makes me feel secure, and this helps promote job satisfaction.”

Theme 3: Perceptions of Performance Appraisals

Knowledge. Participants expressed vast knowledge about performance appraisals. They viewed performance appraisal as a SMART assessment tool used by employers to evaluate and enhance the performance of their employees. They were considered an opportunity to evaluate employees, organizational performance and understand manager expectations especially, in a corporate environment. The appraisal could be tied to promotion, but some acknowledged that it was not routinely done.

PT 2: “Performance appraisal is a tool used to assess employees’ performance of their jobs and reward accordingly by management at the end of the year.”

PT 11: “Personal appraisal was considered an integral part of the performance appraisal process.”

PT 6: “Performance appraisal in general was described as a structured, periodical process done to assess strengths and weaknesses, improve performance and work motivation, to aid career development.”

PT 4: “As an individual, I am constantly reviewing my own performance on the job to ensure that I am doing what my job position expects of me.”

Some participants’ knowledge about performance appraisal perceptions was that there were mixed outcomes that were sometimes fair and other times unfair depending on the relationship between the appraisee and the appraiser.

PT 18:

My knowledge is that the perceptions can be good or bad depending on its accuracy and fairness of the outcomes after the assessment is conducted. The outcome is

sometimes shielded in secrecy without any feedback for the employee to know whether they are doing well on the job or not. The results are also not probably used to inform decisions or policy but left on the shelves to gather dust.

Perceptions on performance appraisals. There was a consensus that PAs provided an opportunity for evaluation and growth of employees. Even though there were some concerns, they believed performance appraisals are important to both the employers and employees if done objectively. It ensures that employees are meeting their job expectations, gives them the opportunity for career growth, to know their strength, weaknesses, and achievements. It was viewed as a learning opportunity in instances when it was not based on bias or personal relationship between the manager and subordinates.

PT 12: “Performance appraisal can be good and can be bad for employees. Where there are impediments or restrictions that hinder the thorough execution of your job, you are held accountable, as a result demoralizes the employee, and hence productivity decline.”

The inherent subjectivity in the appraisal process was highlighted as a concern that could make it counterproductive and peer reviews were suggested by a Participant 13. Concerns raised by participants were around the possibility of appraisers being subjective and punitive. It was believed that the relationship between appraisers and appraisees influences the outcome of performance appraisals. Participants held the opinion that it could be used to intimidate and pick on employees perceived to be threats to appraisers. It could dash the morale of employees instead of improving their performance when biased. Some participants perceived greater fairness and satisfaction

with performance appraisals in private sectors compared to public sectors.

PT 7: “It may be positive or negative depending on who is doing the appraisal. Peer reviews tend to be more beneficial because there is usually close connection between the peers they know work closely with the employee.”

PT 13:

My perceptions are that performance evaluation outcomes tend to be skewed to be fair based on good relationships and responses between the reviewer and the employee and unfair towards an employee who is not in compliance with rules and regulations and has adverse work ethics such as irregularity, laziness, disrespectful to management, and frequent call out from work.

Fairness (fair or unfair). Participants expressed diverse opinions on the fairness of performance appraisals. Some considered performance appraisals as fair if it was structured and done without bias, as it enabled them to know their employer’s perception and expectations on the job they do. Others considered the degree to which it was fair was dependent on the measures used.

PT 2: “I consider performance appraisals as a fair mechanism used by human resource managers because, the system forms the basis for coaching the low-performing employees, among other functions and helps facilitate worker’s pay increases.”

PT 9: “I consider performance appraisals fair when done objectively with the aim of improving quality and efficiency. Where subjectivity is involved, and the intent is to punish, then performance appraisal cannot be said to be fair.”

Some participants believed the fairness of PAs depends on the appraiser or employer as well as factors such as personal dislike, race, and gender. They believed objectivity or subjectivity of the appraiser when appraising employees plays a role in determining the fairness of performance appraisals. PAs were viewed as unfair because they were not effective in improving the performances of employees but instead fostered power-and-control mechanisms in the workplace. Lack of automation of the appraisal process reduced transparency and may contribute to unfair perceptions and appraisals.

PT 11:

Performance appraisals are unfair. Managers assume that an employee is naturally good or bad at his job. This perspective is usually based on personality clashes and other factors that do not actually indicate job performance. Managers who feel threatened by an employee who shows talent tends to give poor appraisal scores.

PT: 3:

Performance appraisal by itself is an assessment tool used to evaluate competence and productivity. There is nothing wrong with it. These assessments are not automated but are carried out by humans that is where the problem lies. The issue of fairness or unfairness comes in where the one performing the assessment is biased. Implicit biases or explicit bias against the employee he or she is evaluating.

When feedback on appraisal is not communicated, participants reported not being able to conclude that the appraisal process was fair and assumed fairness was hinged on

the relationship between the managers and employees. Personal experience with the appraisal process influenced participants' responses on the fairness of the process and the fear of being sacked in some instances was the driver for some participants to work harder on this appraisal comments.

PT 1:

It depends on the individual and how he/she perceives the outcome of the evaluation. In a government facility where I also work, the exercise is conducted bi-annually but in my current work, it is held only once a whole year without any feedback and sometimes it is not done, and we have no idea of how the results are used. Sometimes it is just a mere self-assessment of form-filling if the supervisor is busy or it is done in a rush as everyone is busy with their schedule.

PT 9: "The fairness or unfairness of performance appraisals can be good or bad so long as it does not affect my pay as it has never added value to my working conditions or offer any incentives to reflect on the pocket."

Fairness of performance appraisal perceptions in ensuring job satisfaction.

Participants agreed that the fairness of PAs is critical for job satisfaction and security. They opined that with employees in an organization devoid of fair and clear expectations, appraisal and feedback system will not know if they are meeting their goals and this will affect their job satisfaction. If the performance appraisals were perceived as unfair to the employees, demotivation and consequently job dissatisfaction occurred as some employees felt their contributions were not appreciated relative to other employees. Fair PAs were important to get them more engaged with the company's interest and improve

their performances. Communication was critical to ensuring that employees properly understood the outcome of an appraisal process and considered it fair.

PT 17: “Employees feel disappointed when they are unable to take any incentive. When the incentive system is self-evident, the manager discusses performance in good time and regularly to enable workers know that their performance is below required standards to assure a more substantial incentive.”

Theme 4: Reasons for Unfair Perceptions

Bias. Participants believed bias or subjectivity from appraisers or employers was a major reason for unfair perceptions about PAs. Bias could be because of favoritism, gender, race, and color. Appraisers tend to favor some and be unfair to others during PAs based on personal biases or having favorites. Personal biases and animosities of supervisors towards employees could lead to the supervisor overlooking or ignoring the positive contributions of the employee and only focusing on the negatives.

PT 6: “I do have some practical knowledge as I have conducted appraisals for over 10 years. Therefore, the human factor such as subjectivity and negative perceptions unrelated to the matter at hand are real issues which could affect results and may need to be addressed.”

PT 10: “Perpetually unequal and unfair treatment of workers makes workers feel exploited and therefore remain resolute with the notion that performance appraisals have not been fair to them due to bias and managers feeling more superior over employees especially, the individually private- owned companies and agencies.”

Technical capacity of appraisers. Untrained appraisers were believed to be more likely to have unfair perceptions about performance appraisals of employees. Appraisers who do not have a clear understanding of the actual duties of the employee may have unfair expectations from employees. Participants believed appraisers should be properly trained or outsourced to undertake performance appraisals.

PT 4: “The conduct of the appraiser whereby he/she had exhibited questionable appraisals in the past. Giving too much room for appraisers to use their own discretion.”

PT 12: “The managers are rather subjective instead of being objective with the assessment, timing of the evaluations due to unpreparedness and scheduling conflicts, unqualified managers performing the assessment because they do not have the requisite training in HR.”

Failure to follow laid down procedures. Unfair perceptions of PA may occur because of the failure of facilitators to provide professional and fair evaluations, failure to follow laid down procedures and protocols of conducting PAs. There is also the lack of knowledge about how the results are used to impact decision making and policy in the organization.

PT 5: “To me, the biggest cause of unfair perception of performance appraisal is how the system itself is designed. If the appraisal is not objective and scientific, allowing for too much manager’s subjective judgement to be used to evaluate an employee, there will be unfair perception.”

PT 8: “Lack of effective and efficient methods or procedures for evaluating workers can also be another cause of unfair perceptions.”

It happens only once yearly. Participants believed conducting performance appraisal once per year does not allow employees to feel as though the process is fair. If most managers would revisit performance on an ongoing basis this will offer employees the opportunity to continually improve, celebrate accomplishments, and discuss development strategies with management.

PT 17: “My perceptions of performance evaluation are that they most often than not are unfair to the employee and the outcome does not portray the actual condition if it is ever conducted at all, and all year round. It is not conducted regularly enough to reflect the real situation as you sometimes don’t hear about it at all.”

Lack of feedback to appraisees. Lack of feedback to employees after the assessment or not making the employees know about the results of the PAs were viewed as one of the reasons why employees perceive PAs as unfair. Lack of documentation and use of data to support points during PAs were viewed as a reason for unfair perceptions of performance appraisals.

PT: 7: “Inability to communicate feedback about outcomes to employees.”

Lack of motivation and reward. Participants believed that sometimes, managers imposed unreasonably high-performance standards and did not motivate the employees to do better which can demoralize and discourage employees. This could serve as a reason for unfair perception of PAs. Lack of accompanying reward and incentives to employees for hard work was viewed as a reason for unfair perception of PAs.

PT 6: “Lack of interest in employee development, rewards and motivation.”

Poor communication/relationships. Participants believed the failure of some employers to establish a two-way communication system within the workplace contributes to unfair perceptions of PAs. Employers needed to listen to their workers and accommodate criticism.

PT 12: “Poor communication between the supervisor and an employer can contribute to unfair performance appraisals.”

PT 9: “Disagreements, and differences in perspectives among supervisors and their immediate employees, questionable relationships between supervisors, and some workers may all be some of the reasons contributing to the unfair perceptions of workers about performance appraisals.”

Poor design or application of performance appraisals. Another possible cause of unfair perception expressed by the participants was wrong approach to achieving what PAs are designed to do, the factors considered during the entire appraisal system development as well as how that is expected to benefit both the employee and the employer. Poor design of the appraisal system implied that it will not be fit for the purpose and will wrongly appraise employees.

PT 11: “Improper application and use of performance appraisals can have a negative effect on employees and in some instances result in employees resorting to legal action against the organization.”

Theme 5: Recommendations to Improve Fairness Perceptions

Employee ownership in goal setting and appraisals. Some participants highlighted the need to offer workers a sense of ownership in the goal-setting process.

This was perceived as an important way on fostering objectivity and making expectations tangible and measurable. When goals are clearly defined, employees are inclined to understand the appraisal criteria (which should be strictly adhered to) at the beginning of the performance year.

PT 2: “Having a well thought out and documented performance plan with goals and deliverables spelt out clearly.”

PT 10: “Avoiding surprises by setting very clear expectations for the managers. Focusing on the needs of employees and being specific on the objectives.”

PT 5: “Give employees a sense of ownership in the goal-setting process, link these goals to compensation, rewards and recognition and hold employees accountable for their actions and remain consistent and reliable.”

Consider work conditions. The need to understand and take into consideration the work conditions of an employee was highlighted by some interviewees. This means that the employers take into consideration any challenges that employees may be facing in the performance of their duties and acknowledge that in their appraisals.

PT 17: “There are times that the demands of the job are beyond the capacity of the employee. When this happens, the employee should be given some benefit of the doubt when it comes to performance appraisal.”

PT 1: “Where tools and resources are inadequate for the execution of the job, efforts should be made to ensure that it factors in employee performance appraisal. Performance appraisal should be done when all conditions that affect the work environment are constant.”

Employees should be encouraged and given second chances. The need to give employees an opportunity to improve if they fell short of the appraisal process was highlighted by some employees. This implied that appraisals should be supportive and not punitive, to acknowledge employee challenges, celebrate their achieved milestones, and offers help to improve the employee's performance. One participant commented about removing rankings from the appraisal system and another participant felt that self-appraisals should be encouraged among employees.

PT 14: "Opportunity must be given for improvement as well as second chances for mistakes."

PT 3: "Employers must be seen as wanting to help employees improve the quality of work being done and not always profit-oriented."

Encourage communication and feedback. A major recommendation that was highlighted by majority of the interviewees was the need to give employees feedback and seek feedback from them as part of the AP in a timely manner. This bidirectional feedback ensures that everyone knows where improvements are needed. Majority of interviewees stressed the need for employers to communicate performance expectations and employees' goals regularly.

PT 2: "Seek employee feedback on the appraisal and incorporate them into your system where possible to let the employees know that they are part of the appraisal system design."

Communication culture as an ongoing activity was considered necessary to ensure that employees had ample opportunity to address their challenges and make the necessary

changes.”

PT 7: “Where an employee does the wrong thing, it should be pointed out immediately instead of piling it up to be used in his appraisal. Appraisals should not be annual events as some employees tend to forget their inadequacies by the time they are appraised.”

It should be rewarding. The key motivation and job satisfaction that can come from the appraisal system was described as ensuring that rewards are embedded into the appraisal system. Incentives that are provided because of positive appraisals were highlighted as an important way of fostering future performance.

PT 13: “Perceived fairness of employee rewards or the lack thereof, is often at the root of why employees leave organization. Therefore, most companies should ensure reward programs focus on fairness from both an internal and external perspective.”

Equality and objectivity. There was a consensus that equality was at the core of a good appraisal system. The same rules apply to all workers and equity in the evaluations by the supervisors without bias and in line with organizational policy. The need to ensure the appraisal process and review mechanisms were conducted externally to foster accountability was mentioned by some employees.

PT 14: “I recommend that the right and same tools are used to measure all employees to assure fairness and accuracy of performance appraisals to improve over a long period to enhance the perceptions of workers and this will also go a long way to ensure job satisfaction.”

PT 20: “There should be mechanisms for reviewing appraisees’ performance appraisal to ensure accountability.”

Provide training/coaching. The foundation for a good work environment that fosters career development and job satisfaction was identified as training. A wide range of training needs was identified: training for supervisors who conduct the appraisals, training for supervisees, training to address shortfalls and improve future performance. Linked to this was the need for supervisors tasked with performing appraisals to have a clear understanding of the employee’s duties to ensure that their assessment is fair.

PT 6: “All stakeholders involved need to be educated or empowered on what appraisals are. A well established and tested process needs to be used. Appraisals are very complicated processes that people specialize in.”

No identified discrepant cases were observed for inclusion in the analysis of data as the absence of bias, enough analysis, and the avoidance of any conflict of interest was ensured during the study to minimize the possibility of obtaining discrepant responses.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Credibility

The exploratory qualitative multiple case study approach and design permitted the enablement of construct validity based on evidence from the litany of sources utilized for the study including thorough explanation and pattern matching logic prototypes (Amerson, 2011). The ability of interviewees to explain, discuss, and emphasize critical issues of the informed consent dispassionately during the meeting sessions preceding the

interviews and follow-up for the verification and confirmation of participant transcripts served as two critical values that assured credibility of the study.

The engagement of participants during the interviews including participant notification prior to the commencement of each interview session coupled with my journal notes was significant in ensuring success during the interviews. I paused occasionally to take notes during each interview if I noticed that a participant felt distracted in any way by my notes taking so as not to interfere with the flow and thought process or concentration of participants, and after the conclusion of each interview. The journal notes, and additional impressions and thoughts gathered as well as participants' expressed views, emotions and mannerisms were then incorporated in the memo section of NVivo 12 Pro to help clarify and ensure the accuracy of information as reflected in the transcription and emerging questions during the follow-up process with participants for verification.

Transferability

The interview protocol and guide, as well as the interview questionnaire which were all vigorously vetted, revised, and validated several times by a panel of experts including IRB helped increase the appropriateness of the topic and the relevance of the study for clarity and accuracy of content specific to the population. The importance of validating a questionnaire in the process of qualitative research adds credibility or credence to a study (Bengtsson, 2016). The constructs of the equity theory (Rowland, 2013), and the two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1959; Ozguner & Ozguner, 2014), served as the foundational framework for the research questions.

Utilizing these theories helped in providing an established protocol and guide for incorporation into the study design to serve as a supporting framework for obtaining external validity of this exploratory qualitative multiple case study (Amerson, 2011). The conceptual framework of using the theories as part of the constructs utilized for the study helped establish validity to adequately support the study, as transferability of a study entails an application of research findings from one group to the other with the expectation that this study would have applicability to other organizations especially, in healthcare (Thomas & Magilvy, 2011).

Dependability

Dependability of the study was assured using a combination of digital audio recordings that were transcribed verbatim and reviewed repeatedly in conjunction with journal notes taken during the interview with the goal of the repeated reviews being to identify hints related to workers' lived experiences and perceptions shared to enhance transcription and interpretation of the interviews.

The review was done to compare the audio recordings with the journal notes about the expressed perceptions, views, feelings of the engaged participants to capture the associated experiences that might not have been verbally expressed. All the activities engaged in during the collection of data including the audio recordings and researcher journal notes, and transcripts were transferred and input into NVivo v. 12 qualitative analysis software to ensure accurate, non-bias and dependable results and subsequently analyzed.

Confirmability

Confirmability of the study was maintained during the entire process of the interview, coding, analysis, and interpretation of data because remaining neutral in a qualitative research is a core value attainable by addressing critical issues such as consistency, truth, value, and applicability of the study per Noble and Smith (2015), though very challenging to maintain during the interview process. In accordance with maintaining the value of confirmability in a qualitative research, I ensured that each interview was reviewed ahead to serve as a constant reminder as the researcher to remain focused on participants' responses as it helped me to maintain neutrality in relation to my experience or any philosophical views like mine that was likely to trigger any personal instincts during the interviews.

Reviewing the audio recordings alongside the journal notes multiple times helped to uncover, remove or minimize bias or personal responses during the review, transcription, coding, analysis, and interpretation of the data. Cautious and reflective bracketing was undertaken at several different stages of the study to permit easy understanding and reflexivity because each level of the data analysis required nonjudgmental and conscientious procedures to maintain neutrality and the avoidance of bias.

Ethical Considerations and Procedures

The several ethical considerations and procedures for this study were undertaken within the framework or purview and approval of the Walden University while adhering strictly and precisely to the processes described in the final IRB application submitted to

the Board. Permission to conduct the study was granted per IRB approval number 05-16-18-0344898 with expiration date of May 15th, 2019. The approval included informed consent as described within the IRB application process. The entire recruitment of participants and data collection began immediately following IRB approval.

Participants were assured of confidentiality upon agreement to take part in the study as part of the informed consent process. Participation in the study was mainly from a healthcare organization in the Baltimore-Washington Metropolitan area. Data collection was done through face-to-face interviews with audio recordings and journal notes that culminated in transcripts and entry of data electronically.

All data, journal notes, audio recordings, transcripts and other electronic information were encrypted and stored on an electronic file, with backups retained, in a file cabinet, and password protected on external drives as a means of assuring participant confidentiality and security. Participants were fully informed of data handling and maintenance procedures as part of full disclosure and transparency. The interview transcripts were protected and stored in a secure computer environment. Consent forms, schedules, participant codes, master lists, and other forms of data gathered were secured in a locked area accessible only by me for maintenance.

These records would be securely maintained and kept for a period of 5 years including all contact information and would be destroyed after successful completion of the study with an effective exit strategy, and any formal sharing or publication of the outcomes of the study in any professional forums. A discussion of research findings,

interpretations, limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, and implications for positive social change are presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this exploratory qualitative case study was to explore and understand the perceptions of fairness of employee PAs on job satisfaction. Insight into the perceptions and lived work experiences of employees in the healthcare organization remained the focus and benefits of this study. The views and experiences of employees on PAs were analyzed about job satisfaction within the framework and constructs of the equity theory and the two-factor theory. Utilizing these two main theories to constitute the conceptual framework had the following overarching research question for the study: What are employee perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals on job satisfaction in healthcare organizations? The related subquestion was: What are the reasons that lead to unfair perceptions of performance appraisals?

This chapter provides the connection between the literature review and conceptual framework in Chapter 2, the research design and methodology presented in Chapter 3, and the results and findings presented in Chapter 4. During the process, the implications of the study derived from the responses to the research questions posed in Chapter 1. These implications could be applied by management in various organizations to improve decision-making to impact policy concerning employee perceptions of performance appraisals. Chapter 5 includes a research summary, recommendations, and limitations of the study, conclusions, and implications for positive social change. The perceptions and experiences of workers were analyzed, as they relate to the constructs of the equity theory and the two-factor theory.

Interpretation of Findings

The findings of the study concluded that employee perceptions of PAs are critical and an invaluable component of the human resource function and should include basic knowledge and level of employee input in the appraisal design and process. The expressed intentions of employees included the desire to engage in the PA process provided it remains relevant and beneficial, and the outcomes are readily communicated in the form of immediate feedback to impact decision making and policy. The primary themes with subthemes based on the constructs, and research questions were discussed in Chapter 4, and the interpretations of the findings are further expounded in this chapter. In consideration of all participant responses and recommendations for action in response to the research questions and constructs emerged the primary themes and subthemes to constitute the basis of the interpretation of the findings.

Theme 1: Participants' Perceptions of Fairness

In the data analysis, 78% of employees viewed fairness as a construct embedded in adherence to rules and regulations that applied equally to people without bias and emphasized that workers must be treated with the same measure without any discrimination regardless of background and characteristics. Fairness meant equal treatment of all employees, devoid of partiality, bias, nepotism, favoritism or discrimination. It may be contended that transparency remains a major factor in ensuring that employee evaluations are fair and just without bias and conducted without special considerations for fairness and justice to reinforce workplace values.

Theme 2: Participants' Perceptions of Job Satisfaction

When asked about their perceptions of job satisfaction, 86% of the participants viewed job satisfaction as relevant and a situation where employees were contented and happy with their jobs and a feeling of accomplishment with the notion that their contributions would be valued and expectations fulfilled. According to some employees, job satisfaction should entail good relationship with coworkers and superiors, rewards, financial stability of the organization, an opportunity for growth, company values, favorable work schedules, and job security.

Other employees believed job satisfaction was linked to having a favorable working environment including the availability of required tools, remuneration, appropriate workload, fair treatment, and availability of opportunities for career development. I found that a positive work environment contributes immensely to how employees feel about their jobs, as employees believed that well-rewarded employees find satisfaction in their jobs. Rewards in the form of pay increase, career progression, promotion, security, respect and appreciation of employees for executing their jobs with diligence will motivate them to assure enhanced job performance.

Theme 3: Participants' Perception of Performance Appraisals

The employees expressed considerable knowledge about PAs. They viewed PA as a SMART assessment tool used by employers to evaluate and enhance the performance of their employees as an opportunity to evaluate employees, organizational performance and understand manager expectations. It was noted that individual appraisals must be

considered an integral part of the PA process although some participants' knowledge about PA perceptions was mixed with outcomes that were sometimes fair or unfair depending on the relationship between the appraisee and the appraiser. There was a consensus that PAs provided an opportunity for evaluation and growth of employees. Although some concerns were expressed, it is still believed that PAs are critical to both employers and employees if conducted objectively as it will ensure equal opportunity for career growth and offer an opportunity for learning. The inherent subjectivity in the appraisal process was highlighted as a concern that could make it counterproductive and peer reviews were suggested. Concerns raised by participants were around the possibility of appraisers being subjective and punitive.

It is believed that the relationship between appraisers and appraisees influence the outcome of PAs. Employees believed PAs could be used to intimidate and victimize employees who are perceived to be threats to appraisers and could affect morale instead of improving their performance. Some employees perceived greater fairness and satisfaction with PAs in private sectors compared to public sectors as they expressed diverse opinions on the fairness of PAs. Some considered PAs as fair if it was structured and done without bias, as it enabled them to know their employer's expectations while others considered that its degree of fairness depended on the measures used.

When participants were asked to explain their views on the fairness of PAs, 68% shared that the fairness perceptions of PAs depend on the appraiser or employer as well as factors such as personal dislike, race, and gender. It was found that objectivity or subjectivity of the appraiser played a role in determining the fairness of PAs and viewed

it as unfair because they were not effective in improving employee performance but instead fostered power-and-control mechanisms. The notion was also expressed that lack of automation of the appraisal process reduced transparency and may contribute to unfair perceptions of the appraisal outcomes.

Employees agreed that the fairness of PAs is critical for ensuring job satisfaction and security. They opined that if the PAs were perceived as unfair, demotivation and consequently job dissatisfaction occurred as some employees felt their contributions were not appreciated relative to other employees. It was discovered that communication is critical to ensuring that employees properly understand the outcome of an appraisal process to consider it fair.

Theme 4: Participants' Reasons for Unfair Perceptions

A major reason expressed by the employees for unfair perceptions about PAs is bias or subjectivity of appraisers or employers because of favoritism, gender, race, and color because appraisers tend to favor some people against others based on personal biases or favoritism. Personal biases and animosities enable managers to overlook or ignore the positive contributions of employees and only focus on the negative aspects of employees. Untrained appraisers were believed to be more likely to have unfair feedback about PAs and appraisers who do not have a clear understanding of employee expectations affect the outcomes. It is the belief that appraisers would be properly trained or outsourced to carry out PAs fairly and effectively. Unfair perceptions of PA may occur because of the failure of facilitators to provide professional and fair evaluations, failure to follow laid down procedures and protocol of conducting PAs.

There was also a lack of knowledge about how the results are used to influence decision making and policy in the organization. Participants believed that conducting PAs once per year does not allow employees to feel as though the process is fair. Lack of feedback to employees after the assessment or not making the employees know about the results of the PAs was viewed as one of the reasons employees perceive PAs as unfair. Lack of documentation and use of data to support points during performance evaluations was viewed as a reason for unfair perceptions of PAs. The findings indicate that managers sometimes impose unreasonably high-performance standards and do not motivate employees to improve and this could demoralize and discourage employees leading to the unfair perception of PAs.

Theme 5: Participants' Recommendations to Improve Fairness Perceptions

A sense of ownership in the goal-setting process was highlighted in the findings as an important way of fostering objectivity and making expectations tangible and measurable. It was established that when goals are clearly defined, employees are inclined to understand the appraisal criteria. Some workers emphasized understanding the work conditions of employees. The need to give employees an opportunity to improve when they fall short of the appraisal process was highlighted by some employees. The opportunity to improve implies that appraisals should be supportive of employees and not serve as a punitive measure. A major recommendation that was highlighted by most of the employees was the need to give employees feedback or seek feedback regularly from them as part of the appraisal process promptly. They emphasized bidirectional feedback to ensure that all workers know where improvements are needed.

A culture of communication as an ongoing activity was considered necessary to ensure that employees had many opportunities to address their challenges and make the necessary changes. The key motivation and job satisfaction that can come from the appraisal system was described as ensuring that rewards are embedded into the appraisal system. Incentives that are provided because of positive appraisals were highlighted as an important way of fostering future performance. There was a consensus that equality was at the core of a good appraisal system. The same rules must apply to all workers to assure equity in the evaluations without bias and in line with organizational policy.

Study Results

The primary themes and subthemes that were discovered during the coding were discussed in the data analysis section including all statistical data and frequency. Each of the primary themes and subthemes were coordinated and based on the constructs of equity theory and two-factor theory. The sample size of 20 participants selected from the available employee groups of the population for the study was appropriate for the investigation of the data gathered to achieve realistic data saturation (Marshall, Cardon, Poddar, & Fontenot, 2013). The sample size is reflective of a case study and indicative of a structured and semistructured method of data collection to ensure that a sufficient number of interviews were completed to address the research questions of the study (Marshall et al., 2013).

Based on the analysis, 76% of the participants perceived fairness to be synonymous with equality and impartiality in a work environment that was transparent and upheld justice. Participants considered that job satisfaction occurred in a conducive

environment that fostered job security with a good reward system for performance. Mixed perceptions about the fairness of job appraisals were due to the assumed subjectivity of the process especially in instances where the measures were not automated or standardized. In addition, poor communication and a poor feedback system meant that employees could not reflect adequately on the quality of the PAs they have received. Bias, lack of capacity of the appraiser, poor appraisal design and infrequent appraisal procedures were some reasons given for poor appraisal. Recommendations that were made for improvement include training/coaching, employee ownership of the process, considerations for employee challenges with meeting up with responsibilities, and improved objectivity of the process.

Summary

The exploratory qualitative case study design used for this study is relevant and appropriate because the method permitted findings that helped augment the knowledge and understanding of the perceptions of fairness of workers' PAs on job satisfaction as applicable in healthcare settings. This application of the methodology to the workers' expressed opinions, perceptions, experiences and self-supported accounts provided incredible insights into their lived experiences related to the perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals in the healthcare environment. The research methodology and design helped address the general business management questions and research questions in a way that provides meaning relevant to the topic while adding to the body of existing knowledge.

Limitations of the Study

Research studies have limitations, regardless of methodology or design (Yin, 2014). This study was limited by its generalizability, as the study sample of workers focused only on a single healthcare organization. Although the sample size may not have been substantial enough for the generalization of the results to the population (Yin, 2014), the chosen sample size was appropriate for the design in gathering rich and exhaustive data. The sample size of 20 participants was deliberate because it yielded rich and comprehensive data on the fairness perceptions of employees about PAs.

The outcome of the sample population represents the views of workers based on their perspectives and experiences of PAs that were furnished in a limited descriptive representation, thus may not be predictive of future perspectives, views, perceptions, and behavior of the population of workers that could be made applicable to other organizations. The limited representation could be due to circumstances peculiar to this organization based on geographic location because the study participants were self-reporting and self-reported results of studies carry bias, difficult to verify, and are often influenced by past and present circumstances or experiences (Brutus, Aguinis, & Wassmer, 2013).

The participants of the study could have prior perceptions and experiences with other organizations that I might not have been aware of and might have likely yielded limited responses of interest in participants during recruitment for the study. Another limitation is that I had to rely solely on the honesty of participant responses by utilizing both structured and semistructured interviews, although semistructured interviews ensure

rich and in-depth information. Employee concerns about identification and potential leakage of information about participants which could cause fear of victimization or intimidation and likely to lead to disciplinary action against employees by management could lead to participant dishonesty, limited or false response, or even nonresponse to interview questions during the interviews and may serve as a limitation to the study. This fear of victimization combined with self-reporting might have influenced or skewed the honesty of responses provided by participants.

An additional limitation is that the study did not integrate sample PA records or reports due to the sensitive nature of the topic and confidentiality between the organization and I to be in the position to assess the exact situation than to rely solely on the honesty of workers' shared perspectives and experiences. The procedure of utilizing a reflexive approach remained significant in maintaining dependability and credibility of the sample and analysis of the data.

Although participants volunteered, chose, and agreed to be interviewed during the day, they must have undergone self-imposed time constraints, which likely served as a limitation since the interviews were conducted at times when some participants were in a hurry to leave for their next appointments or schedules, which may have influenced the depth of the data gathered. Although the interview protocol and guide adequately covered the research questions, I could have incorporated more questions on demographic data to obtain deeper insights into the background of participants to enable the capturing of more information for analysis.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study has furnished information on the perceptions of employees and reinforced potentially improved perceptions of fairness of PAs on job satisfaction within the health care setting. Because there is minimal research on perceptions of fairness, it is recommended for researchers to conduct further studies on the topic using other methods and design. These studies could yield practical information to help management to strive in improving workers perceptions. Fair and just perceptions of PAs can have an influence on the outcomes of PAs and subsequently on job satisfaction (Shrivastava & Purang, 2011, 2016).

I recommend that further research should explore the PA phenomenon by using other approaches to research and include several organizations to provide a holistic view and perspectives on the perceptions of fairness of employees about job satisfaction and other human resource functions. Research should be conducted to investigate whether hostile relationships can influence the PA outcomes or otherwise of the fairness perceptions of employees and how this can be used to improve decision making and policy.

A quantitative study could offer vivid statistical insights on the individual perceptions of various organizations of employee experiences related to job satisfaction. The value of exploring different types of organizations and workers should be considered because the study would increase the depth and extend the breadth of case study research. A focus on quantitative research in the types of organizations and worker groups could serve human resource practitioners, managers and employees alike. There may be

varying kinds of employee groups and organizations who bring value to an institution; but, understanding the fairness perceptions of how PA relate to job satisfaction remains critical and should be pursued vigorously.

Further research on fairness perceptions of employees is needed because both employees and managers deserve to know more about the subject of employee perceptions and their value in impacting processes. More information is required to potentially assist to inform policies and procedures towards decision making to govern PAs for the job satisfaction of workers. Extension obvious to this study could result from this new study to expand on the data gathered, the findings and conclusions drawn therefrom. These enhancements could assume the form of conducting similar research on the other several organizations in a health care setting or other industries that undertake PAs.

Implications

Positive social change related to the perceptions of fairness of PAs on job satisfaction has the potential for contributing substantially to employee job satisfaction in most organizations including healthcare. The results and findings of this study suggested that the implications for positive social change remain critical and ongoing as described. The findings necessitate the need for change and improvement on the perceptions of fairness of employees in specific areas of the job to enhance job satisfaction. In the findings, I was able to identify that employees had regard for and expressed concern about the unfairness of PAs outcomes to assure equity in the evaluations without bias and in line with organizational policy. Acknowledging and understanding the perceptions of

employees of their PA outcomes on job satisfaction elicits the need for a meaningful discourse to introduce innovative tools and resources for the application of human resource development and management. The findings of the research have helped identify three implications for possible social change.

There is a need to create awareness in employees about the fairness perceptions of PAs on job satisfaction. Understanding the perceptions of PAs on job satisfaction provides the relational value of the PA phenomenon. Information derived from participants during the study helped minimize the unfair or negative perceptions that characterize PA outcomes that influence decision-making within organizations (Costanza & Finkelstein, 2015).

Empowering and reinforcing employees is essential to help contribute deeper insights and understanding of the perceptions of PA expectations in organizations. Enhanced awareness of the perspectives of PAs of workers' experiences may contribute to worker motivation and retention with valuable skills and knowledge in the present day's decision-making efforts. Interview responses if the willingness of workers to make amends following honest feedback on performance appraisal outcomes together with management will enhance subordinate-superordinate relationships on employee perceptions. A further recommendation is that PAs should be conducted regularly, at least quarterly, with a continuous-feedback process because regular evaluations will help establish relationships to address relational scenarios to enhance the perceptions of employees (Reed & Bogardus, 2012).

Significance to Practice

This research has furnished information on the perceptions of fairness of employee PAs on job satisfaction. The study offered an in-depth qualitative analysis and results that revealed the perceptions of employees and their experiences with PAs in a healthcare setting. The data collected are current and provide insights into the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals related to job satisfaction. The central research question and related subquestion that provided the primary themes on the perceptions of fairness of employee PAs indicated that knowledge of fair perceptions is connected to job satisfaction (Masum et al., 2016).

Practical implications include management of organizations and human resource practitioners creating awareness among employees about the practice of PAs and the associated procedures to guarantee fairness outcomes through the provision of immediate, regular, and continuous feedback. Some of the awareness strategies may include employee involvement in the planning, design, and implementation of the PAs, communication of feedback, training, and rewards.

Management of healthcare organizations, human resource departments, agencies or organizations could use the information presented in this study to ensure the fairness perceptions of employees of PAs to influence job satisfaction unless not used adequately during the PA process and implementation. Nawaz and Pangil (2016) recommended that efficient and effective PAs remain critical in minimizing turnover if only employees can perceive the phenomenon along with other human resource practices in organizations as fair and just.

Organizations may utilize the findings derived from the research as an invaluable tool to improve the perceptions of fairness of PAs related to job satisfaction to make appropriate decisions to inform policy to enhance job satisfaction. This study has contributed to both perceptions of fairness of PAs and job satisfaction. Although there is extant literature on PAs for many years, this study has been the focus on perceptions of fairness and addressed the perceptions of fairness of PAs about job satisfaction of workers in healthcare in the Maryland-Washington Metropolitan area.

Significance to Theory

Organizational justice is a component of fairness at work, which concerns employee fairness perceptions within an organization (Hamlett, 2014). Researchers have utilized organizational justice to investigate perceptions of work processes at the workplace on decisions related to job satisfaction (Bin Abdullah, Anamalai, Ismail bt, & Ling, 2015). Fair perceptions of PAs can affect job satisfaction (Hamlett, 2014). The findings of the present study provide knowledge about fairness perceptions of PAs in a healthcare setting, which extends understanding of organizational justice, motivation, and job satisfaction that could help predict perceptions of PA in other sectors, organizations, and agencies including healthcare (Herzberg, 1959; Ozguner & Ozguner, 2014). It is critical for human resource managers in organizations to help establish a bond between individual managers and employees to address the disconnect and missed opportunities in relationships of perceptions that may exist between managers and employees of organizations.

Perceptions of PAs are essential, considering the workflow nature of the human resource management function and should be linked to the constructs used for the study. Rowland (2013) and Tseng and Kuo (2014) discussed equity theory but did not provide the necessary linkage of fairness perceptions with the constructs on motivation that contribute to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction except Herzberg who executed the linkage within the two-factor theory of motivation. An increased understanding of the perceptions of fairness related to the constructs on job satisfaction meaningfully would render the constructs more relevant, appropriate, applicable, and operational at the workplace in enforcing the theories.

Although theory development was not the purpose of this study, the framework used helped minimize obstacles to the perceptions of fairness of employees necessary for creating job satisfaction. The conceptual framework will serve knowledge areas geared toward improving overall perceptions of the value for PAs related to job satisfaction. Addressing this missing link or disconnect is likely to promote positive social change by helping workers to gain more insight and understanding into organizational practices on perceptions of fairness of employees.

Significance to Positive Social Change

The perception of fairness of employees of PAs is an essential element that could contribute to the positive image of organizations as a major change agent or factor to affect positive social change. Employees who lack the trust in the management of organizations, as well as human resource professionals and managers due to unfair perceptions about issues related to job satisfaction may feel demotivated to perform

assigned tasks at substandard levels instead of being motivated to perform their jobs dutifully with diligence to excel.

Facilitating employee-management relationships through fairness perceptions and trust may potentially result in a positive social change by motivating employees to influence positively management decision-making involving employees to make them aware of their performance expectations through their involvement in the planning, design, and execution of PAs. Incorporating trust, accuracy and fairness practice will help improve the perceptions within the organization to enhance the positive image, improved work processes and subsequent potential enhancement of employee-manager relations. Fairness needs to be maintained through motivation, communication of outcomes, continuous feedback, transparency, and accuracy of PAs to attain fairness perceptions.

Researchers have offered sights into the employee perceptions and value of PAs and noted that the need for improvements to the PA system would likely be beneficial since the lack of research on the fairness perceptions will likely hinder its improvement. It was the goal of this study to add to the perceptions of employees on performance appraisals specifically on issues related to job satisfaction. The outcome of the study could potentially lead to a positive social change in health care settings and other agencies and organizations. The current study was designed to investigate a defined organization of bona fide workflow of a supposed effective occupational system.

The present study adds to the extant literature on perceptions of fairness of employees of PAs on job satisfaction to enable managers to learn to be fair, just, and accurate with their PA outcomes devoid of bias and favoritism (Nair & Salleh, 2015).

Although challenges may persist if employees are not demotivated based on their perceptions of unfair PA outcomes that may have favored employees rewarded over them. It is recommended that further research be therefore encouraged.

Conclusion

A comprehensive understanding of the perceptions of fairness of PAs related to job satisfaction is critical and would assist in formulating appropriate policies in respect of PAs to aid decision making as one of the valuable human resource functions within organizations following the improvement in employee perceptions. This study has provided basic research data that could be adopted and used extensively to impact employee perceptions. Information gathered from the research may add to the understanding of the perceptions of employees of PAs about job satisfaction in all sectors of management.

The dissemination of the findings of the study may enable management, organization leaders, and human resource practitioners to implement decisions to enhance change, provide employee motivation and job satisfaction through trust, fairness, accuracy, and effectiveness of PAs and perceptions. A sense of ownership in the goal-setting process highlighted in the findings is critical in fostering objectivity and subsequently fair and just perceptions to render PAs and outcome expectations tangible, measurable, and achievable. Participant perceptions shared suggest that continuous communication and feedback culture, as an ongoing activity is considered necessary to ensure that employees have many opportunities to address their challenges and make the necessary changes for decision making to influence policy.

Consequently, there is a need for improvements in fair perceptions of employees about PAs. Finally, the findings suggest a consensus that equality is at the core of a good appraisal system so the same rules must apply to all workers to assure equity in the evaluations without bias and in line with organizational policy. The findings may call for a need to glean and advance more theories possible to assure effective policies to improve perceptions of employees of performance appraisals at the workplace to enhance job satisfaction. It is important for organizations to train performance appraisers to use appropriate evaluation methods and procedures because performance appraisal becomes only beneficial to the organization if it is fair and accurate. This is necessary because an organization's performance management process may rely extensively on the organization's ability to identify and eliminate performance challenges.

References

- Abdelhadi, N., Jamal, B. M., & André, L. (2015). Performance appraisal system and employee satisfaction: The role of trust towards supervisors. *Journal of Human Resources Management and Labor Studies*, 3(1), 40-53. doi:10.15640/jhrmls.v3n1a3
- Abdullah, F. (2015). Values in management: Cultural restructure for an effective performance appraisal. *International Journal of Business, Economics, and Law*, 6(2), 33-38. Retrieved from <http://ijbel.com/>
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422 - 436. doi:10.1037/h0040968
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299. New York: Academic Press. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2
- Adeyinka, O. P., Dagauda, A. P., & Mohammed, G. (2015). Performance measurement techniques and performance and performance management in the public sector. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Reviews*, 5(1), 126-145. Retrieved from <http://www.ijsshr.com/journal/index.php/IJSSHR>
- Agbola, R. M., Hemans, S., & Sumaila, A. (2011). The effectiveness of performance appraisal as a tool for enhancing employee performance in the public health sector. *Global Management Journal*, 3(½). Retrieved from <http://globalmj.eu/>
- Agwa, H. A., & Salem, I. (2015). A study of factors motivating expatriates in the United

- Arab Emirates. *International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research*. IACSIT Press, Singapore. 84, 108-124. doi:10.7763/N PEDR
- Agyare, R., Yuhui, G., Mensah, L., Aidoo, Z., & Opoku Ansah, I. (2016). The impacts of performance appraisal on employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A case of microfinance institutions in Ghana. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 11(9), 281-297. doi:10.5539/ijbm.v11n9p281
- Ahmad, R., & Bujang, S. (2014). Relationship between selected factors of job satisfaction and Job performance among workers at palm oil industries. *International Review of Management and Business Review*. 3(3), 1751-1766. Retrieved from www.irnbrjournal.com
- Ahmed, M. N. (2015). An understanding towards benefits and concerns associated with performance appraisals: A study highlighting the essentials of good appraisal system. *Researchers World-Journal of Arts Science & Commerce*, 4(1), 9-19. doi:10.18843/rwjasc/v6i4(1)/02
- Akinbowale, M. A., Lourens, M. E., & Jinabhai, D. C. (2014). Employee performance measurement and performance appraisal policy in an organization. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 5(9), 342-347. doi:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n9p342
- Akkas, M. P. N. (2015). Performance appraisal system of the academics of public and private universities in Bangladesh: An empirical study. *Full Paper Proceeding of Multi-Disciplinary Studies, MBCR*. Global Illuminators Publishing, University of Dhaka. 2, 27-40.
- Aleassa, H. M. (2014). Performance appraisal satisfaction and counterproductive

behaviors: Direct and moderating effects. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 5(1), 76. doi:10.5430/ijba.v5n1p76

Alessandri, G., Borgogni, L., & Latham, G. P. (2016). A dynamic model of the longitudinal relationship between job satisfaction and supervisor-rated job performance. *Applied Psychology*. doi:10.1111/apps.12091

Alexopoulos, E. C., Palatsidi, V., Tigani, X., & Darviri, C. (2014). Exploring stress levels, job satisfaction, and quality of life in a sample of police officers in Greece. *Safety and Health at Work*, 5, 210-215. Retrieved from

Al Fazari, M., & Rahman Khan, M. F. (2016). Performance appraisal system in Majan Electricity Company (Sohar, Oman) and its impact on employee's motivation. *International Journal of Management, Innovation, and Entrepreneurial Research (IJMIER)*, 2(1). Retrieved from <http://www.giapjournals.com/index.php/ijmier/article/view/338>

Alfayad, Z., Suriani, L., & Arif, M. (2017). Employee voice and job satisfaction: An application of Herzberg Two-Factor Theory. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(1), 150-156. Retrieved from <https://www.econjournals.com/index.php/irmm/article/view/3342/>

Al-Hamdan, Z., Manojlovich, M., & Tanima, B. (2016). Jordanian nursing work environments, intent to stay, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. doi:10.1111/jnu.12265
<http://www.journals.elsevier.com/safety-and-health-at-work/>

Ali, M. H., & Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2013). Performance appraisal system and business

- performance: An empirical study in Sri Lankan apparel industry. *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2(1). doi:10.4038/sljhrm.v2i1.5106
- Ali, W. (2016). Understanding the concept of job satisfaction, measurements, theories, and its significance in the recent organizational environment: A theoretical framework. *Archives of Business Research*, 4(1). doi:10.111.10.14738/abr.41.1735
- Alsarairh, F., Quinn-Griffin, M. T., Ziehm, S. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. J. (2014). Job satisfaction and turnover intention among Jordanian nurses in psychiatric units. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 23, 460-467. Retrieved from [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/ \(ISSN\)1447-0349](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1447-0349)
- Amerson, R. (2011). Making a case for the case study method. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 50(8), 427-428. doi:10.3928.01484834-20110719-01
- Amirkhanyan, A. N., Meier, K. J., O'Toole, L. J., Dakhwe, M. A., & Janzen, S. (2017). Management and performance in US nursing homes. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. doi:10.1093/jopart/mux003
- Anderson, E. H., & Spencer, M. H. (2002). Cognitive representations of AIDS: A phenomenological study. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12, 1338-1352.
- Anitha, J., & Saranya, S. (2014). Impact of supervisor style on effectiveness of Performance appraisal system. *ASBM Journal of Management*, 7(2), 39-49. Retrieved from <http://www.asbm.ac.in/ajm/>
- Appelbaum, S. H., Cameron, A., Ensink, F., Hazarika, J., Attir, R., Ezzedine, R., &

- Shekhar, V. (2017). Factors that impact the success of an organizational change: A case study analysis. *Industrial and Commercial Training*. doi:10.1108/ict-02-2017-0006
- Arogundade, O. T., & Olasunkanmi-Alimi, T. H. (2015). Performance appraisal knowledge: An implication on workplace commitment in a selected commercial bank in Lagos, Nigeria. *Ife Centre for Psychological Studies/Service. Ife Psychologia*, 23(1), 98-106. Retrieved from <http://www.ifepsychologia.org/>
- Arthur, P. (2015). The challenges facing performance appraisal management: Lessons for polytechnics in Ghana. *African Journal of Applied Research (AJAR)*, 1(1). 299-314. Retrieved from www.ajaronline.com
- Aslam, S., Aslam, S., & Saleem, R. (2015). Determinants of Employee Satisfaction: A case study of Banking Sector in Lahore, Pakistan. *Journal of Poverty, Investment, and Development*, 14, 73-80. Retrieved from www.iiste.org
- Atkinson, P., & Delamont, S. (2006). In the roiling smoke: Qualitative inquiry and contested fields. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(6), 747-755. doi:10.1080/09518390600975974
- Aydan, O. (2016). The effects of diversity management on job satisfaction and individual performance of teachers. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(3), 105-112. doi:10.5897/err2015.2573
- Aziz, J., Saif, N. R., Qureshi, M. I., Khan, M. S., & Khan, F. (2013). Perception of job performance appraisals toward turnover intention and job satisfaction. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 4(6), 260-267.

- Bahri-Ammari, N., & Bilgihan, A. (2017). The effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice on customer retention: An empirical investigation in the mobile telecom industry in Tunisia. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 37, 89-100. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.02.012
- Bak, O. (2011). The role of qualitative research in a mixed methods study. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 11(2), 76-84. doi:10.3316/QRJ1102076
- Bal, P. M., De Cooman, R., & Mol, S. T. (2013). Dynamics of psychological contracts with work engagement and turnover intention: The influence of organizational tenure. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 22(1), 107-122. doi:10.1080/1359432x.2011.626198
- Balcioglu, H., & Nihinlola, A. J. (2014). Perception of employee towards performing performance evaluation system: Case study of National Horticultural Research Institute (NIHORT) Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(8). 135-150. Retrieved from <http://www.ijbssnet.com/>
- Balogun, A. G. (2017). Emotional intelligence as a moderator between perceived organizational injustice and organizational deviance among public sector employees. *International Journal of Management Practice*, 10, 2-175. doi:10.1504/ijmp.2017.083084
- Bayarçelik, E. B., & Findikli, M. A. (2016). The mediating effect of job satisfaction on the relation between organizational justice perception and intention to leave. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 403-411. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.11.050

- Bayraktar, C. A., Araci, O., Karacay, G., & Calisir, F. (2016). The mediating effect of rewarding on the relationship between employee involvement and job satisfaction. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries*. doi:10.1002/hfm.20683
- Bayram, H., & Dinç, S. (2015). The role of transformational leadership on employees' job satisfaction: The case of private universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *European Researcher*, 93(4), 270-281. doi:10.13187/er.2015.93.270
- Bean, C. J. (2007). Book Review: Maxwell, J. A. (Ed.). (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. In *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(2), 393-394. doi:10.1177/1094428106290193
- Bednall, T. C., Sanders, K., & Runhaar, P. (2014). Stimulating informal learning activities through perceptions of performance appraisal quality and human resource management system strength: A two-wave study. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 13(1), 45-61. doi:10.5465/amle.2012.0162
- Begum, S., Hossain, M., & Sarker, M. A. H. (2015). Factors determining the effectiveness of performance appraisal system: A study on pharmaceutical industry in Bangladesh. *The Journal of Cost Management Journal*, 43(6). Retrieved from <http://maaw.info/JournalofCostManagement.htm>
- Behzad, M., & Habib, H. (2015). Investigation of the mediating role of organizational justice in the relationship between administrative performance appraisal practices and organizational commitment (Case study: Social Security Organization of

- Hormozgan Province). *Asian Journal of Research in Banking and Finance*, 5(2), 38-49. doi:10.5958/2249-7323.2015.00023.1
- Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*, 2, 8-14. doi:10.1016/j.npls.2016.01.001
- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it; now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in Qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 15(2), 219-234. doi:10.1177/1468794112468475
- Bergh, A., Nilson, T., & Waldenström, D. (2016). Measuring inequality. *Sick of inequality? An Introduction to the Relationship between Inequality and Health*, 22-37. doi:10.4337/9781785364211.00007
- Bhurtel, A., & Adhikari, E. R. (2016). Performance appraisal for employee development: Exploring perceptions of supervisors. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management*, 3(2), 91-101. doi:10.3126/ijssm.v3i2.14670
- Bin Abdullah, A. G., Anamalai, T., Ismail bt, A., & Ling, Y. L. (2015). Do perceived organizational justice and trust determine satisfaction of performance appraisal practice? A case of Malaysian secondary school teachers. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 2(8), 23-37. doi:10.14738/assrj.28.1347
- Birkenmeier, B. J., & Sanséau, P. -Y. (2015). The relationships between perceptions of supervisor, trust in supervisor and job performance: A study in the banking industry. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 32(1), 161. doi:10.19030/jabr.v32i1.9530
- Bloomberg, L. A., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A*

Roadmap from beginning to end (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bobocel, D. R., & Mu, F. (2016). Meyer, J. P. (Ed). Organizational justice and employee commitment: A review of contemporary research. *Handbook of Employee Commitment*. Edward Edgar Publishing Ltd. 346-548.

doi:10.4337/9781784711740

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bogicevic, V., Yang, W., Bilgihan, A., & Bujisic, M. (2013). Airport service quality drivers of passenger satisfaction. *Tourism Review*, 68(4), 3-18. doi:10.1108/tr-09-2013-0047

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(6), 698-712. doi:10.1080/02602938.2012.691462

Brata, H., & Juliana, L. (2014). Performance-based reward systems and perceived justice: A case of motorbike dealer in Pontianak. *International Journal of Business and Society*. 15(2), 195-214. Retrieved from <http://www.ijbs.unimas.my/>

Brimhall, A. C., & Engblom-Deglmann, M. L. (2011). Starting over: A tentative theory exploring the effects of past relationships on post bereavement remarried couples. *Family Process*, 50(1), 47-62. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2010. 01345. x

Brutus, S., Aguinis, H., & Wassmer, U. (2013). Self-reported limitations and future directions in scholarly reports analysis and recommendations. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 48-75. doi:10.1177/0149206312455245

- Budworth, M.-H., Latham, G. P., & Manroop, M. (2014). Looking forward to performance improvement: A field test of the feedforward interview for performance management. *Human Resource Management, 54*(1), 45-54. doi:10.1002/hrm.21618
- Buveneswari, R., & Mujeeb Rahman, K. V. (2015). A study on the effectiveness of performance appraisal system and its impact on employee motivation on BNSL Telecom sector, Tiruchirappalli. *International Journal of Research Instinct, 2*(2), 113-123 ISSN Online 2348-2095
- Cappelli, P., & Conyon, M. (2016). What do performance appraisals do? *The National Bureau of Economic Research*. NBER Working Paper No. 22400. doi:10.3386/w22400
- Chang, Y.-W. (2015). Employee performance appraisal in a logistics company. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(70), 47-50. doi:10.4236/jss.2015.37008
- Chandhana, K., & Easow, D. T. (2015). Performance appraisal method used in top 10 I T companies-360-degree feedback & balanced score card: A Review. *Bonfring International Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management Science, 5*(2), 73- 77. doi:10.9756/bijiems.8082
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through Qualitative analysis*. London: Sage.
- Charmaz, K. (2008). Grounded method as an emergent method. In S.N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.). *Handbook of Emergent Methods* 155-172. New York: The Guilford Press.

- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chetana, N., Pattnaik, L., & Mohapatra, A. S. D. (2015). Determinants of performance appraisal: An empirical study. *International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies*, 3(11), 150-161. Retrieved from <http://www.ijarcsms.com/>
- Chouhan, V., Chandra, B., Goswami, S., & Verma, P. (2016). Analyzing the performance appraisal system of a public-sector organization in India: The case of Rajasthan State Mines and Minerals Limited. *IUP Journal of Management Research*, 15(1), 48-74. Retrieved from <http://www.iupindia.in/705/ijmr.asp>
- Chughtai, A., Byrne, M., & Flood, B. (2014). Linking ethical leadership to employee well-being: The role of trust in supervisor. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(3), 653-663. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2126-7
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Clarke, C., Harcourt, M., & Flynn, M. (2013). Clinical governance, performance appraisal and interactional and procedural fairness at a New Zealand Public Hospital. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 117(3), 667-678. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1550-9
- Costanza, D. P., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2015). Generationally based differences in the workplace: Is there a there? *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 8(3), 308-323. doi:10.1017/iop.2015.15
- Cullen, K. L., Edwards, B. D., Casper, W. C., & Gue, K. R. (2013). Employees'

- adaptability and perceptions of change-related uncertainty: Implications for perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(2), 269-280. doi:10.1007/s10869-013-9312-y
- Daga, A., & Kappor, S. (2014). 360-degree performance appraisal practices of Indian banks with special reference to ICICI Bank: Is there need for change? *International Journal of Organizational Behavior & Management Perspectives*, 3(1), 739-744. Retrieved from <http://pezzottaitejournals.net/pezzottaite/>
- David, E. M. (2013). Examining the role of narrative performance appraisal comments on performance. *Human Performance*, 26(5), 430-450. doi:10.1080/08959285.2013.836197
- Deepa, E., & Kuppusamy, S. (2016). Factor analysis of performance appraisal system (PAS) in Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL). *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 6(7), 1028-1035. doi:10.5958/2249-7315.2016.00486X
- Deepa, E., Palaniswamy, R., & Kuppusamy, S. (2014). Effect of performance appraisal system in organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and productivity. *Journal of Contemporary Management Research*, 8(1), 72-82.
- Delshad, A., Kolouie, S. R., & Ali, L. A. (2016). The effect of intellectual intelligence on employee perceptions of organizational justice in Qeshm Free Zone. *International Academic Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource*

Management, 3(1), 26-35. Retrieved from <http://iaiest.com/journals/international-academic-journal-of-organizational-behavior-and-human-resource-management/>

Demir, K. (2016). Relations between teachers' organizational justice perceptions and organizational commitment and job satisfaction in the school: A meta-analysis.

International Journal of Human Sciences, 13(1), 1408. doi:10.14687/ijhs.

v13i1.3396

Denkyira, F. O. (2014). Establishing effective performance appraisal practices in the

Ghana Civil Service. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2394578

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of

qualitative research. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4th ed., 1-19).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Devlin, J. F., Roy, S. K., & Sekhon, H. (2014). Perceptions of fair treatment in financial

services. *European Journal of Marketing*, 48(7/8), 1315-1332. doi:10.1108/ejm-

082012-0469

Dewettinck, K., & van Dijk, H. (2013). Linking Belgian employee performance

management system characteristics with performance management system

effectiveness: Exploring the mediating role of fairness. *International Journal of*

Human Resource Management, 24(4), 806-825.

doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.700169.

DiGangi, S., Jannasch-Pennell, A., & Yu, C. H. (2011). Compatibility between text

mining and qualitative research in the perspectives of grounded theory, content analysis, and reliability. *The Qualitative Report*, 16, 730-744. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-10-177

Duffy, M., & Chenail, R. J. (2009). Values in qualitative and quantitative research.

Counseling and Values, 53(1), 22-38. doi:10.1002/j.2161-007x.2009.tb00111.x

Dumight, J., & Qu, S. Q. (2011). The qualitative research interviews. *Qualitative*

Research in Accounting & Management, 8(3), 238-264.

doi:10.1108/11766091111162070

Dunne, C. (2011). The place of the literature review in grounded theory research.

International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 14(2), 111-124.

doi:10.1080/13645579.2010.494930

Dusterhoff, C., Cunningham, J., & MacGregor, J. (2014). The effects of performance

rating, leader - member exchange, perceived utility, and organizational justice on performance appraisal satisfaction: Applying a moral judgment perspective.

Journal of Business Ethics, 119(2), 265-273. doi:10.1007/s10551

Dutt, S. (2016). Perception of employees towards job satisfaction in banking industry: An

empirical study. *International Journal of Research*, 3(9). 431-443. Retrieved from <https://internationaljournalofresearch.com/>

Dzansi, L. W., Chipunza, C., & Dzansi, D. Y. (2016). Impact of municipal employees'

perceptions of fairness in human resources management practices on motivation: Evidence from a South African Province. *Problems and Perspectives in*

Management, 14(1-1), 138-149. doi:10.21511/ppm.14(1-1).2016.01

- Ekpe, A. N., Daniel, E. E., & Ekpe, M. A. (2013). Analysis of performance appraisal system of the Nigerian Public-Sector Organizations. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 18(3), 49- 54. doi:10.9790/0837-1834954
- Elliott, K. (2015). Teacher performance appraisal: More about performance or development? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(9), 102-116. Retrieved from <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol40/iss9/6>
- Evans, S., & Tourish, D. (2015). Agency theory and performance appraisal: How bad theory damages learning and contributes to bad management practice. *Management Learning*. doi:10.1177/1350507616672736
- Faheem, M. A., & Mahmud, N. (2015). The effects of organizational justice on workplace deviance and job satisfaction of employees: Evidence from a public-sector hospital of Pakistan. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(5), 342-352. doi:10.5901/mjss. 2015v6n5p342
- Farndale, E. (2013). A cross-cultural comparison of supervisor support in performance appraisal and employment engagement. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1(1), doi:10.5465/aomafr.2012.0077
- Fetterman, D. M. (2010). *Ethnography: Step-by-step*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Fila, M. J., Paik, L. S., Griffeth, R. W., & Allen, D. (2014). Disaggregating job satisfaction: effects of perceived demands, control, and support. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(4), 639-649. doi:10.1007/s10869-014-9358-5
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2011). Case study. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The SAGE*

Handbook of qualitative research (4th ed.), 301-316. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Fogarty, L., Mi Kim, Y., Juon, H. S., Tappis, H., Noh, J. W., Zainullah, P., & Rozario, A. (2014). Job satisfaction and retention of health-care providers in Afghanistan and Malawi. *Human Resources for Health, 12*(1), 1478-4491. doi:10.1186/1478-4491-12-11

Folger, R. (2013). Equity theory. *Encyclopedia of Management Theory*. doi:10.4135/9781452276090

Ford, M. T. (2014). Perceived unfairness at work, social and personal resources, and resting blood pressure. *Stress Health, 30*(1), 12-22. doi:10.1002/smi.2491

Frankfort - Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (2008). *Research methods in the social sciences* (7th ed.), Worth Publishers, New York, NY

Friesen, P., Kearns, L., Redman, B., & Caplan, A. L. (2017). Rethinking the Belmont Report? *The American Journal of Bioethics, 17*(7), 15-21. doi:10.1080/15265161.2017.1329482

Fusch, P., & Ness, L. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 20*(9). Retrieved from <http://tqr.nova.edu/>

Galanakis, M., Bithava, I., Emmanouil, C., Lali, P., Symeonidi, A.-H., & Darviri, C. (2015). Evidence for the inter/intra-relationship between the sense of fairness at workplace, distress, and health outcome: A systematic review. *Psychology, 6*(16), 2081-2090. doi:10.4236/psych.2015.616203

Gatewood, R., Field, H. S., & Barrick, M. (2015). *Human resource selection*. Nelson

Education.

- Gelard, P., & Rezaei, S. (2016). The relationship between job motivation, compensation satisfaction and job satisfaction in employees of tax administration-A case study in Tehran. *Asian Social Science*. 12(2), 165-171. doi:10.5539/ass.v12n2p165
- Githui, C. W., & Wario, G. (2013). Employee fairness perception on performance appraisals in the civil service in Kenya. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Entrepreneurship*. 1(7), 624-638. Retrieved from <http://www.ijssse.org/>
- Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Goh, S. C. (2012). Making performance measurement systems more effective in the public sector organizations. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 16 (1), 31-42. doi:10.1108/13683041211204653
- Goksoy, A., & Alayoglu, N. (2013). The impact of perception of performance appraisal and distributive justice fairness on employees' ethical decision making in paternalist organizational culture. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 26(1), 57-79. doi:10.1002/piq.21137
- Gouveia-Pereira, M., Vala, J., & Correia, I. (2016). Teachers' legitimacy: Effects of justice perception and social comparison processes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. doi:10.1111/bjep.12131
- Govender, T., Grobler, A., & Joubert, Y. T. (2015). Justice perceptions of performance

management practices in a company in the chemical industry. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*. 18(4), 567-585.

doi:10.17159/2222-3436/2015/v18n4a9

Groen, B. A. C., Wouters, M. J. F., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2016). Employee participation, performance metrics, and job performance: A survey study based on self-determination theory. [Abstract]. *Management Accounting Research*.

doi:10.1016/j.mar.2016.10.001

Gul, S. K., & O'Connell, P. E. (2013). Police performance appraisals: Comparative perspective. *Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press*.

Haase, H., & Franco, M. (2016). What factors drive performance of small and medium-sized enterprises? *European Journal of International Management*. 10(6), 678.

doi:10.1504/ejim.2016.10000371

Hamlett, J. (2014). Managers' perception of job satisfaction using an organizational justice framework in a large-sized manufacturing company. *International Journal of Teaching and Case Studies*, 5(2), 175. doi:10.1504/ijtcs.2014.065626

Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, R. (2011). *Doing case study research: a practical guide for beginning researchers* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Harari, M. B., & Rudolph, C. W. (2016). The effect of rater accountability on performance ratings: A meta-analytic review. *Human Resource Management Review*. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.09.007

Harrington, J. R., & Lee, J. H. (2014). What drives perceived fairness of performance

- appraisal? Exploring the effects of psychological contract fulfillment on employees' perceived fairness of performance appraisal in U.S. federal agencies. *Public Personnel Management*, 44(2), 214-238. doi:10.1177/0091026014564071
- Hartmann, F., & Slapničar, S. (2013). The perceived fairness of performance evaluation: The role of uncertainty. *Management Accounting Research*, 23(1), 17-33. doi:10.1016/j.mar.2011.10.004
- Hatch, J. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. State University of New York Press, Albany, NY
- Hauck, W. (2014). Fearless feedback boosts trust while replacing traditional performance appraisal at Independent Living, Inc. *Global Business, and Organizational Excellence*, 33(4), 50-62. doi:10.1002/joe.21553
- Herr, R. M., Loerbroks, A., van Vianen, A. E. M., Hoffmann, K., Fischer, J. E., & Bosch, J. A. (2015). Injustice at work and leukocyte glucocorticoid sensitivity: Findings from a Cross-sectional study. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 77, 527-538. doi:10.1097/PSY.000000000000185
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (2017). *The motivation to work*. (Second Edition), New York, N.Y: Wiley & Sons.
- Herzberg, F. (1959) *Work and the nature of man*. London: Staples Press.
- Holtz, B. C., & Hu, B. (2017). Passive leadership: Relationships with trust and justice perceptions. (Abstract). *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 32(1). Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journal/jmp>
- Hosain, S. (2016). 360-degree feedback as a technique of performance appraisal: Does it

- Really work? *Asian Business Review*, 6(1), 21. doi:10.18034/abr. v6i1.779
- Hurst, C., Scherer, L., & Allen, J. (2016). Distributive justice for volunteers. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 35-42. doi:10.1002/nml.21251
- Ibeogu, P. H., & Ozturen, A. (2015). Perception of justice in performance appraisal and effect on Satisfaction: Empirical findings from Northern Cyprus Banks. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, 964-969. doi:10.1016/s2212-5671(15)00359-7
- Indriani, M. (2015). Equity theory in accounting research. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce, and Management*. ISSN 2348 0386 3(5). 907-924.
Retrieved from <http://ijecm.co.uk/>
- Iqbal, N., Ahmad, N., Haider, Z., Batool, Y., & Ul-ain, Q. (2013). Impact of performance appraisal on employee's performance involving the moderating role of motivation. *Oman Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 3(1), 37-56. doi:10.12816/0002354
- Iqbal, M. Z., Akbar, S., & Budhwar, P. (2015). Effectiveness of performance appraisal: An integrated framework. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17(4), 510-533. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12050
- Jääskeläinen, A., & Sillanpää, V. (2013). Overcoming challenges in the implementation Of performance measurement: Case studies in public welfare services. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 26(6), 440-454.
doi:10.1108/ijpsm-12-2011-0014
- Jamal, M. (2007). Job stress and job performance controversy revisited: An empirical

examination in two countries. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2), 175-187. doi:10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.175

Jamali, G., Hamidianpour, F., & Ahmadi, E. (2015). Pathology of employee performance evaluation system in Abadan Refinery. *Journal of Exploratory Studies in Law and Management*, 2(2). 145-156. Retrieved from

<http://jeslm.worldofresearches.com/ojs-2.4.4.1/index.php/JESLM/index>

Janesick, V. J. (2011). "Stretching" exercises for qualitative researchers (3rd ed.).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jiang, S., Lambert, E. G., Zhang, D., Jin, X., Shi, M., & Xiang, D. (2016). Effects of work environment variables on job satisfaction among community correctional staff in China. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 43(10). 1450-1471.

doi:10.1177/0093854816633493

Johansen, T. R., & Christoffersen, J. (2016). Performance evaluations in audit firms: Evaluation foci and dysfunctional behavior. *International Journal of Auditing*.

John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. doi:10.1111/ijau.12079

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.

doi:10.3102/0013189X033007014

Jonathan, H. (2013). Perceived job satisfaction and its impact on organizational commitment: An empirical study of public secondary school teachers in Dodoma, Tanzania. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 13(3), 41-52.

doi:10.9790/487x-1334152

- Jones, M., & Alony, I. (2011). Guiding the use of grounded theory in doctoral studies-An example from the Australian Film Industry. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 6, 95-114. Retrieved from <http://ijds.org/Volume6/IJDSv6p095-114Jones322.pdf>
- Joseph, O. B. (2014). The effectiveness of performance appraisal as a tool to measure Employee productivity in organizations. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 4(4). doi:10.5296/jpag.v4i4.6912
- Kampkötter, P. (2014). Performance appraisals and job satisfaction. SOEP paper No. 672. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2469875
- Kampkötter, P. (2016). Performance appraisals and job satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-25.
doi:10.1080/09585192.2015.1109538
- Karakose, T. (2014). The empirical study of organizational justice and job satisfaction for high school teachers in Turkey. *Pakistan Journal of Statistics*, 30(6), 1243-1250.
Retrieved from <http://www.pakjs.com/>
- Kasemsap, K. (2017). Examining the Roles of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in the Global Workplace. *Handbook of Research on Human Resources Strategies for the New Millennial Workforce*, 148-176.
doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-0948-6.ch008
- Kerr, C., Nixon, A., & Wild, D. (2010). Assessing and demonstrating data saturation in

qualitative inquiry supporting patient-reported outcomes research. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes Research*, 10(3), 269-281. doi:10.1586/erp.10.30

Khaldoun, I., Ababneh, K. I., Hackett, R. D., & Schat, A. C. H. (2014). The role of attributions and fairness in understanding job applicant reactions to selection procedures and decisions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. 29(1), 111-129. doi:10.1007/s10869-013-9304-y

Khan, A. H., Anjum, U., Ul Amin, S., & Aftab, J. (2016). Impact of organizational justice perceptions on employee's performance behavior in project oriented organizations in Pakistan. *P.M World Journal*. V (VII). Retrieved from <http://pmworldjournal.net/>

Khan, M. S., & Singh, A. K. (2016). Performance appraisal system at airports authority of India, Lucknow. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 2(2), 30-32. Retrieved from <http://www.allresearchjournal.com/>

Khan, R. A. (2013). Effect of employee's perception of performance appraisal process on the job satisfaction in the Pakistani banking sector. *Global Management Journal for Academic & Corporate Studies*, 3(1), 111-121. Retrieved from <http://bukc.bahria.edu.pk/index.php/about-gmjacs>

Khan, R., Naseem, A., & Masood, S. A. (2016). Effect of continuance commitment and organizational cynicism on employee satisfaction in engineering organizations. *International Journal of Innovation, Management, and Technology*. 7(4), 141. doi:10.18178/ijimt.2016.7.4.661

- Khan, S. S. (2015). Employees' perception of job satisfaction in Kashmir Division: A study of HDFC Bank. *Global Journal of Multidisciplinary studies*, 4(6), 120-131. Retrieved from <http://www.gjms.co.in/index.php/gjms2016>
- Kim, M. (2016). A study on the development of the tool for the performance appraisal for companies employing persons with disabilities. *Asian Journal of Human Services*, 10 (0), 25-40. doi:10.14391/ajhs.10.25
- Kim, T., & Holzer, M. (2016). Public employees and performance appraisal: A study of antecedents to employees' perception of the process. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. Sage Journals, 36(1), 31-56. doi:10.1177/0734371X14549673
- Kim, T. -Y., Lin, X.-W., & Leung, K. (2015). A dynamic approach to fairness: Effects of temporal changes of fairness perceptions on job attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(1), 163-175. doi:10.1007/s10869-013-9341-6
- Klassen, A. C., Creswell, J., Plano Clark, V. L., Smith, K. C., & Meissner, H. I. (2012). Best practices in mixed methods for quality of life research. *Quality of Life Research*, 21(3), 377-380. doi:10.1007/s11136-012-0122-x
- Kobussen, G., Kalagnanam, S., & Vaidyanathan, G. (2014). The impact better-than-average bias and relative performance pay on performance outcome satisfaction. *Accounting Perspectives*, 13(1), 1-27. doi:10.1111/1911-3838.12022
- Kok Seng, E. L., & Wai, C. C. (2016). An empirical study of academic and non-academic staff's job satisfaction and organizational commitment in an institute of higher learning. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Business, and Economics*. ISSN 2345-4695. 4(1), 45-72. Retrieved from <http://scientificia.com/index.php/JEBE>

- Kong, D. T., & Barsness, Z. I. (2016). Perceived managerial (remote leader) Trustworthiness as a moderator for the relationship between overall fairness and perceived supervisory (direct leader) trustworthiness. *Journal of Current Psychology*, 1-15, doi:10.1007/s12144-016-9511-6
- Körner, M., Wirtz, M. A., Bengel, J., & Göritz, A. S. (2015). Relationship of organizational culture, teamwork, and job satisfaction in inter-professional teams. *BMC Health Services Research*, 15(1), 1-12. doi:10.1186/s12913-015-0888-y
- Kromrei, H. (2015). Enhancing the annual performance appraisal process: Reducing biases and engaging employees through self-assessment. International Society of Performance for Improvement. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 28(2), 53-64. doi:10.1002/piq.21192
- Kuranchie-Mensah, E. B., & Amponsah-Tawiah, K. (2016). Employee motivation and work performance: A comparative study of mining companies in Ghana. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 9(2), 255-309. doi:10.3926/jiem.1530
- Kuvaas, B. (2011). The interactive role of performance appraisal reactions and regular feedback. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(2), 123-137. doi:10.1108/026839411111102164
- Kvale, S. (2006). Dominance through interviews and dialogues. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12, 480-500.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Leavy, P., & Simons, H. (2014). Case study research. *The Oxford Handbook of*

Qualitative Research. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.013.005

- LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Designing and conducting ethnographic Research (Ethnographer's toolkit, Vol.1)*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Lilly, J. D., & Wipawayangkool, K. (2017). When fair procedures don't work: A self-threat model of procedural justice. *Current Psychology*. 1-12.
doi:10.1007/s12144-016-9555-7
- Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). 97-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Linna, A., Elovainio, M., Van den Bos, K., Kivimäki, M., Pentti, J., & Vahtera, J. (2012). Can usefulness of performance appraisal interviews change organizational justice perceptions? A 4-year longitudinal study among public sector employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(7), 1360-1375.
doi:10.1080/09585192.2011.579915
- Liu, S., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2014). Teachers' motivation for entering the teaching profession and their job satisfaction: A cross-cultural comparison of China and other countries. *Learning Environments Research*. 17, 75–94. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/journal/10984>
- Lodico, M., Spaulding, D., & Voegtler, K. (2010). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lopes, S., Chambel, M. J., Castanheira, F., & Oliveira-Cruz, F. (2015). Measuring job

- satisfaction in Portuguese military sergeants and officers: Validation of the job descriptive index and the job in general scale. *Military Psychology (American Psychological Association)*, 27(1), 52-63. doi:10.1037/mil0000060
- Lutwama, G. W., Roos, J. H., & Dolamo, B. L. (2017). Assessing the implementation of performance management of health care workers in Uganda. *BMC Health Services Research*, 13/1. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-13-355
- Lyde, A. R., Grieshaber, D. C., & Byrns, G. (2016). Faculty teaching performance: perceptions of a multi-source method for evaluation. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 16(3), 82-94. doi:10.14434/josotl.v16i3.18145
- Magolda, P. M. (2007). Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(1), 123-125. doi:10.1353/csd.2007.0003
- Mahapal, M., Dzimbiri, L., & Maphosa, F. (2015). Performance management in public sector organizations: Benefits and complexities. *Online Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 4(2), 18-22. Retrieved from <http://www.onlineresearchjournals.org/JSS>
- Malina, M. A., Norreklit, H. S., & Selto, F. H. (2011). Lessons learned: Advantages and disadvantages of mixed method research. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, 8, 59-71. doi:10.1108/11766091111124702
- Mangundjaya, W. L. H., Utoyo, D. B., & Wulandari, P. (2015). The role of leadership And employee's condition on reaction to organizational change. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 172, 471-478. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.385
- Manoharan, T. R., Muralidharan, C., & Deshmukh, S. G. (2011). An integrated fuzzy

multi-attribute decision- making model for employees' performance appraisal.

International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22(3), 722-745.

doi:10.1080/09585192.2011.543763

Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in qualitative research?: A review of qualitative interviews in IS research. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 54(1), 11-22. Retrieved from <http://iacis.org/jcis/articles/JCIS54-2>.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Masum, A. K. M., Azad, A. K., & Beh, L.-S. (2015). Determinants of academics' job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from private universities in Bangladesh *PLOS ONE*, 10(20), e0117834. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0117834

Masum, A. K. M., Azad, A. K., Hoque, K. E., Beth, L.-S., Wanke, P., & Arslan, O. (2016). Job satisfaction and intention to quit: An empirical analysis of nurses in Turkey. *Research funded by UMRG-Frontier Science Cluster (RG300-14AFR) | Bright Spark Unit of the University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*, Peer J. 4. e1896, 1-23. doi:10.7717/peerj.1896

Mathew, U., & Johnson, J. (2015). Impact of performance appraisal and work motivation on work performance of employees: With special reference to a multi-specialty hospital in Kerala. *Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*. 17(6), II. 21-24. doi:10.9790/487X-17622124

Mathie, A., & Carnozzi, A. (2005). Qualitative research on tobacco control: A how-to

- introductory manual for researchers and development practitioners. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: IDRC Books/Les Éditions du CRDI.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An integrative approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach. Applied Social Research Methods Series*. Sage Publications Inc.
- McLeod, J. (2010). *Case study research in counseling and psychotherapy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mehrad, A. (2014). The impact of income on academic staff job satisfaction at public Research universities, Malaysia. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology*, 3(2). Retrieved from <http://www.journal.uad.ac.id/index.php/Psychology/article/view/3726>
- Mehrotra, S., & Phillips, S. G. (2013). Awareness of banking professionals about performance appraisal methods: An empirical study. *IUP Journal of Bank Management*, 12(4), 45-57. Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/s/icf/icfjbm.html>
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A*

Methods sourcebook. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Miller, D. C., & Salkind, N. J. (2002). Qualitative research methodology: A new perspective (6th Ed). *Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement*. Sage Publication. doi:10.4135/9781412984386
- Mishra, V., & Roch, S. G. (2013). Cultural values and performance appraisal: Assessing the effects of rater self-construal on performance ratings. *The Journal of Psychology. Taylor & Francis online*, 147(4), 325–344. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/vjrl20/current>
- Moghadam, M. J. F., Peiravian, F., Naderis, A., Rajabzadeh, A., & Reza Rasekha, H. (2014). An analysis of job satisfaction among Iranian pharmacists through various job characteristics. *Iranian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, 13(3), 1087-1096. Retrieved from <http://ijpr.sbm.ac.ir/>
- Monaghan, M., Sanders, R. E., Kelly, K. P., Cogen, F. R., & Streisand, R. (2011). Using qualitative methods to guide clinical trial design: Parent recommendations for intervention modification in type 1 diabetes. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 25, 868-872. doi:10.1037/a0024178
- Monsur, M. P., & Akkas, M. A. (2015). Performance appraisal system of the academics of public and private universities in Bangladesh: An empirical study. *International Business Management*, 3(9), 712-718. doi:10.3923/ibm.2015.712.718
- Motlou, R. G., Singh, S., & Karodia, A. M. (2016). An evaluation of the impact of job

- satisfaction on employee retention at Lonmin Rowland Shaft North West Province. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*. 5(10), 1-15. Retrieved from http://www.omicsonline.com/open-access/ArchiveJBMR/previousissue_kuwaitchapterAJBMR.php
- Moustakas, C. E. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, London: Sage Publications.
- Nair, M. S., & Salleh, R. (2015). Linking performance appraisal justice, trust, and employee engagement: A conceptual framework. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211, 1155-1162, doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.154
- Nawaz, M. S., & Pangil, F. (2016). The effect of fairness of performance appraisal and career growth on turnover intention. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 10(1), 27-44. Retrieved from <http://www.jespk.net/>
- Nazir, A., Akram, M. S., & Arshad, M. (2014). Exploring the mediating role of CSR practices among leadership styles and job satisfaction. *Pakistan Journal of Science*, 66(4), 351-355. Retrieved from <http://www.pakchem.net/2011/07/pakistan-journal-of-science.html#VgiiqGZcsbgo>
- Neu Morén, E. (2013). The negotiated character of performance appraisal: How interrelations between managers matters. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(4), 853-870. doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.703215.
- Niazi, A., & Hassan, H. (2016). Effect of justice on employee performance in the banking

- sector of Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*. 10(3), 735-752. Retrieved from <http://www.jespk.net/index.php>
- Noble, H., & Smith, J. (2015). Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Evidence Based Nursing*, 18(2), 34-35. doi:10.1136/eb-2015-102054
- Norman, A. D., & Kabwe, C. (2015) "An investigation into the perceptions of employee performance management in the UK retail industry." *Journal of Research Studies in Business & Management JRSBM: 1*(1), 210-235. Retrieved from <http://ijmbs.com/>
- Nzoka, R. M. (2015). Employee perceptions on human resource practices and employee job performance among micro and small enterprises in the manufacturing sector in Kenya. *The Strategic Business and Change Journal of Management*, 2(47), 1000-1043. Retrieved from www.strategicjournals.com
- O'Boyle, I. (2013). Traditional performance appraisal versus 360-degree feedback. *Training & Management Development Methods*, 27(1), 201-207,705. Retrieved from <http://publicationethics.org/members/training-and-management-development-methods>
- Ohene Afriyie, E. (2015). Impact of performance appraisal strategy on employee's job satisfaction in Ghana Technology University. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*. 2(9). 104-118. doi:10.14738/assrj.29.1475
- Omeluzor, S. U., Tinuoye, G. O., & Akpojotor, L. O. (2016). Factors influencing job satisfaction of academic librarians in university libraries in Edo and Delta states, Nigeria. *The Electronic Library*. 34(6). doi:10.1108%2FEL-07-2015-0128

- Ordu, A. (2016). The effects of diversity management on job satisfaction and individual performance of teachers. *Educational Research and Reviews of Academic Journals*. 11(3). 105-112. doi:10.5897/ERR2015.2573
- Ouyang, Y.-Q., Zhou, W.-B., & Qu, H. (2015). The impact of psychological empowerment and organizational commitment on Chinese nurses' job satisfaction. *Contemporary Nurse*. 50(1), 80-91.
doi:10.1080/10376178.2015.1010253
- Owoyemi, O., & George, O. (2013). The use performance appraisal system in enhancing employees' performance in a public-sector agency in Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(10), 240-249.
doi:10.6007/IJARBSS/v3-i10/294
- Ozguner, Z., & Ozguner, M. (2014). A managerial point of view on the relationship between Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Herzberg's dual factor theory. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(7) n/a. Retrieved from <http://www.ijbssnet.com/>
- Pajibo, E. D., & Adjabeng, S. A. (2015). Factors influencing job satisfaction of technical And vocational education instructors in the Accra Metropolis. *Advanced Journal of Science and Technology Education*, 1(1), 8-22. Retrieved from <http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/IJSTER>
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful Sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation Research. *Administration and Policy in Mental*

Health and Mental Health Services Research, (42)5, 533-544.

doi:10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Pan, B., Shen, X., Liu, L., Yang, Y., & Wang, L. (2015). Factors Associated with Job Satisfaction among University Teachers in Northeastern Region of China: A Cross-Sectional Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 12(10), 12761-12775. doi:10.3390/ijerph121012761

Pandey, S., & Khan, M. S. (2015). The impact of performance appraisal on effectiveness of communication. *Global Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(10), 79-82.

Retrieved from www.gjms.co.

Paramanandam, P. (2013). Organizational justice and job satisfaction among the employees of an auto component manufacturing company. *Sumedha Journal of Management*, 2(4). 34-46. Retrieved from

<http://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:sjm&type=home>

Park, S. (2014). Motivation of public managers as raters in performance appraisal:

Developing a model of rater motivation. *Public Personnel Management*, 43(4), 387-414. doi:10.1177/0091026014530675

Pichler, S. (2012). The social context of performance appraisal and appraisal reactions: A meta-analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 51(5), 709- 732.

doi:10.1002/hrm.21499

Pitman, M. A. (1998). Qualitative research design: An Interactive Approach: An Interactive Approach. *Anthropology Education Quarterly*, 29(4),499-501

doi:10.1525/aeq.1998.29.4.499 Actions

- Pittman, B. (2003). Leading for value. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(4), 41-46
- Prasad, P. (2015). Performance appraisal: An empirical study to understand job satisfaction and motivation of personnel through the system. *International Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences (IJEAS)*, 2(4), 118-125. Retrieved from <https://www.ijeas.org/>
- Purohit, B., & Martineau, T. (2016). Is the Annual Confidential Report system effective? A study of the government appraisal system in Gujarat, India. *Human Resources for Health*, 14(1). doi:10.1186/s12960-016-0133-8
- Puttevar, A. S., Askhedkar, R. D., & Handa, C. C. (2016). Critical analysis of job satisfaction in service industry: A review. *International Journal of Engineering Research and General Science*, 4(2), 433-436. ISSN 2091-2730. Retrieved from <http://www.ijergs.org/>
- Qureshi, M. A., & bin Ab Hamid, A. (2017). Impact of supervisor support on job satisfaction: A moderating role of fairness perception. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(3). 235-242. doi:10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i3/2729
- Radebe, P. Q. (2015). Managers' perceptions of the performance appraisal system in the local municipality of Gauteng Province in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1), 175-182. doi: 10.5901/mjss.2015. v6n1s1p175
- Rafferty, A. E., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2016). Subjective perceptions of organizational

change and employee resistance to change: Direct and mediated relationships with employee well-being. *British Journal of Management*. doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12200

Rahman, M., Haque, M., Elahi, F., & Miah, W. (2015). Impact of organizational justice on employee job satisfaction: An empirical investigation. *American Journal of Business and Management*, 4(4). 162-171. doi:10.11634/216796061504714

Ravitch, S. M., & Riggan, M. (2012). *Reason and rigor*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Raza, M. Y., Sultan, T., Latif, K., Rafiq, T., Khan, M. I., & ul Huda, S. (2015). The impact merger and acquisition on job satisfaction, job motivation and job security of employees working in financial organizations; An environmental study from Pakistani organizations. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 23(8), 1804-1812. doi:10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2015.23.08.22266

Razzaq, S., Iqbal, M. Z., Ikramullah, M., & Van Prooijen, J.-W. (2016). Occurrence of rating distortions and ratees' fairness perceptions per raters' mood and effect. *Career Development International*, 21(7), 726-743. doi:10.1108/CDI-03-2016-0036

Reed, S. M., & Bogardus, A. M. (2012). *PHR / SPHR Professional in Human Resources Certification Study Guide* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Riessmann, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Riratanaphong, C. (2014). Performance measurement of workplace change: In two

Different cultural contexts. *Architecture and the Built Environment*, 4(2), 1-378.

Retrieved from <https://www.westminster.ac.uk/about-us/faculties/architecture-and-the-built-environment>

Rizvi, A. M. (2017). A feedback model for an effective performance appraisal system.

Journal for Global Business Advancement, 10(2), 140.

doi:10.1504/jgba.2017.10004074

Rosenthal, G. (2004). Biographical research. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J.F. Gubrium, & D.

Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice*, 48-64. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

Rowland, C. A., & Hall, R. D. (2012). Organizational justice and performance: Is

appraisal fair? *EuroMed Journal of Business*, 7(3), 280-293.

doi:10.1108/14502191211265334

Rowland, C. (2013). Managing team performance: Saying paying. *International Journal*

of Organizational Analysis, 21(1), 38-52. doi:10.1108/19348831311322524

Rowley, J. (2012). Conducting research interviews. *Management Research Review*,

35(3/4), 260-271. doi:10.1108/01409171210154

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, K. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA:

Sage.

Rusu, G., Avasilcăi, S., & Huțu, C.-A. (2016). Organizational context factors influencing

employee performance appraisal: A research framework. *Procedia - Social and*

Behavioral Sciences, 221, 57-65. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.090

Saeed, S., & Shah, F. M. (2016). Impact of performance appraisal on employees:

- Motivation in Islamic banking. *Oman Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5(7), 1-8. doi:10.12816/0019382
- Saha, S. K. (2015). The importance of performance appraisal practices for the development of an organization-A case study of a NGO in Bangladesh. *Proceedings of Kuala Lumpur International Business and Social Science Research Conference*. Universiti Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, Caritas, Bangladesh.
- Saldana, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salleh, M., Amin, A., Muda, S., & Abdul Halim, M. A. S. (2013). Fairness of performance appraisal and organizational commitment. *Asian Social Science*, 9(2). 121-128. doi:10.5539/ass.v9n2p121
- Samal, J. (2015). Performance management system in banking sector: A selective literature review. *Pezzottaite Journals SJIF. International Journal of Trade & Global Business Perspectives*, 4(3), 1903-1911. Retrieved from http://pezzottaitejournals.net/pezzottaite/Editorial_Board_of_%20IJTGBP.php
- Sanyal, M. K., & Biswas, S. B. (2014). Employee motivation from performance appraisal implications: Test of a theory in the software industry in West Bengal (India). *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 11, 182-196. doi:10.1016/s2212-5671(14)00187-7
- Sanyal, M. K., & Biswas, S. B. (2015). Role of team leaders in employee faith in the

- performance appraisal practices: An exploratory study on the software professionals in some selected IT companies in West Bengal (India). *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, 669-680. doi:10.1007/978-81-322-2247-7_68
- Sanyal, M. K., Biswas, S. B., & Ghosh, R. (2016). Implication of performance appraisal process on employee engagement mediated through the development and innovation-oriented culture: A study on the software professionals of IT companies in West Bengal. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*. 277-294. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-2035-3_29
- Saqib, S., Khan, Z., & Khan, S. (2015). Contributing factors of employee's performance: A case study of local NGOs in Peshawar City. *UTMS Journal of Economics*. 6(1): 127-134 Retrieved from <http://www.utmsjoe.mk/>
- Saunila, M., & Ukko, J. (2012). A conceptual framework for the measurement of innovation capability and its effects: Measurement of innovation capability. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 7(4), 355-375. doi:10.1108/17465261211272139
- Sawitri, D., Suswati, E., & Huda, K. (2016). The impact of job satisfaction, organization commitment, organization citizenship behavior (OCB) on employees' performance. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation (Online)*, 9(2), 24-45. Retrieved from <http://www.ijoi-online.org/about-ijoi.html>
- Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education & the social sciences* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press, Columbia University. New York., NY.
- Senyah, M. M., Boateng Coffie, R., & Adu-Parkoh, K. (2016). Assessment of the

- effectiveness of performance appraisal on work productivity: A case study of Kumasi Polytechnic. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(3), 1-15. Retrieved from <http://www.eajournals.org/>
- Shah, N., Anwar, S., & Irani, Z. (2017). The impact of organizational justice on ethical Behavior (Abstract). *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, 12(2). doi:10.1504/ijbir.2017.081405
- Sharma, A., & Sharma, T. (2017). HR analytics and performance appraisal system: A conceptual framework for employee performance improvement. *Management Research Review*, 40(6). doi:10.1108/MRR-04-2016-0084
- Shiekhah, N. A., Sarhan, N., Abbad, M., & Istaiteyah, R. (2015). The Impact of personal characteristics and employee's perception towards the objectivity of performance appraisal. *Business and Economic Research* ISSN 2162-4860. 5(2). doi:10.5296/ber. v5i2.7773
- Shih, S. P., Yu, S., & Tseng, H. C. (2015). The Study of consumers' buying behavior and consumer satisfaction in beverages industry in Tainan, Taiwan. *Journal of Economics, Business, and Management*, 3(3), 391-394. doi:10.7763/joebm. 2015 v3.215
- Shrivastava, A., & Purang, P. (2011). Employee perceptions of performance appraisals: A comparative study on Indian banks. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(3), 632-647. doi:10.1080/09585192.2011.543639

- Shrivastava, A., & Purang, P. (2016). Performance appraisal fairness and its outcomes: A study of Indian banks. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 51(4), 660-674.
Retrieved from <http://www.publishingindia.com/ijir/>
- Simons, H. (2012). *Case study research in practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Sing, R. R., & Vadivelu, S. (2016). Performance appraisal in India-A review. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, 1(5). 3229-3234.
Retrieved from <https://www.ripublication.com/ijaer.htm>
- Singh, P., & Mishra, R. K. (2016). Performance-related pay perception in Indian central public sector enterprises. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*, 13(4), 474. doi:10.1504/ijicbm.2016.079814
- Singleton, R. A., & Straits, B. C. (2005). *Approaches to social research* (4th Ed). New York: Oxford University Press
- Skibba, B. (2006). Book review: Qualitative research design: An interactive approach (2nd ed.). *Adult Education Quarterly*, 6(2), 165-166,
doi:10.1177/0741713605283436 Actions
- Smith, P. M. R., Nagy, H., Bilsland, C., & Nhung, D. T. H. (2016). Gender equality in performance assessment to nurture the ASEAN entrepreneurial spirit: An exploratory study in Vietnam. [Abstract]. *Managing the Asian Century*, 95-110.
doi:10.1007/978-981-10-2281-4_8
- Snella, R. S., Yi, Z., & Chak, A. M. K. (2013). Representational predicaments for

employees: Their impact on perceptions of supervisors' individualized consideration and on employee job satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(8), 1646-1670.

doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.723634

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case studies research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work*. The Guilford Press, New York: London

Stanfield, J. (2006). The possible restorative justice functions of qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative studies in Education*, 19(6), 723-727.

doi:10.1080/09518390600975925

Stepanovich, P. L. (2013). Pernicious performance appraisals: A critical exercise. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 14(2). 107-139. Retrieved from <http://www.ibam.com/jbam.html>

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications

Sullivan, S. E., & Terjesen, S. (2011). The role of developmental relationships in the transition to entrepreneurship. *Career Development International*, 16, 482-506.

doi:10.1108/13620431111168895

Sumelius, J., Björkman, I., Ehrnrooth, M., Mäkelä, K., & Smale, A. (2014). What Determines employee perceptions of HRM process features? The case of performance appraisal in MNC subsidiaries. *Human Resource Management*, 53(4), 569- 592. doi:10.1002/hrm.21604

- Suri, H. (2011). Purposeful sampling in qualitative research synthesis. *Qualitative Research Journal, 11*(2), 63–75. doi:10.3316/QR1102063
- Swanepoel, S., Botha, P. A., & Mangonyane, N. B. (2014). Politicization of performance appraisals. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 12*(1), 1-9. doi:10.4102/sajhrm.v12i1.525
- Tabibnia, G., Satpute, A. B., & Lieberman, M. D. (2008). The sunny side of fairness: Preference fairness activates reward circuitry (and disregarding unfairness activates self-control circuitry). *Psychological Science, 19*, 339-347
- Tahar-Kedem, E. (2014). Is motivation essential for creating new lifestyles: Management intervention model for female immigrants from developing countries. *Review of International Comparative Management, 15*(1), 16-30. Retrieved from <http://www.rmci.ase.ro/>
- Taneja, S., Srivastava, R., & Ravichandran, N. (2015). Consequences of performance appraisal justice perception: A study of Indian Banks. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(3), 33-57. Retrieved from <http://www.iupindia.in/>
- Taylor, J. (2014). Organizational culture and the paradox of performance management. *Public Performance & Management Review, 38*(1), 7-22. doi:10.2753/pmr1530-9576380101
- Teckchandani, A., & Pichler, S. (2015). Quality results from performance appraisals. *Industrial Management, 57*(4), 16-20, 5. Retrieved from <https://www.iienet2.org/Details.aspx?id=652>
- Thomas, E., & Magilvy, J. K. (2011). Qualitative rigor or research validity in qualitative

research. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing*, 16(2), 151-155.

doi:10.1111/j.1744-6155.2011.00283.x

Thomson, O. P., Petty, N. J., Ramage, C. M., & Moore, A. P. (2011). Qualitative research: Exploring the multiple perspectives of osteopathy. *International Journal of Osteopathic Medicine*, 14, 116-124. doi:10.1016/j.ijosm.2011.06.001

Trochim, W. M. K. (2001). *The research methods knowledge base*. (2nd ed.). United States of America: Atomic Dog Publishing.

Tsai, C. J., & Wang, W. -L. (2013). Exploring the factors associated with employees perceived appraisal accuracy: A study of Chinese state-owned enterprises. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(11), 2197-2220. doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.723019

Tseng, L. M., & Kuo, C. -L. (2014). Customers' attitudes toward insurance frauds: an application of Adams' equity theory. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 41(11), 1038-1054. doi:10.1108/ijse-08-2012-0142

Turhan, M., Köprülü, O., & Helvacı, I. (2016). The relationship between academic staff's perception of organizational justice and demographic factors: A case study in foundation universities in Turkey. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 5(4), 1406-1412. Retrieved from www.irnbrjournal.com

Ullah Khan, M. F. (2013). Role of performance appraisal system on employees' motivation. *IOSR. Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 8(4), 66-83. doi:10.9790/487x-0846683

- Usop, A. M., Askandar, D. K., & Langguyuan-Kadtong, M. (2013). Work performance and job satisfaction among teachers. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3, 245-252. Retrieved from <http://www.ijhssnet.com/>
- Valaei, N., & Jiroudi, S. (2016). Job satisfaction and job performance in the media industry: A synergistic application of partial least squares path modelling. [Abstract]. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 28(5). Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/APJML-10-2015-0160>
- Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for and action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Vasset, F. (2014). Various perspectives on performance appraisals in the health service. *Health*, 6(10), 929-967. doi:10.4236/health.2014.610117
- Voußem, L., Kramer, S., & Schäffer, U. (2016). Fairness perceptions of annual bonus payments: The effects of subjective performance measures and the achievement of bonus targets. *Management Accounting Research*, 30, 32-46. doi:10.1016/j.mar.2015.10.001
- Warokka, A., Gallato, C. G., & Moorthy, T. (2012). Organizational justice in performance appraisal system and work performance: Evidence from an emerging market. *The Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 1-18. doi:10.5171/2012.159467
- Whiteside, D. B., & Barclay, L. J. (2016). When wanting to be, fair is not enough: The effects of depletion and self-appraisal gaps on fair behavior. *Journal of Management*. [Abstract]. doi:10.1177/0149206316672531

- Wickramasinghe, V. (2016). Performance management in medium-sized enterprises: Driving human and organizational performance. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 29(3), 307–331 doi:10.1002/piq.21227
- Widodo, H. P. (2014). Methodological considerations in interview data transcription. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 101–107, 111. Retrieved from https://www.novapublishers.com/catalog/product_info.php?products_id=50128
- Wolcott, H. F. (2008). *Ethnography: A way of seeing* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: AltaMira.
- Worlu, R., & Chidozie, F. C. (2012). The validity of Herzberg's Dual-Factor Theory on job satisfaction of political marketers. *African Research Review*, 6(1). doi:10.4314/afrev.v6i1.4
- Worthington, S., & Devlin, J. (2015). Fairness and financial services in Australia and the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 31(4), 289-304. doi:10.1108/ijbm-09-2012-0094
- Wu, J. (2015). Internal audit and review of the negative customer behavior. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 8, 578-587. doi:10.4236/jssm.2015.84058
- Wu, W., Ma, L., & Yu, W. (2017). Government transparency and perceived social equity. *Administration & Society*, 1-25. doi:10.1177/0095399716685799
- Wulandari, P., Mangundjaya, W., & Utoyo, D. B. (2015). Is job satisfaction a moderator Or mediator on the relationship between change leadership and commitment to change? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*.172, 104-111. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.342

- Yadav, N., & Sushil, S. M. (2013). Performance measurement and management frameworks: Research trends of the last two decades. *Business Process Management Journal*, 19(6), 947-971. doi:10.1108/BPMJ-01-2013-0003
- Yang, Y. F. (2013). Studies of transformational leadership in consumer service: Market orientation behavior and the mediating-moderating role of change commitment. *Psychological Reports*, 113, 767-785.
- Yang, L.-Q., Bauer, J., Johnson, R. E., Groer, M. W., & Salomon, K. (2014). Physiological mechanisms that underlie the effects of interactional unfairness on deviant behavior: The role of cortisol activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(2), 310-321. doi:10.1037/a0034413
- Yang, Y. F. (2014a). Studies of transformational leadership in the consumer service workgroup: Evaluating six competing models of job satisfaction, change commitment, and cooperative conflict resolution. *Psychological Reports*, 114(1), 33-49.
- Yang, Y. F. (2014b). Studies of transformational leadership: Evaluating two alternatives models of trust and satisfaction. *Psychological Reports*, 114(3), 740-757.
- Yang, Y.-F. (2016). Examining competing models of transformational leadership, Leadership trust, change commitment, and job satisfaction. *Psychological Reports*, 119(1), 154-173. doi:10.1177/0033294116657586
- Yates, L., Woelert, P., Miller, V., & O'Connor, K. (2016). Performance Measurement and Management. *Knowledge at the Crossroads?* 183-195. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-2081-0_11

- Yeong Ng, J. C., & Han, G. L. D. A. (2015). Searching for fallacies in performance feedback and appeal: A grounded theory research in China. *Indian Journal of Commerce & Management Studies*, VI (3), 26. Retrieved from www.scholarshub.net
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research, design, and methods*, (2nd Ed.). Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zhan, L. (2016). Written teacher feedback: Student perceptions, teacher perceptions, and actual teacher performance. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 73-84.
doi:10.5539/elt.v9n8p73
- Zhang, J., Wu, Q., Miao, D., Yan, X., & Peng, J. (2013). The impact of core self-evaluations on job satisfaction: The mediator role of career commitment. *Social Indicators Research*. 116(3). doi:10.1007/s11205-013-0328-5
- Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, P., & Ting Ding, J.-M. (2017). Employees' justice perceptions as a factor influencing successful outsourcing in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(6).
doi:10.1108/ijchm-09-2015-0477
- Zopiatis, A., Constanti, P., & Theocharous, A. L. (2014). Job involvement, commitment, satisfaction and turnover: Evidence from hotel employees in Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 41, 129-140. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2013.09.013

Appendix A: Letter of Cooperation and Statement of Understanding

Date
Name of Organization
Address

Dear [Name of Requesting Party/Executive or Participant],

I wish to apply for permission and cooperation to use your organization for data collection as part of requirements for a doctoral research. I am a PhD candidate at Walden University pursuing a degree in Management with specialization in Human Resources. My research is on the topic “Perceptions of Fairness of Employee Performance Appraisals on Job Satisfaction.” The purpose of the study is to explore how employee perceptions of performance appraisals can be improved to enhance job satisfaction within a healthcare organization. This research is entirely academic in nature. I am seeking to utilize face-to-face interviews with employees who satisfy the criteria of having worked for at least a period of one year and experienced performance appraisals within the organization. I developed the criteria for selection to ensure that participants are likely to possess the requisite knowledge pertinent to the goal of the study. The research will entail voluntary participation of employees within your establishment. Participants will be required to answer nine open-ended face-to-face interview questions. Participants may decide to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without retribution or loss of benefits to them. The research outcome may be published, but neither the identity of participants, position or the organization’s name will be mentioned, or participant responses compromised.

Anonymity and confidentiality of the study will be assured to protect participant identity by assigning a numeric code or alphabet to participants and the transcript would be preserved in strict confidence after the study. The only foreseeable risk to participants in this study may include individual sensitivity, increased recognition, or emotional responsiveness in relation to sharing their current and past experiences and knowledge involving their perceptions of performance appraisals in the organization. There is no direct benefit to participants. Rather, participants may enhance their understanding, and mindset about performance appraisals, thereby increasing their knowledge on the complex nature of performance appraisals. I have included a letter of cooperation from a research partner to grant permission to use the organization with this statement of understanding. The return of the completed permission letter will be considered as your organization’s consent to participate in the study strictly for academic purposes.

You may contact me with any questions regarding this study via telephone at xxx-xxx or xxxx@waldenu.edu. If you would like to talk privately about your rights, you may contact Dr. xxx, the Walden University representative on xxx-xxx-xxxx.

Sincerely,

Simon-Davies A. Nutakor (PhD Candidate)

Walden University

Appendix B: Letter of Cooperation from a Research Partner: Permission to use
Organization, Premises and Subjects

Name of Community Research Partner: -----

Official's Name: -----Title-----

Contact Information: -----

Date -----

Dear ----- [Researcher Name],

Based on my review of your research proposal, I hereby authorize Simon-Davies A. Nutakor, a doctoral student at Walden University, to use the organization, premises, and subjects requested within the _____ [Name of the Healthcare Organization] to collect data for a study entitled "Perceptions of Fairness of Employee Performance Appraisals on Job Satisfaction." We understand that our organization's responsibilities include:

- Personnel/Supervisors participating in a 30-60 minutes face-to-face interviews.
- Provision of copies of documents and list of names/database of employees (as applicable) of [Name of the Healthcare Organization] that the organization is willing to share.
- Participation in validating the accuracy of researcher's interpretations and conclusions with participants who will participate in the face-to-face interviews.

We reserve the right to withdraw from the study at any time if our circumstances change. As part of this study, I authorize you to recruit individuals in this organization to participate in the study. I will provide you a list of names of individuals that meet your inclusion criteria and you may contact them directly or I may forward an invitation to employees informing them to contact you directly if they are interested in participating in the study. Participation in the study will be voluntary and at the discretion of individual employees. I confirm that I am authorized to approve research in this setting and that this plan complies with the organization's policies. I understand that the data collected will remain entirely confidential and may not be provided to anyone outside of the student's supervising faculty/staff without permission from the Walden University Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Sincerely,

Authorization Official

Name, Title, and Date

Walden University policy on electronic signatures: An electronic signature is just as valid as a written signature if both parties have agreed to conduct the transaction electronically. The Uniform Electronic Transactions Act regulate electronic signatures. Electronic signatures are only valid when the signer is either (a) the sender of the email, or (b) copied on the email containing the signed document. Legally an "electronic signature" can be the person's typed name, their email address, or any other identifying marker. Walden University staff verify any electronic signatures that do not originate from a password-protected source (i.e., an email address officially on file with Walden).

Appendix C: Letter of Appreciation for Participation

Dear [Name of Employee/Participant/Executive],

Thank you for participating in the study entitled “Perceptions of Fairness of Employee Performance Appraisals on Job Satisfaction.” I very much appreciate your participation in the study. The time and experience shared and your candid opinion in response to the interview questions concerning the complexity of the perception of performance appraisal on job satisfaction remains invaluable. Your contribution to this study is critical and may help enhance the knowledge and understanding of the topic. I appreciate your desire to participate in this important study by contributing your views. I may provide you with a complimentary copy of the study as a token of my appreciation once the study is completed and approved by the Walden University Chief Academic Officer (CAO). Meanwhile, I may be reached at xxx-xxx-xxxx or xxxxxxxxxxxx@waldenu.edu to answer any questions or concerns that you may have.

Thank you once again for your participation in the study.

Sincerely,

Simon-Davies A. Nutakor (PhD Candidate).

Walden University

Appendix D: Informed Consent for Participants

You are hereby invited to participate in a research about the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction. You were identified as a potential participant for the study because you are an employee who have worked for at least one year and experienced performance appraisals in the organization. This consent form constitutes part of a process referred to as “informed consent” that enables you to understand this study before deciding on whether to participate.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named Simon-Davies A. Nutakor, who is a PhD Management student at Walden University.

Background information:

The purpose of this study is to explore the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction.

Procedures:

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be required to:

- Take part in a semi-structured face-to-face, interview with the researcher concerning the perceptions of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction.
- The interview will be scheduled in the conference room of your organization or a private location of your choice.
- The interview will span a time commitment of 30-60 minutes during or after normal hours of work.
- The interview will be recorded, transcribed, and later analyzed by the researcher.
- The interview will be a one-time event of data collection.
- The researcher will provide participants a copy of the transcript via e-mail after the interview to review for accuracy of data.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

This research is voluntary. You have the liberty to accept or decline the invitation to participate in the study and your decision will be respected by everyone. No one will treat you differently if you decide not to be included in the study. You may decide to join this study now and can still change your mind later to stop the interview. You may choose not to answer some questions if you do not feel comfortable to provide a response.

Here are some sample questions:

1. How would you describe fairness of job performance at your workplace?
2. What are your perceptions of performance appraisals in your organization?
3. What are the possible reasons that cause negative perceptions of performance appraisals?

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

You will be provided with specific details of how to obtain a copy of the completed dissertation in its entirety. You may be provided a copy of the research findings for your personal information. If interested, I will provide a verbal presentation in the research region or at a professional conference. Individuals' privacy and confidentiality of information will be assured unless I learn of harm to participants, self or others, in which case I would need to report that to the proper authorities. There are no risks involved with the study. Your participation in the study will be greatly appreciated and will contribute immensely to the body of knowledge pertinent to the perceptions of employees of performance appraisals on job satisfaction.

Compensation:

There will be no payments for participating in the research.

Privacy:

All information provided during and after the interview, will be treated as strictly confidential.

None of your personal information including your name and that of the organization or anything else that purports to identify you in the reports or study will be used. Number codes and letters of the alphabet will be assigned to participants in place of names throughout the study. Data gathered including all electronic files saved to CD-ROM disks will be encrypted, password protected, and secured in a locked file cabinet in the office for a period of 5 years per Walden University requirements. All research files and disks containing interview data, transcripts and electronic files will be shredded and destroyed with the use of an electrical shredder after 5 years following the study.

Contacts and Questions:

You may ask any questions now or later by contacting the researcher, Simon-Davies A. Nutakor, at xxx-xxx-8123 or simondavies.nutakor@waldenu.edu OR the researcher's Doctoral Faculty Chair/Mentor, Dr. Jean Gordon, at xxx-xxx-1655 or jean.gordon@waldenu.edu. You may also call the University's Research Participant Advocate who is Walden University's representative to discuss any issues related to your privacy and participant rights at 1-800-925-3368 Ext. 312-1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is xxx-xxx-xxx. This number expires on xx-xx-xxxx.

Statement of Consent:

If you have read and feel you understand the above information regarding the study well enough to decide about your participation, please indicate your consent.

By signing this consent form, I am agreeing to participate in the study based on the terms described above and will receive a copy of the signed consent form for my records.

*If you choose not to sign the consent form, you can reply via telephone or email "Yes, I am interested in participating in the study" and schedule a time for an interview. You will

receive a copy of the signed consent form with my signature and a typed statement that you confirmed participation via telephone or email.

Printed name of participant _____

Date of consent _____

Participant's written signature _____

Researcher's written signature _____

Appendix E: Interview Protocol/Guide

The central research question is: What are employee perceptions of fairness of performance appraisals on job satisfaction in healthcare organizations? The related sub-question is: What are the reasons that lead to unfair perceptions of performance appraisals? In this qualitative case study, the interview will consist of 9 open-ended questions to explore or understand perceptions of performance appraisals of employees in the healthcare organization located in the Baltimore-Washington Metropolitan Area in Western Maryland.

Procedure:

Select Participants	Researcher will contact participants via email or phone.
Arrange Venue, Date, and Time	Set time, date, and venue for the interview. The interviews will take place in the conference room or participants' personal office of the healthcare organization at a time to be agreed upon.
Explain the Study and its Content	Provide an overview or synopsis of the purpose of the study and obtain verbal and written consent from each participant, after providing the participants with consent forms.
Record the Interview	Record interviews and thank participants followed by sending email, a letter or a thank you card or note to participants following the interviews.
Transcribe the Interviews	Transcribe interviews and cross-check the transcription and interpretation for validation with participants.

Additional Questions	Ask participants follow-up probing questions based on the prevalence of the responses to seek further clarification of unclear responses and when the question has not been fully answered.
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. How would you describe fairness of job performance at your workplace?
2. What are your perceptions of performance appraisals in your organization?
3. What knowledge do you have about performance appraisal perceptions in your organization? Please explain.
4. Do you consider performance appraisals in your organization as fair or unfair and why? Please explain and provide examples.
5. How do you think the fairness perceptions of performance appraisals can be improved to ensure job satisfaction?
6. What are the possible reasons that cause unfair perceptions of performance appraisals?
7. How do you think the fairness perceptions of performance appraisals can lead to job satisfaction?
8. What recommendations would you make to improve the fairness perceptions of performance appraisals in your organization?
9. What other information are you willing to furnish that have not been covered?

Appendix F: Face-to-Face Interview Script

Participants will be required to provide a signed copy of informed consent agreeing to participate as a volunteer in this study without compensation and incentives before the start of the interview. The following statements will constitute the structure and procedures for the participant interviews:

1. Arrange a date, time, and venue to interview each participant through email correspondence.
2. Welcome participants with the following opening remarks: *“Hello! My name is Simon-Davies A. Nutakor, a Doctoral student at Walden University. I am grateful for taking time off your busy schedule to volunteer as a participant in this research study.” “The interview should span a total time of approximately 30-60 minutes.”*
3. Check to ensure that each participant received an email copy of the written informed consent form and ask for a signed copy. Give each participant a copy with his or her signature and the researcher’s signature.
4. Explain that the informed consent form includes: a) the Walden Institutional Review Board (IRB) number for this study, b) an email address and phone number for the chair of my Doctoral Study Committee, and c) an email address and phone number for the IRB representative if they have additional questions about this study.
5. Ask participants if they read the entire informed consent form, permit participants to ask questions about the consent forms, and confirm their agreement to continue with the research.

6. Read the statement of consent and option to withdraw from the interview process aloud to participants. Mention that the interview is voluntary, and they may decline to answer any question that will make them feel uncomfortable. Indicate that they may withdraw from the study at any time, during or after the interview and that all recorded information, notes, transcripts, and references collected will be permanently destroyed after use. It may be noted that if they decide to withdraw from the study, it will not be held against them in any way or have any adverse impact on their work.

7. (Read Aloud): *Performance appraisal is a critical element of managing employees. For the study, my interest is to explore your perceptions about performance appraisals on job satisfaction. Please keep this purpose of the study in mind as you respond to the interview questions.*

8. Assure participants that all written and recorded interview responses will be confidential, and that participant's personal information will not be used for any other purpose outside the project.

9. Ask participants if they are still interested and willing to take part in the project.

10. Explain the purpose of the study and the interview procedure: *"The purpose of this study is to explore the perception of fairness of employee performance appraisals on job satisfaction."* *"The interview will follow a designed interview protocol and consist a format of open-ended questions."*

11. Obtain permission from participants to record and start audio recording the interview after participants have agreed and announce participants' pseudonym assigned to maintain anonymity and confidentiality, date, and time for interview.

12. Ask interview questions and follow-up questions to seek clarification of responses.
13. Take field notes of key comments and observations during the interview.
14. Inform participants that they will receive a copy of the transcribed notes and interpretations of the audio recording within a couple of days for them to review for accuracy and return same using the Walden University email address that will be provided.
15. Conclude the interview by thanking participants for their time and willingness to participate in the study after confirming that answers recorded properly and to the satisfaction of participants after the interview. (Adapted from Exploring Mentoring and Career Advancement: A Community College Case Study by Steele, L. D., 2016).