

Influence of Demographic Variables on Performance Appraisal: A Study of Five Star Hotels in Jordan

Mohammed Abd-Alwahab Al Rawashdeh^a, C Sumangala^b

^aResearch Scholar, Department of Management Science, University of Mysore, Mysuru, India

^bHead of Department, Department of Management Science, Yuvaraja's College, University of Mysore, Mysuru, India

Abstract

Performance has been regarded by various scholars as the "accomplishment, execution, carrying-out, and working out of anything ordered or undertaken". Armstrong (2011) argues that performance is a matter not only of what people achieve, but how they achieve it. The purpose of measuring performance is not to indicate only where things are not going according to plan but also to identify why things are not going well so that steps can be taken to build on success. There could be several factors that influence performance appraisals in an organization. Therefore, the researcher considered assessing the factors such as *age, gender, current position, length of service, and education* that influence performance appraisal. A total of 263 employees working in Five star hotels in Jordan were selected for the study. A questionnaire was used to collect data regarding the factors that influenced performance appraisals and hypothesis was adequately tested using ANCOVA test. Results revealed that Gender did not have significant influence over the Current Performance Appraisal System both in individual components and total CPAS. Age of the respondents did not have significant influence over the CPAS both in individual components and total CPAS. Experience of employees had significant influence over only 'credibility' factor of CPAS, employees with experience of 5-10 and above 15 years had higher 'credibility' scores compared to employees with <5 and 11-15 years of experience. Education of the respondents did not have significant influence over the Current Performance Appraisal System both in individual components and total CPAS

KEYWORDS – Performance appraisal, Age, Gender, Current position, Length of service, and Education

Introduction

Tourism industry contributes at least 6 % of the world's gross domestic product and employing over 127 million workers both directly and indirectly worldwide, it is estimated that the world's Travel and Tourism Economy will contribute 10.5 % to global gross domestic product by 2019 with growth averaging 4.4 % per annum between 2009 and 2019 (Wttc, 2017). The industry contribution towards economic development cannot be over-emphasized in both developed and developing economies. Some countries especially those in the developing economies rely on tourism as a major catalyst for growth and development. Tourism and hospitality move together in the service industry to provide the necessary service to clientele. Hospitality is one of the largest industries in

the world, it plays significant role in terms of accommodation, drink and food to visitors away from home for reward (Medlik, 2012).

Hotel industry of Jordan has experienced tremendous growth in recent years. To benefit from growing market, hotels require right people for the right Job. To attract, retain, add to shareholder value innovative and improve organization`s performance, Hotels are considered the fundamental mainstay in the tourism sector. It almost provides 25% out of the generic tourism income. It also is considered as the main source for the employment in the tourism sector where it provide more than 30% out of the Total job accumbency and opportunities that the tourism sector provides (Al-Omari, Ali, Mahmoud, & Jawabreh, 2015). Performance Appraisal of Employees` are required to be implemented. There is therefore the need to assess the contribution of employee appraisal and performance in the hotel industry and how best the benefits can be harnessed for the development of the industry in the country. The purpose of this study was to ascertain the extent to which performance appraisal is practiced.

Performance Appraisal is an important dimension of Human Resource Management practices and it is essential to have an effective performance appraisal in every organization. Performance Appraisal is identified as a very significant tool for any organization to evaluate their employees` performance because through the performance appraisal the capabilities and abilities of an employee to manage the tasks and responsibilities will be visibly seen by the top management. (Akinyele, 2010) stated that having a good performance appraisal is significant for any organization as it is one of the main elements that ensure continuous improvement in employee performance. In conclusion performance is a systematic management process and to be successful, the management has to adopt a strong administrative mentality.

Performance Appraisal practices

There are various ways of conducting performance appraisal, and ideas change over time as to what are the most effective appraisal methods and systems. According to Pathania (2011), a number of approaches both traditional and modern are utilized in performance appraisal practices. Some of the methods utilized in performance appraisals as pointed out by the authors and discussed in this section include free essay approach, graphics scale, checklist method, ranking approach, critical incident appraisal, management by objectives and 360-degree performance appraisal among others.

Under essay appraisal, the supervisor or the person in charge of employee`s performance appraisal writes a series of statements concerning an individual`s strengths, weaknesses, past performance and potential for promotion. This is normally done after the rater intensely monitors and evaluates the performance of an employee. The other method of performance appraisal that is utilized by entities is the graphic rating scale in which the rater assesses an individual on factors such as initiative, dependability, cooperativeness, attitude and quantity of work. The other performance appraisal approach is the checklist method in which the rater does not evaluate performance but merely records it on a series of questions concerning the employee`s behavior by checking yes or no responses (Elverfeldt, 2005).

Another approach of performance appraisal practice is Management By Objective. This approach is based on converting organizational goals and objective for individual employees. The approach as pointed out by Obisi (2011) can be communicated to the subordinates employees being appraised using tell and sell method, tell and listen method or problem solving method. Under tell and sell approach, the supervisor or the person in charge of appraisal lets the employee know how he or she is doing, gets the employee's acceptance of the evaluation, and makes the employee agree to plan on improvement. This method as indicated by the author is most likely to be successful with new, young employees and with employees who are in a new assignment.

The other approach of performance appraisal practice used by entities is 360-degree- type of appraisal. This kind of approach as asserted by Elverfeldt (2005) ensures that it is not only the superior that appraises the subordinate but also the subordinate appraises the superior. Colleagues also appraise colleagues and individuals who appraise themselves and all the appraisals are used to arrive at the final appraisal outcome after calculating the average. According to Wise (1998) in the typical 360-degree process, supervisors, subordinates, peers and internal or external customers provide feedback on performance for each target employee, using some type of standardized instrument. The employee then uses the data, along with a self-rating, to make appropriate changes to improve performance. DeNisi and Kluger (2000) concur with Wise (1998) that 360-degree appraisals involve the employees receiving feedback from individuals whose views are considered helpful and relevant. The feedback is typically provided on a form showing job skills, abilities, attitudinal, behavioral criteria and some sort of scoring or value judgment system. The employees then assess themselves using the same feedback instrument or form.

According to Grote (2002), effective performance appraisal practices follow a four-phase model i.e. performance planning, performance execution, performance assessment and performance review. Performance planning is normally done during the beginning of every financial year of the organization where the manager and the subordinates get together for a performance-planning meeting. During the performance-planning meeting, managers and the employees discuss what each employee will accomplish during the financial year. They discuss key responsibilities of the employee's job and the goals and projects the person will work on and how the person will do the job i.e. the behaviors and competencies, the organization expects of its members as well as employee's development plans. The second phase of performance execution as pointed out by Bladen (2001), occurs over the course of the year where the manager provides coaching and feedback to the individual employees to increase the probability of success. This creates the conditions that motivate and resolves any arising performance problems. Thus, all throughout the year, managers and individual employees meet to review the individual's performance against the plans and goals discussed during performance planning.

In the third phase of performance assessment as the time for the formal performance appraisal nears, the manager reflects on how well the subordinate has performed over the course of the year, assembles the various forms and paperwork that the organization provides to make this assessment, and fills them out. The manager may also recommend a change in the individual's compensation based on the quality of the individual's work.

The completed assessment form is usually reviewed and approved by the appraiser's boss. During the fourth phase of performance review, the manager and the subordinate meet and review the appraisal form that the manager has written and talk about how well the person performed over the past financial year. At the end of the review, the performance management process starts anew (Elverfeldt, 2005).

Review of Literature

Abukhalifeh and Som (2015) conducted a conceptual study on the topic "Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction and Restaurants' Performance Appraisal in Hotel Industry" A review the staff restaurants processes and their relationships with service quality (SQ) and total quality management (TQM) of restaurants,, in the hotel industry. More importantly, this study applies a new model for the restaurants,, SQ measurement that incorporates restaurant's staff performance in the SQ level measurement. This new SQ for customer satisfaction model, in turn, can be integrated directly into the hospitality TQM operation since SQ is a basic component of TQM. This new model prevails over the traditional SQ models in several areas. First, the new model is more comprehensive. Also, the new model reflects the actual SQ situation better.

Saeed and Shah (2016) in their study titled "Impact of Performance Appraisal on Employees: Motivation in Islamic Banking" examined the relationship between performance appraisals on employee's motivation in Islamic banking. Islamic banking is a new phenomenon in the Asian nation as Pakistan especially in this decade, with the aim to execute Shariah based human resource practices and their usage. For analysis, linear regression and spearman's correlation techniques were connected through IBM SPSS programming. A result of correlation and regression investigation shows that there is general positive relationship of performance appraisal on employee's motivation in Islamic banking. The findings of the study concluded that performance appraisal absolutely impact on employees motivation in Islamic banks.

Ismail, Mohamed, and Rayee (2017) conducted study "Relationship between performance appraisal communication, procedural justice and job satisfaction" examined the effect of performance appraisal communication and procedural justice on job satisfaction using 99 usable questionnaires collected from employees who work at public tertiary educational institutions in East Malaysia. The outcomes of stepwise regression analysis showed that relationship between feedback, treatment and procedural justice significantly correlated with job satisfaction. In sum, this result demonstrates that the ability of appraisers to appropriately provide feedback and treatment will strongly invoke appraises' feelings of procedural justice and this may lead to an enhanced job satisfaction in the organization studied.

Objectives of the Study

To study the influence of select demographic variables-gender, age, marital status, working department, experience, and qualification on Performance Appraisal in hotels.

Hypothesis of the Study

H₁–Select demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, working department, experience, qualification) have an impact on Performance Appraisals among Five Star Hotels in Jordan.

Sample

This study was based on five-stars rated hotels in operation in South Area of Jordan (Aqaba, Petra, Dead sea) and around 18 Hotels were chosen.

Statistical Tools employed

The study employed statistical tools in order to analyze the data. The tools used for the study were descriptive statistics tools like percentage, mean and standard deviation and One Sample t-test, ANOVA and ANCOVA.

Procedure

Performance appraisal was measured using the Current Performance Appraisal System (CPAS).

Results of Data Analysis and Interpretation

Gender and Current Performance Appraisal System

Table 1(a): Mean and other descriptive statistics of male and female respondents on various components and total CPAS

Components of CPAS	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Satisfaction	Male	173	23.56	4.861	.370
	Female	90	23.94	3.773	.398
Credibility	Male	173	17.94	4.580	.348
	Female	90	18.20	4.256	.449
Objectivity	Male	173	15.73	2.626	.200
	Female	90	15.84	2.389	.252
Awareness	Male	173	16.29	2.606	.198
	Female	90	15.81	2.365	.249
Fairness	Male	173	16.41	2.435	.185
	Female	90	16.24	2.442	.257
Total CPAS	Male	173	89.94	11.892	.904
	Female	90	90.04	9.988	1.053

Table 1(b): Results of Independent samples ‘t’ tests for Mean scores of male and female respondents on various components and total CPAS

Components of CPAS	t-test for Equality of Means			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Satisfaction	-.653	261	.514	-.384

Credibility	-.444	261	.658	-.258
Objectivity	-.333	261	.739	-.110
Awareness	1.473	261	.142	.484
Fairness	.524	261	.601	.166
CPAS total	-.070	261	.944	-.102

Gender of the respondents was found to have no significant influence over individual components of CPAS and total CPAS. All the obtained t values for mean difference between male and female respondents were found to be non-significant. The t values obtained for satisfaction (t=0.653; p=.514), credibility (t=.444; p=.658), objectivity (F=.333; p=.739), awareness (t=1.473; p=.142), Fairness (F=0.524; p=.601) and for total CPAS scores (t=.070; p=.944) were all found to be non-significant indicating a statistical similarity in the mean scores of the male and female respondents working in five star hotels of Jordan.

Age and Current Performance Appraisal System

Table 2(a): Mean and other descriptive statistics of respondents in different groups on various components and total CPAS

Components of CPAS	Age groups (years)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Satisfaction	18-25	87	24.18	4.342	.465
	26-35	96	23.36	3.963	.405
	36-45	58	23.31	5.576	.732
	OVER 46	22	24.18	4.415	.941
	Total	263	23.69	4.515	.278
Credibility	18-25	87	18.31	4.378	.469
	26-35	96	17.84	4.354	.444
	26-45	58	17.88	4.592	.603
	OVER46	22	18.14	5.167	1.102
	Total	263	18.03	4.465	.275
Objectivity	18-25	87	16.15	2.504	.268
	26-35	96	15.38	2.429	.248
	26-45	58	15.95	2.698	.354
	OVER 46	22	15.55	2.668	.569
	Total	263	15.77	2.543	.157
Awareness	18-25	87	16.20	2.322	.249
	26-35	96	16.09	2.534	.259
	26-45	58	15.90	2.808	.369
	OVER 46	22	16.64	2.647	.564
	Total	263	16.13	2.532	.156
Fairness	18-25	87	16.28	2.688	.288
	26-35	96	16.21	2.353	.240
	26-45	58	16.34	2.189	.287
	OVER 46	22	17.32	2.276	.485

	Total	263	16.35	2.434	.150
Total CPAS	18-25	87	91.11	11.614	1.245
	26-35	96	88.89	10.364	1.058
	26-45	58	89.38	12.455	1.635
	OVER 46	22	91.82	10.312	2.199
	Total	263	89.98	11.257	.694

Table 2(b): Results of one-way ANOVA for mean scores of respondents in different age groups on various components and total CPAS

Components of CPAS	Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Satisfaction	Between Groups	45.070	3	15.023	.735	.532
	Within Groups	5294.984	259	20.444		
	Total	5340.053	262			
Credibility	Between Groups	11.734	3	3.911	.194	.900
	Within Groups	5212.023	259	20.124		
	Total	5223.757	262			
Objectivity	Between Groups	30.455	3	10.152	1.580	.195
	Within Groups	1663.857	259	6.424		
	Total	1694.312	262			
Awareness	Between Groups	9.300	3	3.100	.481	.696
	Within Groups	1670.305	259	6.449		
	Total	1679.605	262			
Fairness	Between Groups	23.025	3	7.675	1.300	.275
	Within Groups	1529.089	259	5.904		
	Total	1552.114	262			
Total CPAS	Between Groups	322.345	3	107.448	.846	.470
	Within Groups	32879.518	259	126.948		
	Total	33201.863	262			

When the influence of age on CPAS was verified through one-way ANOVA, one way ANOVA revealed non-significant mean differences for all the individual components of CPAS and for total CPAS of employees working in five star hotels. The F values obtained for components-satisfaction (F=0.735; p=.532), credibility (F=0.194; p=.900), objectivity (F=1.580; p=.195), awareness (F=.481; p=.696), Fairness (F=1.30; p=.275) and for total CPAS scores (F=.846; p=.470) were all found to be non-significant. In other words, the respondents in different age groups of 18-25, 26-35, 36-45 and over 46 years had statistically similar scores on individual components of CPAS and total CPAS.

Experience and Current Performance Appraisal System

Table 3(a): Mean and other descriptive statistics of respondents with varied years of experience on various components and total CPAS

Components of CPAS	Experience in years	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Satisfaction	< 5	124	23.43	4.483	.403

	5-10	78	23.78	4.535	.513
	11-15	40	24.43	4.278	.676
	15+	21	23.52	5.192	1.133
	Total	263	23.69	4.515	.278
Credibility	< 5	124	17.25 ^a	4.462	.401
	5-10	78	19.60 ^b	3.488	.395
	11-15	40	17.40 ^a	5.178	.819
	15+	21	18.00 ^a	5.040	1.100
	Total	263	18.03	4.465	.275
Objectivity	< 5	124	15.60	2.671	.240
	5-10	78	15.85	2.353	.266
	11-15	40	16.53	2.100	.332
	15+	21	15.10	3.015	.658
	Total	263	15.77	2.543	.157
Awareness	< 5	124	16.05	2.399	.215
	5-10	78	15.94	2.689	.304
	11-15	40	16.68	2.269	.359
	15+	21	16.29	3.149	.687
	Total	263	16.13	2.532	.156
Fairness	< 5	124	16.14	2.630	.236
	5-10	78	16.29	2.286	.259
	11-15	40	17.05	1.797	.284
	15+	21	16.52	2.713	.592
	Total	263	16.35	2.434	.150
Total CPAS	< 5	124	88.46	12.085	1.085
	5-10	78	91.46	10.683	1.210
	11-15	40	92.08	8.325	1.316
	15+	21	89.43	12.464	2.720
	Total	263	89.98	11.257	.694

Note: mean values with different superscripts are significantly different from each other as indicated by Scheffe's post hoc test

Table 3(b): Results of one-way ANOVA for mean scores of respondents with varied years of experience on various components and total CPAS

Components of CPAS	Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Satisfaction	Between Groups	31.398	3	10.466	.511	.675
	Within Groups	5308.655	259	20.497		
	Total	5340.053	262			
Credibility	Between Groups	284.227	3	94.742	4.968	.002
	Within Groups	4939.529	259	19.072		
	Total	5223.757	262			
Objectivity	Between Groups	36.535	3	12.178	1.903	.130
	Within Groups	1657.777	259	6.401		
	Total	1694.312	262			

Awareness	Between Groups	16.155	3	5.385	.838	.474
	Within Groups	1663.450	259	6.423		
	Total	1679.605	262			
Fairness	Between Groups	26.089	3	8.696	1.476	.221
	Within Groups	1526.025	259	5.892		
	Total	1552.114	262			
Total CPAS	Between Groups	639.762	3	213.254	1.696	.168
	Within Groups	32562.101	259	125.722		
	Total	33201.863	262			

Experience of the employees working in five star hotels did not have significance over their CPAS either in individual components or total CPAS scores except for credibility component. In credibility component, one way ANOVA revealed significant mean difference between employees with experience of <5, 5-10, 11-15 and above 15 years. The F value obtained for component credibility was 4.968 with the significance level of .002 level. The mean credibility scores of the employees with experience of <5, 5-10, 11-15 and above 15 years were 17.25, 19.60, 17.40 and 18.00 respectively. Further, Scheffe's post hoc test revealed that employees with experience of 5-10 and above 15 years had higher credibility scores compared to employees with <5 and 11-15 years of experience.

However, the F values obtained for components-satisfaction (F=.511; p=.800), objectivity (F=1.903; p=.130), awareness (F=.838; p=.474), fairness (F=1.476; p=.221) and for total CPAS scores (F=1.696; p=.168), were all found to be non-significant. In other words, employees with varied years of experience had statistically equal scores on individual components of CPAS and total CPAS scores except for credibility

Educational Qualifications and Current Performance Appraisal System

Table 4(a): Mean and other descriptive statistics of respondents with varied educational qualification on various components and total CPAS

Components of CPAS	Educational qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Satisfaction	High School	91	23.53	4.293	.450
	Diploma	70	23.47	3.744	.448
	Bachelor's Degree	82	23.83	5.513	.609
	Master's Degree	20	24.65	3.453	.772
	Total	263	23.69	4.515	.278
Credibility	High School	91	17.80	4.554	.477
	Diploma	70	18.34	3.974	.475
	Bachelor's Degree	82	17.84	4.809	.531
	Master's Degree	20	18.75	4.411	.986
	Total	263	18.03	4.465	.275
Objectivity	High School	91	15.89	2.505	.263
	Diploma	70	15.54	2.301	.275
	Bachelor's Degree	82	15.95	2.858	.316

	Master's Degree	20	15.30	2.179	.487
	Total	263	15.77	2.543	.157
Awareness	High School	91	16.09	2.355	.247
	Diploma	70	15.76	2.349	.281
	Bachelor's Degree	82	16.27	2.969	.328
	Master's Degree	20	17.05	1.731	.387
	Total	263	16.13	2.532	.156
Fairness	High School	91	16.40	2.032	.213
	Diploma	70	16.31	2.540	.304
	Bachelor's Degree	82	16.38	2.849	.315
	Master's Degree	20	16.20	2.016	.451
	Total	263	16.35	2.434	.150
Total CPAS	High School	91	89.70	11.745	1.231
	Diploma	70	89.43	9.836	1.176
	Bachelor's Degree	82	90.27	12.718	1.404
	Master's Degree	20	91.95	6.871	1.536
	Total	263	89.98	11.257	.694

Table 4(b): Results of one-way ANOVA for mean scores of respondents with varied educational qualification on various components and total CPAS

Components of CPAS	Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Satisfaction	Between Groups	25.769	3	8.590	.419	.740
	Within Groups	5314.284	259	20.518		
	Total	5340.053	262			
Credibility	Between Groups	24.857	3	8.286	.413	.744
	Within Groups	5198.900	259	20.073		
	Total	5223.757	262			
Objectivity	Between Groups	12.034	3	4.011	.618	.604
	Within Groups	1682.277	259	6.495		
	Total	1694.312	262			
Awareness	Between Groups	28.389	3	9.463	1.484	.219
	Within Groups	1651.216	259	6.375		
	Total	1679.605	262			
Fairness	Between Groups	.790	3	.263	.044	.988
	Within Groups	1551.324	259	5.990		
	Total	1552.114	262			
Total CPAS	Between Groups	112.684	3	37.561	.294	.830
	Within Groups	33089.179	259	127.757		
	Total	33201.863	262			

When the influence of education on CPAS was verified through one-way ANOVA, one way ANOVA revealed non-significant mean differences for all the individual components of CPAS and for total CPAS of employees. The F values obtained for

components-satisfaction ($F=0.419$; $p=.740$), credibility ($F=0.413$; $p=.744$), objectivity ($F=.618$; $p=.604$), awareness ($F=1.484$; $p=.219$), Fairness ($F=.044$; $p=.988$) and for total CPAS scores ($F=.294$; $p=.830$) were all found to be non-significant. In other words, the respondents with different educational qualifications-high school, diploma, bachelors and masters had statistically similar scores on individual components of CPAS and total CPAS.

To test this hypothesis, and to detect the effect of the Secondary variables (gender, age, Current Position, length of service, Education) on Performance Appraisals among Five star Hotels, ANCOVA analysis was used. To validate the hypothesis, the univariate analysis test for impact of independent variables (gender, age, Current Position, length of service, Education) on the performance appraisal in five star hotels among cities were used, since the data is non-normal distributions.

Table 5: The Results Analysis of variance associated (ANCOVA) on a scale of Performance Appraisals among Five star Hotels in Jordan

City	Independent variable	Type III sum squares	df	Mean squares	F.	sig
Aqaba	intercept	29.643	1	29.643	256.066	.000
	Age	.002	1	.002	.021	.884
	Gender	.066	1	.066	.570	.452
	Length of Service	.050	1	.050	.432	.513
	Current position	.002	1	.002	.014	.908
	Education	.494	1	.494	4.266	.042
Petra	Intercept	22.667	1	22.667	210.135	.000
	Age	1.357	1	1.357	12.583	.001
	Gender	5.739	1	5.739	.001	.982
	Length of Service	.246	1	.246	2.278	.136
	Current position	.606	1	.606	5.618	.021
	Education	.136	1	.136	1.256	.266
Dead Sea	intercept	30.464	1	30.464	193.480	.000
	Age	.074	1	.074	.469	.495
	Gender	.001	1	.001	.007	.933
	Length of Service	.480	1	.480	3.046	.084
	Current position	.317	1	.317	2.011	.159
	Education	.083	1	.083	.525	.470

DISCUSSION

Major findings of the study

- Gender did not have significant influence over the Current Performance Appraisal System both in individual components and total CPAS
- Age of the respondents did not have significant influence over the Current Performance Appraisal System both in individual components and total CPAS

- Experience of employees had significant influence over only credibility factor of CPAS, employees with experience of 5-10 and above 15 years had higher credibility scores compared to employees with <5 and 11-15 years of experience.
- Education of the respondents did not have significant influence over the Current Performance Appraisal System both in individual components and total CPAS

According to ANCOVA table 5, education had a significant impact on the Performance Appraisal within Aqaba Hotels and other independent variables such as age, gender, current position and length of service had no significant impact on the Performance Appraisal.

In case of hotels in Petra, both age and gender had significant effect on the Performance Appraisal but Gender, education and current position had no significant effect on the Performance Appraisal. In term of Dead Sea hotels, all variables age, gender, current position, length of service, and education had no significant effect on the Performance Appraisal.

Hence, this hypothesis was accepted for impact of Education on Performance Appraisals at Aqaba Hotels. In addition, this hypothesis was accepted for impact of age and Current Position on Performance Appraisals at Petra Hotels. In contrast, this hypothesis was rejected for impact of (gender, age, Current Position, length of service, Education) on Performance Appraisals at Dead Sea Hotels.

Hypothesis formulated for the present study is rejected as gender, age, education of the employees did not have significant influence over individual components of CPAS and of total CPAS. However, only for the credibility factor of CPAS H_1 is accepted as experience of the employees had significant influence.

Conclusion

Taylor and Zawacki (1976) observed that an organization's success or failure may be determined by the ways in which performance is managed. The essence of Performance Management is the organization of work to achieve optimum results and this involves attention to both process and people. When it is used well, performance management would contribute to organization success, and as such, is a vital management function (Radnor & McGuire, 2004). Performance management involves performance appraisal. Hence, the study focused on determining the factors that influenced performance appraisal in five star hotels of Jordan. The factors were determined, assessed and were analyzed which showed that gender, age, Current Position, length of service did not have an impact on performance appraisal of five star hotels of Jordan but education had an impact on performance appraisal of five star hotels of Jordan. The researcher suggested for a wider study on the influence of demographic variables on various components of CPAS as this study found that hypothesis formulated had been rejected. More or less wider study on this may help in getting a better understanding of the influence of demographic variables on CPAS.

References:

- Armstrong, M. (2011). *Armstrong's handbook of strategic human resource management*: Kogan Page Publishers.
- Akinyele, S. (2010). Performance appraisal systems in private universities in Nigeria: A study of Crawford University, Igbesa-Nigeria. *Global Journal of Management And Business Research*, 10(6).
- Abukhalifeh, A. N., & Som, A. P. M. (2015). Service Quality, Customer Satisfactions and Restaurants' Performance Appraisal in Hotel Industry. *Advances in Environmental Biology*, 9(3), 27-30.
- Al-Omari, I., Ali, M., Mahmoud, R., & Jawabreh, O. (2015). The Arab spring impacts on the Jordanian hotels sector. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(4), 159-171.
- Bladen. (2001). Current theory and best practices underlying performance management and employee development programs: A white paper. *Whitehouse Station, NJ: Merck & Co., Inc.*
- DeNisi, A., & Kluger, A. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: can 360-degree appraisals be improved? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 129-139.
- Elverfeldt. (2005). *Performance appraisal: How to improve its effectiveness*. University of Twente, Enschede.
- Grote, R. (2002). *The performance appraisal question and answer book: A survival guide for managers*: AMACOM Div American Mgmt Assn.
- Ismail, A., Mohamed, N. A. K., & Rayee, M. R. (2017). Relationship between performance appraisal communication, procedural justice and job satisfaction. *Geografia-Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 12(2).
- Medlik, S. (2012), *Dictionary of travel, tourism and hospitality*: Routledge.
- Obisi, C. (2011). Employee performance appraisal and its implication for individual and organizational growth. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 92.
- Pathania, K. S. (2011). Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal System of Insurance Sector-A Study Of Himachal Pradesh. *Gurukul Business Review*, 7, 19-23.
- Radnor, Z., & McGuire, M. (2004). Performance management in the public sector: fact or fiction? *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 53(3), 245-260.

Sanyal, & Biswas. (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.

Saeed, R., Lodhi, R., Naeem, A., Rehman, A., Mahmood, Z., & Ahmed, M. (2013). Impact of Performance Appraisals and Motivation on Employee's Outputs in Banking Sector of Pakistan. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 26(3), 415--421.

Taylor, & Zawacki. (1976). A view of performance appraisal from organizations using it. *Personnel Administrator*, June, 290, 292-299.

Wttc. (2017). Country Economic Impact Analysis, Retrieved from <https://www.wttc.org/research/economic-research/economic-impact-analysis/>

Wise, G. (1998). Rating differences in multi-rater feedback: A new look at an old issue.