# The Effect of Performance Management System on Employee Productivity in Cross-Border E-Commerce Enterprises in China

Yan Fang, Taien Layraman

Payap University, Chiang Mai, Thailand

The aim of the current research was to analyze how the performance management system of China's cross-border e-commerce enterprises affects employee productivity. The study was guided by the following research objectives: to investigate the performance management system on employee productivity in cross-border e-commerce enterprises in China; to determine the relationship between the performance management system and employee productivity in cross-border e-commerce enterprises in China. The study adopted a quantitative approach to the effects of performance management practices on employee productivity. The dependent variables included performance appraisals, reward systems, and performance feedback, and the implications on employee productivity as the independent variable. The target population is comprised of 400 employees in China's cross-border e-commerce enterprises. Descriptive statistics were utilized as a data analysis tool. The demographic profiles of the respondents were analyzed using percentages and frequencies. Inferential statistics such as correlation and regression analysis established the relationship between dependent and independent variables. The study recommends that the performance management practices should be optimized to improve employee performance. Performance reviews should be focused on the contributions of the individual employees to meet the organizational objectives. For every possible opportunity, the manager should formally recognize good employee efforts for enhanced work performance. Effective performance management practices that edify appraisal and reward should be used to achieve organization goals and enhance employee productivity.

*Keywords:* performance management system, performance appraisal, performance feedback, reward systems, employee productivity, cross-border e-commerce

## Introduction

A research report on the development of the cross-border e-commerce industry in 2021 pointed out that since 2016, the transaction scale of China's cross-border e-commerce industry has almost maintained a growth rate of more than 20%. In 2020, the transaction scale of China's cross-border e-commerce reached 12.5 trillion yuan. In 2020, China's cross-border e-commerce flourished. The total import and export volume of cross-border e-commerce reached 1.69 trillion yuan, an increase of 31.1% according to comparable standards. Among them, the export volume was 1.12 trillion yuan, an increase of 40.1%. The import volume was 0.57 trillion yuan, an increase of 16.5%. In the whole year, 2.45 billion import and export bills were checked and

YAN Fang, MBA candidate, Faculty of Business Administration, Payap University, Chiang Mai, Thailand.
Taien Layraman, D.B.A., Dr., assistant professor, Faculty of Business Administration, Payap University, Chiang Mai, Thailand.
Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Yan Fang, No. 19 Wuhe Road, Qingxiu District, Nanning City, Guangxi Province, China.

released through the customs cross-border e-commerce management platform, an increase of 63.3% year on year.

The performance management indicators in organizational objectives realize the value of effectiveness. The impact of performance management practices on organizational performance and employee productivity is a significant topic in the fields of human resource management. Normally, performance management is usually employed to build a service or product, as well as other key areas in an organization that would lead to employee productivity (Homayounizadpanah & Baqerrkord, 2012). Armstrong and Baron (2005) concluded performance management is an integrated and strategic approach. It aims to enhance employee and organizational productivity by improving the performance of employees through developing the individuals' and teams' capabilities. Performance management intends to assist the companies to manage results and behavior, which are the two important aspects of what is commonly identified as performance (Homayounizadpanah & Baqerrkord, 2012). Existing literature argues that the use of performance management practices, taking into account comprehensive employee recruitment and selection procedures, employee engagement, and training, can improve employee motivation and increase employee retention and productivity.

There are a number of issues facing the effective and efficient use of the performance management system in boosting employee productivity. There is, however, relatively little research to support the view that performance management activities have any positive impact on organizations operating with the cross-border e-commerce enterprises. This called for the investigation of the current study. Thus, this study aims to determine the effect of performance management practices on employee productivity with a focus on cross-border e-commerce enterprises in China.

## Method

The study adopted a quantitative approach to the effects of performance management practices on employee productivity. The independent variables included performance appraisals, performance feedback, and reward systems, and the implications on employee productivity as the dependent variable. The data collected in the study are analyzed by quantitative methods. The research design has three basic frameworks: exploratory, descriptive, and causal. Exploratory research focuses on obtaining ideas and insights and decomposes extensive. The focus of descriptive research is to determine the frequency of something or the degree of correlation between two variables. The third research is descriptive research design: the focus of causal research is to determine the causal relationship. Therefore, this study, represented by descriptive research and causal research, uses correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis as tools to explore the impact of a performance management system on employee performance.

### The Population and Group Example

Taking into consideration of the objectives of this study, that is, to assess the performance appraisals, reward systems, and performance feedback from the cross-border E-commerce enterprises, the population of the study is Guangzhou and Shenzhen regions in Guangdong Province. A total of 400 cross-border e-commerce employees were selected for this study.

### The Research Instruments

The questionnaires have five parts which are translated by the language professional from the English version to the Chinese version as follows.

Part 1: This part has five questions in multiple choices that concern with demographic of the respondents, where questions related to gender age, department, working years, and educational background were asked.

Part 2: This part has six questions on a scale of one to five that concern with influence of performance appraisals on employee productivity as below.

Part 3: This part has six questions on a scale of one to five that concern with performance feedback on employee productivity as below.

Part 4: This part has nine questions on a scale of one to five that concern with influence of reward systems on employee productivity as below.

Part 5: This part has four questions on a scale of one to five that concern with employee productivity as below.

The questionnaire was designed to gather quantitative data pertaining to performance appraisal, performance reward system, performance feedback, and employee performance investigated by using structured questionnaire base on five points in Likert Scale rating from: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree.

**Data Collection**

Volunteers more than 19 years old have experienced working in cross-border e-commerce in Guangzhou and Shenzhen, from 2018 to 2021 who agree to participate in the survey and know in cross border e-commerce in Guangzhou and Shenzhen.

The instruments for collecting data in this study are personal surveys using constructed survey questionnaires for the customers experienced in this business until completed.

The data collection methods of this study include online questionnaire investigation and field investigation. The participants were requested for their time prior to sending the actual questionnaire. A pilot test involving 50 respondents was carried out to evaluate the completeness, precision, accuracy, and clarity of the questionnaires. Questionnaires have been sent to all employees via email. A telephone call has also been used to clarify the questions to the staff. For employees who have difficulty with the English language, the questionnaire has been translated into Chinese. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement/item by choosing one of the options given as "Strongly agree", "Agree", "Neutral", "Disagree", or "Strongly disagree". After the amendment of the final questionnaire, the researcher explained the purpose of the research and sought permission from the two companies to carry out the field investigation. Face-to-face interview conducted to obtain information on the employees' performance management practices of the organization. Finally, the collected data were edited and entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software to enable the carrying out of the analysis.

## Results

The aim of the study was to find out the factors of employee productivity that influence the performance management system of China's cross-border e-commerce enterprises. The sample has consisted of ($n = 400$) respondents of staffs who have experience working in cross-border e-commerce in Guangzhou and Shenzhen, from 2018 to 2021. Psychometric properties of performance appraisals, performance feedback, reward systems, and employee productivity were measured through Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis. Descriptive statistical analysis was used to find of the frequencies and percentages of demographic variables.

The ages of respondents are: 20 to 30 (23.25%), 31 to 40 (24.5%), 41 to 50 (24.75%), and above 51 (27.5%), with 52.75% of males and 47.25% of females. The years of the establishment of the company of these respondents are mostly in the range of 1 to 5 years (47%), the rest are 0 to 1 years (31%), 6 to 10 years (10.75%), and above 10 years (11.25%). The work years of respondents are mostly in the range of 1 to 5 years (48%), the rest are less than a year (37%), 6 to 10 years (8.25%), and above 10 years (6.75%). The majority of respondents have junior college (43.75%), high school students (33%), undergraduate (17.25%), and postgraduate (6%).

Table 1

*Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Variables*

|  |  | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 211 | 52.75% |
|  | Female | 189 | 47.25% |
|  | Total | 400 | 100.00% |
| Age | 20~30 years old | 93 | 23.25% |
|  | 31~40 years old | 98 | 24.50% |
|  | 41~50 years old | 99 | 24.75% |
|  | Above 51 years old | 110 | 27.50% |
|  | Total | 400 | 100.00% |
| The Years of establishment of the company | 0-1 year | 124 | 31.00% |
|  | 1-5 years | 188 | 47.00% |
|  | 6-10 years | 43 | 10.75% |
|  | Above 10 years | 45 | 11.25% |
|  | Total | 400 | 100.00% |
| worked years | Less than 1 year | 148 | 37.00% |
|  | 1-5 years | 192 | 48.00% |
|  | 6-10 years | 33 | 8.25% |
|  | Above 10 years | 27 | 6.75% |
|  | Total | 400 | 100.00% |
| educational level | High school student | 132 | 33% |
|  | Junior college student | 175 | 43.75% |
|  | Undergraduate | 69 | 17.25% |
|  | Postgraduate | 24 | 6% |
|  | Total | 400 | 100.00% |

**Descriptive Statistics**

The descriptive statistics of performance appraisals collected data from the sample showing that they all agree with every factor as the mean between 3.76 and 3.84. Moreover, the samples agree with the performance reviews make them work harder than expected with 3.84, performance reviews make them work higher expectation due to how it is conducted with 3.76, potential reviews makes them better understand what should be done with 3.77, potential review is used as a decision-making tool for the increasing their performance with 3.79, reward reviews influence positively individual performance with 3.80, reward reviews are valuable to their performance in their organization with 3.76.

Table 2

*Summary Independent Factor*

| Independent factor | Mean | S.D. | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Performance appraisals | 3.785 | 0.8912 | Agree |
| Performance feedback | 3.7496 | 0.88884 | Agree |
| Reward systems | 3.7461 | 0.79669 | Agree |

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics of Performance Appraisals*

| Performance appraisals | Mean | Std. deviation | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Performance reviews make me work harder than expected. | 3.84 | 1.057 | Agree |
| Performance reviews make me work with high expectations due to how it is conducted. | 3.76 | 1.098 | Agree |
| Potential reviews make me better understand what should be done. | 3.77 | 1.125 | Agree |
| Potential reviews are used as a decision-making tool for increasing my performance. | 3.79 | 1.065 | Agree |
| Reward reviews influence positively individual performance. | 3.80 | 1.140 | Agree |
| Reward reviews are valuable to my performance in my organization. | 3.76 | 1.104 | Agree |
| Total | 3.79 | 1.098 | Agree |

Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics of Performance Feedback*

| Performance feedback | Mean | Std. deviation | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| My supervisor gives me fair feedback. | 3.74 | 1.104 | Agree |
| My supervisor regularly discusses my job performance with me. | 3.74 | 1.168 | Agree |
| My colleague gives me fair feedback. | 3.73 | 1.129 | Agree |
| My colleague regularly discusses my job performance with me. | 3.75 | 1.089 | Agree |
| I always get sufficient and effective feedback on my performance. | 3.78 | 1.133 | Agree |
| Supervisor, colleague, and self-performance feedback make me work better. | 3.75 | 1.177 | Agree |
| Total | 3.75 | 1.133 | Agree |

The descriptive statistics of performance feedback collected data from the sample showing that they all agree with every factor as the mean between 3.73 and 3.78. Moreover, the samples agree with the supervisor gives them fair feedback with 3.74, the and supervisor discusses regularly their job performance with them with 3.74, the colleague gives them fair feedback with 3.73, the colleague regularly discusses their job performance with them with 3.75, they always get sufficient and effective feedback on their performance with 3.78, supervisor, colleague, and self-performance feedback make them work better with 3.75.

The descriptive statistics of reward systems collected data from the sample showing that they all agree with every factor as the mean between 3.71 and 3.81. Moreover, bonuses increase their performance with 3.75, and their organization improves the productivity by linking rewards to promotion with 3.71, when they work efficiently, the leader will praise them with 3.73, the supervisor's praise made them work harder with 3.81, when they work efficiently, they will attract the attention of the supervisors with 3.76, the supervisor's attention improved their productivity with 3.74, when they work efficiently, they will get the opportunity to take on important projects or tasks with 3.76, rewards systems help to improve their work efficiency with 3.71, rewards systems encourage staff to be creative with 3.76.

Table 5

*Descriptive Statistics of Reward Systems*

| Reward systems | Mean | Std. deviation | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bonuses increase my performance. | 3.75 | 1.150 | Agree |
| My organization improves productivity by linking rewards to promotion. | 3.71 | 1.134 | Agree |
| When I work efficiently, the leader will praise me. | 3.73 | 1.124 | Agree |
| The supervisor's praise made me work harder. | 3.81 | 1.075 | Agree |
| When I work efficiently, I will attract the attention of the supervisors. | 3.76 | 1.121 | Agree |
| The supervisor's attention improved my productivity. | 3.74 | 1.109 | Agree |
| When I work efficiently, I will get the opportunity to take on important projects or tasks. | 3.76 | 1.119 | Agree |
| Rewards systems help to improve my work efficiency. | 3.71 | 1.117 | Agree |
| Rewards systems encourage staff to be creative. | 3.76 | 1.042 | Agree |
| Total | 3.75 | 1.110 | Agree |

Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics of Employee Productivity*

| Employee productivity | Mean | Std. deviation | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| The quality of output is high as compared to the beginning. | 3.67 | 1.128 | Agree |
| The company's sales grew steadily. | 3.75 | 1.086 | Agree |
| At present, the commodity delivery speed of my organization is very fast. | 3.70 | 1.109 | Agree |
| At present, the organization's after-sales speed is very fast. | 3.73 | 1.112 | Agree |
| Total | 3.71 | 1.109 | Agree |

The descriptive statistics of employee productivity collected data from the sample showing that they all agree with every factor as the mean between 3.67 and 3.75. Moreover, the quality of output is high as compared to the beginning with 3.67, the company's sales grew steadily with 3.75, at present, the commodity delivery speed of my organization is very fast with 3.70, at present, the organization's after-sales speed is very fast with 3.73, respectively shown in Table 5.

**Pearson Correlation**

In statistics, correlation is measured as *r*. It provides information about the strength and direction of the relationship. The ranges of relationship fall between + 1, 0, and -1.

Table 7

*Correlation Coefficients Interpretation*

| The negative direction of linear relationship | Relationship strength | Positive direction of linear relationship |
|---|---|---|
| -1 | Perfect | +1 |
| -0.70 | Strong | +0.70 |
| -0.50 | Moderate | +0.50 |
| -0.30 | Weak | +0.30 |
| 0 | No | 0 |

**Correlation of Performance Appraisals Performance, Feedback Reward Systems, and Employee Productivity**

This section intended to measure the correlation between performance appraisals, performance feedback, reward systems, and employee productivity.

Table 8

*Correlation of Performance Appraisals Performance, Feedback Reward Systems, and Employee Productivity*

|  |  | Performance appraisals | Performance feedback | Reward systems | Employee productivity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Performance appraisals | Pearson correlation | 1 |  |  |  |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  |  |  |  |
|  | *N* | 400 |  |  |  |
| Performance feedback | Pearson correlation | $0.674^{**}$ | 1 |  |  |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 |  |  |  |
|  | *N* | 400 | 400 |  |  |
| Reward systems | Pearson correlation | $0.599^{**}$ | $0.726^{**}$ | 1 |  |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |  |
|  | *N* | 400 | 400 | 400 |  |
| Employee productivity | Pearson correlation | $0.449^{**}$ | $0.461^{**}$ | $0.575^{**}$ | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |
|  | *N* | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |

$^{**}$ Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis 1

H1: There is a significant relationship between performance appraisals and employee productivity.

$H1_0$: There is no significant relationship between performance appraisals and employee productivity.

$H1_1$: There is a significant relationship between performance appraisals and employee productivity.

The results of variable correlation showed that the first null hypothesis was rejected and that there is no significant relationship between performance appraisals and employee productivity. The results accepted the alternate hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between performance appraisals and employee productivity. Results interpreted that the more optimized the performance appraisal, the higher the productivity level.

Hypothesis 2

H2: There is a significant relationship between performance feedback and employee productivity.

$H2_0$: There is no significant relationship between performance feedback and employee productivity.

$H2_1$: There is a significant relationship between performance feedback and employee productivity.

The results of variable correlation showed that the first null hypothesis was rejected and that there is no significant relationship between performance feedback and employee productivity. The results accepted the alternate hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between performance feedback and employee productivity. Results interpreted that the more detailed the performance feedback, the higher the productivity level.

Hypothesis 3

H3: There is a significant relationship between reward systems and employee productivity.

$H3_0$: There is no significant relationship between reward systems and employee productivity.

$H3_1$: There is a significant relationship between reward systems and employee productivity.

The results of variable correlation showed that the first null hypothesis was rejected and that there is no significant relationship between reward systems and employee productivity. The results accepted the alternate hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between reward systems and employee productivity. Results interpreted that the better the reward systems is implemented, the higher the level of productivity.

## Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the effect of the employee performance management system. In this survey, four hypotheses were developed to study the indirect effect of a performance management system on employee productivity through performance appraisal, performance feedback, and reward systems.

Table 9

*Regression Analysis by Model Summary*

| Model | $R$ | $R$ square | Adjusted $R$ square | Std. error of the estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.590[a] | 0.348 | 0.343 | 0.75424 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), performance appraisals, performance feedback, reward systems.

The above table showed correlation values of independent variables ($R = 0.590$), $R$ square value showed 34.8% explained variance, adjusted $R$ square value (0.343) explained about a number of predictors in the model.

Table 10

*Regression Analysis by ANOVA*

| Model | | Sum of squares | df | Mean square | $F$ | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ANOVA[b] | | |
| | Regression | 120.372 | 3 | 40.124 | 70.532 | 0.000[a] |
| 1 | Residual | 225.277 | 396 | 0.569 | | |
| | Total | 345.649 | 399 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), performance appraisals, performance feedback, reward systems.
b. Dependent variable: employee productivity.

The above ANOVA table shows the acceptability of the model. The $p$-value is less than 0.05 i.e. 0.000 which indicates the variation explained by the model is not due to chance.

Table 11

*Regression Analysis by Coefficients*

| Model | | Unstandardized coefficients | | Standardized coefficients | $t$ | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. error | Beta | | |
| | (Constant) | 0.973 | 0.194 | | 5.005 | 0.000 |
| | performance appraisals | 0.166 | 0.059 | 0.159 | 2.822 | 0.005 |
| 1 | Performance feedback | 0.012 | 0.069 | 0.011 | 0.174 | 0.862 |
| | Reward systems | 0.552 | 0.071 | 0.472 | 7.815 | 0.000 |

a. Dependent variable: employee productivity.

The above coefficient table shows the constant, beta value, and $p$-value of the variables to examine the significance of set hypothesis. The significance level of each variable is $p$-value 0.005, 0.862, 0.000 and their standardized coefficients are 0.159, 0.011, and 0.472. The $p$-value of performance feedback is above 0.05 which implies that it has no significant relationship with employee's productivity.

There is a positive relationship between performance appraisals and employee's performance. And its *p*-value is no different than zero. Henceforth, we conclude that performance appraisals have significant relation with employee's productivity.

There is a positive relationship between reward systems and employee's performance. And its *p*-value is zero. Henceforth, we conclude that reward systems have significant relation with employee's productivity.

## Discussion

### Influence of Performance Appraisals on Employee Productivity

The results generally reflected that performance appraisal has a positive influence on employee productivity. The findings suggested that employee appraisal leads to improved productivity as similar with Sivaminvana and Pwaka (2019) studied ICT companies in Harare Zimbabwe. Performance appraisal focuses on employees' contribution to organizational goals. Performance appraisal gives employees the opportunity to express their ideas and expectations in order to achieve the company's strategic objectives. An effective appraisal system can improve employees' motivation and performance, so as to complete specific work, or achieve or exceed specific performance objectives. Performance appraisal has a helpful effect on their productivity. Similarly, it was found out that feedback for employee performance was positively correlated with their productivity (Carol & Florah, 2019).

A significant proportion of the respondents agreed that the performance appraisal makes them understand what they should be doing. With performance appraisal, the employees' can find what is expected from them and the consequences of their performance. Ideally, they receive a fair and analytical feedback for their performance. A large number of the respondents agreed that with performance appraisal they perform better than what can be expected without appraisal. This means that performance appraisal is valuable to employee productivity in the organization. This can directly increase the profitability of the company as similar with Prof. Nwanolue, Dr. Obiora, and Ezeabasili (2018) studied in Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University that the appraisal leads to enhanced employee performance in organization. An effective appraisal model can enhance the interest and performance of the employees leading to the completion of specific targets geared towards attainment of corporate goals.

Majority of the respondents agreed that performance appraisal was used as a decision making tool for increasing employee performance. Decision making is separate but linked to the appraisal system. A large number of the respondents agreed that they were satisfied with the current performance appraisal system in the organization. This suggests that effective appraisal can positively impact on employee productivity in the organization. Performance appraisal can be linked to performance improvement process and the decision to identify training needs and potential, agree on future objectives, support a career development plan, and resolve existing problems. Performance appraisal was of importance in relation to employee productivity and impact of training and development on employee productivity (Ziyaminyana and Pwaka, 2019).

When good performance is observed and then rewarded, the chances of it being repeated are increased, while poor performance is discouraged or even punished to decrease the chance of it happening again. This may mean that performance appraisal underscores the importance of employee involvement and participation in the ratings of the performance. An effective appraisal system can enhance the interest and performance of the employees leading to the completion of specified targets and attainment of specified performance goals. This

means that the lack of a fair appraisal score may make the employees work at a normal pace or work below expectation due to how it is conducted. This finding supports that performance appraisal has helped greatly in the assessment of employees which can stand as a guide to the path of advancement (Onyije, 2015).

**Influence of Reward Systems on Employee Productivity**

Majority of the respondents agreed that the reward system has a significant influence on employee productivity as similar with Odhiambo (2015) who studied in Schindler Limited. The reward system positively caused major variation in employee productivity. This means that there is an appropriate reward system. A significant proportion of the respondents agreed that the appreciation by managers increases their success at work. Also, tangible rewards enhance motivation when they are offered to people for completing work or for attaining or exceeding specified performance goals. Reward systems should recognize both the importance of co-operation and the variances in individual performance. Employees can be rewarded to meet target productivity levels. The opportunity by the manager to formally recognize good employee performance leads to work motivation. When good performance is observed and then rewarded, the chances of it being repeated are increased, while poor performance is discouraged or even punished to decrease the chance of it happening again (Odhiambo, 2015).

Majority of the respondents agreed that bonuses increase employee performance. Rewards in the form of bonuses lead to greater task interest and performance. Most of the respondents also agreed that the rewards provided by the organization sometimes serve to improve their productivity as similar with Prof. Nwanolue , Dr. Obiora, and Ezeabasili (2018) who studied in Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University. Important issues that help ensure a successful reward process are used effectively to enhance interest and performance without undermining the performance and interest of the employees. A significant number of the respondents agreed that the organization influenced their productivity by linking the reward on job promotion. This also means increased employee motivation. A small proportion of the respondents agreed that the rewards motivate them to timely complete their duties. When employees are better appraised and well rewarded, it will increase their commitment to their jobs and loyalty to the organization. This will invariably lead to the attainment of organizational goals. When an employee is given feedback after appraisal on his/her areas of weakness and strength, the employee will put in more efforts to maintain his strength and also improve on his weaknesses. When such happens, the organization will experience increased productivity (Nwanolue, Obiora, & Ezeabasili, 2018).

## Conclusion

**Influence of Performance Appraisals on Employee Productivity**

The study recommends that the performance appraisal should be optimized to improve the performance of the employees. Performance reviews should be focused on the contributions of the individual employees to meet the organizational goals. Performance appraisal should be encouraged among the employees to express their ideas and expectations for meeting the strategic goals of the company. Performance appraisal can make the employees' be aware of what is expected from them and the consequences of their performance. Performance appraisal should lead to improved employee performance. Performance appraisal should be optimized for effective decision making. This can lead the employees to complete their specified work and exceed their normal work performance.

**Influence of Reward Systems on Employee Productivity**

The study recommends that the organization should reward the employees for enhanced productivity levels. For every possible opportunity, the manager should formally recognize good employee efforts for enhanced work performance. The reward system should be varied to encourage the staff to be creative to meet the organization goals. This will increase the chances of the performance to be repeated and increased, while pointing out that poor performance will be discouraged. Bonuses should be used to enhance greater task interest and performance. Job promotion can be used to improve the employee performance in the organization. There should be a fair evaluation process to make the employee feel secure for enhanced productivity.

## References

Aguinis, H., Gottfredson, R. K., & Joo, H. (2012). Delivering effective performance feedback: The strengths-based approach. *Business Horizons, 55*(2), 105-111.

Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (2005). *Managing performance: Performance management in action*. London: CIPD Publishing.

Balcazar, F., Hopkins, B. L., & Suarez, Y. (1985). A critical, objective review of performance feedback. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 7*(3-4), 65-89.

Berry, D. (2003). *Creating a performance culture.* Thousand Oaks: CA Sage.

Biron, M., Farndale, E., & Paauwe, J. (2011). Performance management effectiveness: Lessons from world-leading firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(6), 1294-1311.

Blau, G. (2009). Testing the longitudinal impact of work variables and performance appraisal. *British Psychological Society, 4*(2), 4-8.

Boela, K., & Torrington, S. (2012). An empirical study on the efficiency of management practices system in oil and natural gas commission (ONGC). *India Işletme Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2*(2), 65-78.

Carol, O., & Florah, O. M. (2019). Performance management practice and employee productivity at state department of labor Kenya. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology, 9*(4), 20-30.

Chen, Y., Wang, M., & Xu, Y. (2018). The current situation and measures of cross-border e-commerce in cosmetics industry: Case study of company ABL. *Open Journal of Business and Management, 6*(2), 265.

Cokins, G. (2004). *Performance management: Finding the missing pieces (to close the intelligence gap).* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dyer, L., & Reeves, T. (1995). Human resource strategies and firm performance: What do we know and where do we need to go? *International Journal of human resource management, 6*(3), 656-670.

Greve, H. R., & Gaba, V. (2017). Performance feedback in organizations and groups: Common themes. In *The Oxford handbook of group and organizational learning* (1-45). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Homayounizadpanah, V., & Baqerrkord, G. (2012). Sorting and incentive effects of pay for-performance: Summary of an experimental study. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(6), 387-405.

Latham, G. P., Almost, J., Mann, S., & Moore, C. (2005). New developments in performance management. *Organizational Dynamics, 34*(1), 77-87.

Maduka, C. E., & Okafor, O. (2014). Effect of motivation on employee productivity: A study of manufacturing companies in Nnewi. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research, 2*(7), 137-147.

Nabangala, J., & Amuhaya, J. (2020). Effect of performance management systems on employee productivity: The case of Kenya forestry research institute (KEFRI). *Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management, 2*(7), 579-606.

Nwanolue, B. O. G., Obiora, C. A., & Ezeabasili, I. E. (2018). The impact of performance management system on employee performance in a Nigerian university. *EPH-International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 3*(11), 23-43.

Odhiambo, E. O. (2015). The effect of performance management practices on employee productivity a case study of Schindler Limited (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa, 2015).

Okeke, M., Onyekwelu, N., Akpua, J., & Dunkwu, C. (2019). Performance management and employee productivity in selected large organizations in south-east, Nigeria. *Journal of Business Management, 5*(3), 57-70.

Onyije, O. C. (2015). Effect of performance appraisal on employee productivity in a Nigerian University. *Journal of Economics and Business Research, 21*(2), 65-81.

Sivaminvanam, N., & Pwaka, O. (2019). An investigation into the impact of performance management systems on employee productivity: The case study of information and communication technologies (ICT) companies in Harare, Zimbabwe. *European Journal of Business and Management, 3*(11), 23-40.

Solmon, D., & Podgursky, C. (2010). Employee performance appraisal practices of world vision: Ghana rural water project (GRWP). A thesis submitted to the University of Cape Coast.

Zhang, Y. F., Ping, W. A. N. G., & Xian, K. T. (2019). Study on seller performance management of cross-border e-commerce third-party platform. In *Proceedings of 2019 international conference on computer science, communications and big data (CSCBD)*. Lancaster: DEStech.