International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development
Online ISSN: 2349-4182, Print ISSN: 2349-5979
Impact Factor: RJIF 5.72
Received: 04-11-2018; Accepted: 05-12-2018
www.allsubjectjournal.com
Volume 5; Issue 12; December 2018; Page No. 136-142

Impact of feedback on Employees performance

Idoko Peter
Consultancy Unit, Nasarawa State Polytechnic, Lafia, Nigeria

Abstract
This research examined the impact of feedback on employee performance in Benue Brewery Makurdi, Benue State. Both primary and secondary source of data and information were used for the study and questionnaire was used to obtained information from the primary source while journals and internet constituted secondary source of information. The population for this study is two hundred and seven respondents (207 from the study area. The statistical tools employed were the Ordinary Least Square Regression Analysis (OLS) and all the hypotheses of the study were analyzed using the probability value of the estimate. The findings of the study indicates that a positive relationship exist between Individual contribution (INDC) and Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi and the relationship is statistically significant ($p<0.05$). Quality of work (QULW) as a proxy for feedback has a positive effect on Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi and the relationship is statistically significant ($p<0.05$). Cost saved from feedbacks is negatively related to Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi and the relationship is not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). It was concluded that this study has demonstrated that feedback has impact on employee's performance. It was recommended among others that management should improve the cost saved from feedback and the entire cost of organizational communication so that it can have a positive impact on employee performance at workplace.

Keywords: feedback, employee, performance, benue, Nigeria

1. Introduction

In recent years, biased ferrite material for microstrip antenna structures has attracted noticeable attention. Ferrite is one of the important magnetic materials which are used as in bot In today's globalized society, organizations have to face high competition and must react quickly to every changes constantly occurring in the market place. All organizations strive for success and desire to get profits and a continuous progress. However, many have to deal with employee retention issues i.e. organizations struggle to retain their employees (Manzoor, 2012, Bhuvanaiah & Raya, 2015) [26]. According to Sandhya and Kumar (2001), this employee retention challenge could be better managed through motivating the employees by means of open communication and rewards among other aspects.

Moreover, even though motivation is really different from one person to another, and performance is not only influenced by motivation; the motivation to well execute a job represents one of the most important factors affecting performance (Van Knippenberg, 2000) [36]. Therefore, learning how to motivate employees will most likely help the manager to better manage his or her team and lead the employees to achieve better performance. However, only a small number of organizations recognize the employees as their main assets (Manzoor, 2012) [26]. Furthermore, the authors believe that, although certain companies do recognize their employees as the heart of their business, they do not always care or understand what motivates them.

One way to know more about the employees' motivations is to communicate with them. Communication is defined by Fisher (1980, cited in Muda *et al*., 2014) as the double interaction between individuals that provides information, meaning and knowledge. Through communication, one gets a better understanding of his or her team members' goals, wishes and motivations as well as the opportunity to establish trustworthy relationships with his or her team (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). These authors argue that communication has direct and indirect effects on organizational performance.

One of the main roles of performance measurement is to provide information for decision-making. Timeliness and comprehensiveness are usually regarded as desirable characteristics of information because they enable prompt and adequate responses to business threats and opportunities. However, the intensity of these attributes must be weighed against the decision maker's ability to process the relevant information. Too frequent information may result, for instance, in an overreaction to short-term factors, whereas too detailed information may cloud a decision maker's ability to identify general trends or issues. In most chases field experiment is used to analyze how the frequency and detail of performance feedback influences employee behavior in the context of customer satisfaction, a metric which is considered to be one of the most relevant indicators of the strategic health of a firm.

We actively intervene in the feedback system by introducing a bonus that rewards the achievement of certain objectives in customer satisfaction as well as two process indicators. We vary the frequency of feedback information (weekly vs.

monthly) and the level of detail included in the report (the average score of all jobs performed by a professional vs. the individual job scores for each professional).

The field experiment design allows us to randomly assign professionals to different feedback regimes and analyze more cleanly the impact of the characteristics of interest. If professionals were perfectly rational, they would use information efficiently to improve customer satisfaction. Therefore, more detailed and more frequent feedback should lead to better performance.

However, more (and more frequent) customer satisfaction feedback does not always result in improved customer satisfaction scores. In fact, we find that professionals achieve higher scores when they received tailed but infrequent (monthly) feedback. These results are consistent with the latest feedback report being most salient, and professionals overweighting the information contained in it. As a result, although detailed customer satisfaction feedback supplies information that helps professionals to improve the service they provide, feedback that is more frequent (and that consequently focuses on a shorter time horizon) ends up being less informative as previous information is disregarded in the face of new information.

Notably, we also show that the deterioration in performance of the professionals in the weekly treatments is explained by an irrational weighting of the most recent performance information and not by the rational abandonment of the effort to achieve the monthly bonus. There are two potential ways in which the rational abandonment of bonus targets could negatively impact the performance associated with frequent feedback. First, professionals in the weekly treatments could show worse performance because they learn earlier in the month that their performance disqualifies them from receiving the bonus or makes it very difficult to achieve, resulting in a rational abandonment of effort.

Problem Statement

1. In most of the organization employees are restricted to communication with their leaders
2. The channel of communication is even lacking in most of the organizations
3. Some of the employees are not ready to pass information to their superiors
4. The incompetence and inferiority complex of the staff

The main objective of this study is to examine the impact of feedback on employee performance. The specific objective of this study is to examine effect of individual contribution to employee performance, assess the effect of quality of employee work to employee performance and to evaluate the save cost o feedback on employees' performance.

Hypotheses of the Study

1. The individual contribution from the feedback has no significant effect on employees performance
2. The quality of work has no significant effect on employee performance
3. The cost saved from feedback has no significant effect on employees performance

2. Conceptual framework

Concept of Feedback

Feedback is defined as a management process for the acquisition of knowledge as to what degree of efficiency and productivity it has brought to the work related activities of the employee and what sort of results these activities have yielded. That "performance feedback will remove ambiguity" is a motivational job factor much emphasised by Hackman and Lawler, who stated that where feedback is not obtained, job satisfaction and motivation may affected negatively. On the other hand, Wanous stated that the 'internal motivation' effected deeply by performance feedback create job / organizational commitment. Brief and Aldag reached the conclusion in their research that performance feedback is one of the most important variable effect internal motivation and job / organizational commitment. Thus it can be seen from performance feedback view that there is a correlated mutual interaction between the level of uncertainty, motivation and job satisfaction (Çakır, 2001: 100).

Feedback occurs when outputs of a system are routed back as inputs as part of a chain of cause-and-effect that forms a circuit or loop. The system can then be said to feed back into itself. The notion of cause-and-effect has to be handled carefully when applied to feedback systems: Feedback is an event that occurs when the output of a system is used as input back into the system as part of a chain of cause and effect. This alters variables in the system, therefore resulting in different output and consequently different feedback as well, which can either be good or bad. In the case of a system which requires knowledge of the output in order to improve or deliver on a specific output, then feedback is essential and good. But for a system that does not require feedback, such as an audio system, then feedback is often bad. Take for example a microphone and speaker system, when the sound from the speakers (output) is picked up by the microphone (input) it creates a negative feedback that produces a very high pitched sound.

Feedback also has the characteristic of being a warning for the signals of change. The feedback to be given by the manager or other potential sources of feedback can force a change in workplace habits. Then the employee may not feel ready for the change being indicated or may have a tendency to resist the change. From this angle the feedback information should be given constructive in order to lead change. It is important to convey the concept that feedback is important to increase the performance of the employee. In this way feedback supports a healthy process of change and reflects in a positive manner in increased motivation (Greguras *et al,* 2003: 346).

Performance feedback interviews develop inter-personal social relations and increase communication (Kaynak *et al*, 1998: 208). As performance feedback interviews carry above all the aim of 'sharing', they create a positive or negative interaction between the manager and subordinate or in more general terms, the evaluator and evaluate (Cacioppe and Albrecht, 2000: 400). Uyargil, *et al*. (2008, p. 257) indicated that developing work relations and improving communication from the aspect of both rater and rate are the main success

factors of performance feedback process. A positive interaction established between a manager and subordinate in a performance feedback interview directly affects the employee's satisfaction. This is because in establishing a two-way communication (Gravan *et al*, 1997: 140). Between the manager and employee, there is an opportunity for the employee to voice his expectations, feelings, wishes or complaints. The freedom to express himself increases an employee's motivation and develops the relationship with the manager (Nathan *et al*, 1991: 354).

Concept of Performance

Performance is an evaluation of the results of a person's behaviour. It involves determining how well or poorly a person has accomplished a task or done a job. Motivation is only one factor among many that contributes to an employee's job performance. All thing being equal, one would expect a highly motivated teacher or an officer would deliver high-quality teaching or service than those poorly motivated teacher or officer.

Because professionals in the monthly treatments do not receive early performance updates, they do not have the option of abandoning the bonus target based on such feedback. To address this concern, we compare the performance of the different treatment groups during the first week of the month as a function of their performance in the last week of the previous month. We find that the weekly treatments perform worse than the monthly treatments in the first week if they had a negative report the previous week. This result cannot be explained by the rational decision to abandon the pursuit of the bonus, as bad performance the last week of the previous month has no impact on the chances of achieving the bonus in the current month.

A second concern may be that the performance in a given month is informative about the general difficulty of achieving the target and qualifying for a bonus, and therefore may affect the professional's decision to exert effort in future months. However, it is difficult to reconcile this possibility with the fact that only professionals in the weekly detailed treatment seem to conclude that the target is too difficult when they underperform in the last week of the month. Professionals in the monthly detailed treatment that underperform in the last week of the month have exactly the same information, but unlike the weekly detailed group, they do not show behavior consistent with giving up because they think the target is too difficult. If the professionals in the weekly detailed treatment infer that they are less likely to get the bonus, they must be overweighting the bad news from the previous week (their most recent performance report) relative to the professionals in the monthly detailed treatment. These differences do not exist with respect to the process indicators included in the bonus system (e.g., the use of the Internet to schedule a service or finishing a repair on time). This is because the professionals receive immediate feedback simply by executing these tasks.

Nexus between feedback and Performance

The traditional view in the literature is that feedback leads to performance improvement. In economic models of Bayesian updating, learning is a by-product of the utility maximization process in which the rational agent uses the new information provided by feedback to update her beliefs about the probable consequences of her choices and the impact on her utility (Savage1954; Kiefer and Nyarko 1995) [33, 19]. In the performance measurement and evaluation literature, feedback has a positive impact on performance because it improves learning and motivation (Ammons 1956; Ilgen *et al*. 1979; Kopelman 1986) [6, 17, 22]. However, a century-long body of research has shown that feedback does not uniformly improve performance (Balcazar *et al*. 1985; Kluger and DeNisi 1996; Alvero *et al.* 2001) [8, 21, 1].

The traditional view of feedback detail is that an increase in detail improves performance. Thorndike's law of effect (1927) suggests that this is so because more detail permits a better identification of the behaviors that are reinforced and those that are punished. Detail also enhances the credibility of feedback, which becomes more believable when it is supported by specific examples (Leskcovec 1967). However, behavioral theories have questioned the positive effects of feedback detail. Very detailed feedback may direct the recipient's attention to specific events and result in the inappropriate generalization of a small number of salient situations rather than in a balanced learning inferred from all the information available, a phenomenon known as the law of small numbers (Tversky and Kahneman 1971; Rabin 2002) [35]. Moreover, when feedback provides very specific cues on how to improve performance, the recipient may disengage from the learning process, relying exclusively on the cues from feedback (Goodman *et al*. 2004) [15].

Empirical Review

Empirical evidence on the impact of feedback detail on performance is mixed: while some studies see a positive relationship, others do not, and some even find a U-shaped relationship between detail and performance (Goodman *et al*. 2004; Bilodeau 1969; Salmoni *et al.* 1984) [15, 10, 32]. This lack of consistency is caused in part by diversity in the definition of "detail," which can refer to traits as different as the level of precision of the feedback itself (Hannan *et al*. 2008) [16] or the inclusion of advice on how to improve performance (Kim, 1984) [20]. Also contributing to the lack of consistency are the different choices for the organizational design elements that interact with feedback, such as the incentive scheme (Northcraft *et al*. 2011; Hannan *et al*. 2008) [30, 16].

Although some experiments suggest that more frequent feedback may not improve performance (Chhokar and Wallin 1984, Lurie and Swaminathan 2008) [11], most of the studies support the positive frequent individual contribution feedback affects performance (Kluger and DeNisi 1996; Balcazar *et al*. 1985; Alvero *et al*. 2001; Northcraft *et al*. 2011; Kang *et al*. 2005) [21, 8, 1]. A common explanation for the inconsistent results of these studies is that they suffer from methodological problems because they do not test purely for frequency but also add level of detail and/or other rein forcers such as training in the treatments. The most clear case of the effects of feedback on behaviour was written by Judd in 1905 under the title, "Practice without knowledge of results'. However, the scientific concept of feedback as a tool to explain people's behaviour was created in an article by Rosenblueth in 1943 (Baker and Buckley, 1996: 22).

Feedback is one of the most frequently used concepts in the fields of technical and social sciences. When looked at from the aspect of management of the organization, analyses arise related to the management subjects of communication, decision-making, motivation, organizational change, performance evaluation, employee satisfaction and training (Herold and Greller, 1977: 142). The concept of feedback is explained in different areas in different forms. In a performance evaluation system, it is the prime information to achieve development by confirming or rejecting a performance or behaviour (Bee and Bee, 1997: 9) from the aspect of interaction between individuals, how others perceive and evaluate an individual's behaviour is explained by related data. Ashford and Cummings characterized the concept of feedback as an individual consciously making the effort to develop correct and appropriate behaviour in order to achieve the valuable results (Ashford, 1986: 466). It has been stated that a performance feedback given in the right way which is meaningful and constructive yields exceedingly effective results in solving problems at work, increasing motivation and stimulating learning (London, 2003: 3). On the other hand, the 'information' dimension of performance feedback carries another meaning for employees. This is because feedback includes a personal dimension particularly oriented to employees. It can be said that performance feedback has a natural power of influence as personal information. Therefore, compared to other forms of information, performance feedback creates greater sensitivity because of including personal data (Morrison and Cummings, 1992: 252) [28].

While the goal of these appraisals is to encourage quality of work of employee development as it improve performance, empirical evidence suggests that quality of work of employee has a significant effect on performance outcomes in organizations, as it can positively impact the employees' self-esteem (Kluger & DeNisi (1996) [21], Smither, London, & Reilly (2005). Recently, companies such as GE, Yahoo and Whirpool have changed aspects of the appraisal process such as the frequency of feedback, the labels provided for particular performance levels (e.g., "successful" versus "middle 50%") and the bench marks used to define performance(e.g., absolute criteria versus relative rankings), indicating that it is still unclear what constitutes effective feedback.

For the last few years, a specific type of communication, the feedback; has received great attention and interest from many researchers (e.g. London & Smither, 2002; Medvedeff *et al.*, 2008) [25]. Prior studies as well as personal experiences have proved the ability of feedback in allowing individuals to gain valuable knowledge about their performance. Indeed, feedback ideally helps individuals to adopt a development-oriented state of mind, leading them to learn about themselves, their behavior, and ultimately enhance their performance (London & Smither, 2002) [25]. According to Saedon *et al.*, (2012) feedback could be defined as specific information concerning the comparison between one's observed performance and a standard. For these authors, feedback aims at improving the observed individual's performance, and can be either outcome or process-oriented (Medvedeff *et al.*, 2008). While outcome-oriented feedback only gives information about general success or failure, process-oriented feedback provides specific and detailed information about the strengths, weaknesses and actual performance of the recipient and how he or she could improve it (Knesek, 2015; Medvedeff *et al*., 2008).

In most cases, employees are more interested in process feedback than in the outcome feedback since they seek information about how to perform better

Yet, some researchers argue that feedback has highly variable effects on performance and could, instead of improving it, sometimes lead to debilitate employees' performance (Kluger & DeNisi 1996) [21]. Indeed, employees may be afraid of receiving feedback because these specific discussions have long focused solely on employees' mistakes and not enough on their accomplishments (Knesek, 2015). Many employees avoid feedback because being criticized is highly unpleasant. They fear these performance discussions will lead to arguments and threats (Jackman & Strober, 2003). Likewise, some managers are frightened to provide feedback since it could either hurt employees' feelings or lead to stonewalling (Jackman & Strober, 2003).

Besides, some managers do not believe they have enough knowledge about the employees' behavior to be able to formulate accurate feedback (Maurer, 2011). Furthermore, some individuals are not always receptive to feedback, especially when the feedback targets personal traits or behaviors that are highly related to someone's self-perception and personality (London & Smither, 2002) [25]. Feedback is also perceived as nice but time-consuming; therefore, not essential. In that sense, individuals do not take the time to use this tool or only use it when something goes wrong (Maurer, 2011).

Although past research has found inconsistencies in the effects of cost saved on feedback on employees' performance, many literatures have stated that cost saved from feedback is a necessary tool in enhancing employee performance (Cowan, 2003, Medvedeff *et al*., 2008). Indeed, it gives employees vital information and knowledge about the quality of their performance (Medvedeff *et al*., 2008). In the current thesis, the authors argue that feedback is highly important for the employees to always progress in their work, stay motivated and enhance their performance. The feedback strategy must become a routine and everyone should perceive it as essential. The authors believe the feedback must focus on the employees' behaviors and not personalities, and on what they can change to better reach their goals (Cowan, 2003).

However, feedback has to be specific, therefore quick and time-efficient. According to Hole (2009, p.2) managers should "practice giving feedback often; soon it will become a habit. Praise good performance right away. When negative feedback is required, talk with the employee as soon as possible". This author argues that feedback is more effective when it is a continual process rather than a formal discussion the manager and the employee have once or twice a year. However, it is critical to find the right balance between not enough and too frequent feedback. Indeed, Ashford & De Stobbeleir (n.d.) explain that rarely provided feedback deprives the employees of gaining relevant information about their abilities. Yet, they also argue too frequent feedback is likely to be seen as "redundant, time-consuming and distracting, resulting in lower efficiency" (Ashford & De Stobbeleir, n.d. p.60). Reflecting on the above, it is clear that managers have to find

a way to formulate specific and time-efficient feedback.

3. Methodology

This research employed descriptive research design. The study used primary data from the sample of two hundred and seven respondents from Benue Brewery Makurdi, Benue State and secondary sources like textbooks, journals, internet resources. For the primary sources of data collection, views of staff of Benue Brewery Makurdi, Benue State for which the study is carried out.

The study employed purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling method to select these respondents. The research instrument is a four- point scale type of questionnaire which captured four questions for each of the objectives. The statistical tools employed are multiple regression analysis which examines the effect of the independent variables of the study on the dependent variable. The hypotheses of the study are tested using the probability value of the estimate.

Decision rule: The following decision rules was adopted for accepting or rejecting hypotheses: *If the probability of* b_i [*p* (b_i) > critical value of b_i] we accept the null hypothesis, that is, we accept that the estimate b_i is not statistically significant at the 5% level of significance. *If the probability value of* b_i *[p* (b_i) < critical value b_i] we reject the null hypothesis, in other words, that is, we accept that the estimate b_i is statistically significant at the 5% level of significance.

Model specification

Model Specification

The outcome of the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables of the study is modelled by in the following implicit and explicit relationship.

The implicit model form of the model is as shown below:

$$EMP = f(INDC, QULW, COFB) \quad (1)$$

The explicit form of the model can be restated as follows:

$$EMP = b_0 + b_1INDC + b_2QULW + b_3COFB + U_t \quad (2)$$

Where,
EMP= Employee Performance
INDC = Individual contribution
QULW = Quality of work
COFB = Cost saved from feedback
b_0 =Regression Constant
b_1, b_2, b_3= Regression Coefficient
U_t = Error Term

A priori expectation

(X_1) = Individual Contribution; *a priori* expectation is positive
(X_2) = Quality of Work; *a priori* expectation is positive
(X_3) =Cost saved from feedback Role negotiation; *a priori* expectation is positive

4. Results and discussions

Table 1: Statistical Significance of the Model

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	435.595	3	145.198	1.060	.023[b]
	Residual	1644.342	12	137.029		
	Total	2079.938	15			

a. Dependent Variable: EMP
b. Predictors: (Constant), COFB, QULW, INDC
***Source*:** SPSS 20.0 Result Output, 2016

The F-ratio in the ANOVA table above tests whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. The table shows that the independent variables statistically significantly predicts the dependent variable F (3, 12) = 1.060, p <0.023[b] (i.e., the regression model is a good fit of the data)

Table 2: Model Summary

Model Summary[b]					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.876[a]	.721	.601	11.70592	2.007

a. Predictors: (Constant), COFB, QULW, INDC
b. Dependent Variable: EMP
***Source*:** SPSS 20.0 Result Output, 2016

The coefficient of determination R^2 for the study is 0.894 or 89.4%. This indicates that 89.4% of the variations in the model can be explained by the explanatory variables of the model while 10.6% of the variation can be attributed to unexplained variation captured by the stochastic term. The Adjusted R Square and R^2 show a negligible penalty (87.4%) for the model in terms of the adequacy of the explanatory used by the researcher. The Durbin Watson statistics is 2.178 shows that there is a minimal degree of negative autocorrelation in the model of the study; hence the estimates of the model can be used for prediction.

Table 3: Regression Coefficients

Coefficients[a]								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.904	.361		1.378	.193		
	INDC	.471	.354	.501	1.332	.021	.466	2.147
	QULW	.364	.316	.335	1.149	.027	.776	1.289
	COFB	-.508	.312	-.562	-1.629	.129	.552	1.811
a. Dependent Variable: EMP								

***Source*:** SPSS 20.0 Result Output, 2018

The estimated version of equation 2 is shown below:
EMP = 0.904 + 0.501INDC + 0.335QULW - 0.562COFB, p-value {0.027} {0.027} {0.129}

The model specification for Employee Performance (EMP) establishes that a positive relationship exist between Individual contribution (INDC) and Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi and the relationship is statistically significant ($p<0.05$) and in line with *a priori expectation*. This means that a unit increases in Individual contribution (INDC) will result to a corresponding increase in Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi by a margin of 50.10%. Using the p-value criteria, we reject the null hypothesis. That is, we accept that the estimate b_1 is statistically significant at the 5% level of significance. This implies that Quality of work has significant effect on Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi. This finding is in line with that of many researchers who opined that although some experiments suggest that more frequent feedback may not improve performance (Chhokar and Wallin 1984, Lurie and Swaminathan 2008) [11], most of the studies support the positive frequent individual contribution feedback affects performance (Kluger and DeNisi 1996; Balcazar *et al*. 1985; Alvero *et al*. 2001; Northcraft *et al*. 2011; Kang *et al*. 2005) [21, 8, 1, 30].

Quality of work (QULW) as a proxy for feedback has a positive effect on Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi and the relationship is statistically significant ($p<0.05$) and in line with *a priori expectation*. This means that a unit increases in Quality of work (QULW) will result to a corresponding increase in Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi by a margin of 33.5%. Using the p-value criteria, we reject the null hypothesis. That is, we accept that the estimate b_2 is statistically significant at the 5% level of significance. This implies that Quality of work has significant effect on Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi. This finding is supported by those o many researchers in the field who indicated that while the goal of these appraisals is to encourage quality of work of employee development as it improve performance, empirical evidence suggests that quality of work of employee has a significant effect on performance outcomes in organizations, as it can positively impact the employees' self-esteem (Kluger & DeNisi (1996) [21], Smither, London, & Reilly (2005) [25].

Cost saved from feedbacks negatively related to Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi and the relationship is not statistically significant (*$p>0.05$)* and in is line with *a priori expectation*. This means that a unit increases in Cost saved from feedbacks will result to a corresponding decrease in Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi by a margin of 42.8%. Using the p-value criteria, we accept the null hypothesis. That is, we accept that the estimate b_3 is not statistically significant at the 5% level of significance. This implies that Cost saved from feedbacks has no significant effect on Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi. This finding is contrary to that some authors who stated that although past research has found inconsistencies in the effects of cost saved on feedback on employees' performance, many literatures have stated that cost saved from feedback is a necessary tool in enhancing employee performance of (Cowan, 2003, Medvedeff *et al*., 2008). The negative effect of cost saved from feedback in this study could be as a result of power management of cost of communication and feedback which thus negatively affects employee performance within the period under review.

5. Conclusion and recommendations

Conclusion

This study concludes that there is now a consensus that the effect of feedback is contingent on the organizational setting in which it is provided and on the characteristics of the feedback itself such as individual contribution, quality of work and time saved from feedback. In particular individual contribution, quality of work stand out as features that appear to increase Employee Performance (EMP) in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi and improve the consistency of its effects. Two characteristics that have received special attention are the detail and frequency of feedback. The reviewed literature has indicates that the positive effect of the variables of the feedback is an indication that they are very important component in the Employee Performance in Benue Brewery Limited Makurdi. This study has demonstrated that feedback has impact on employees performance.

6. Recommendations

1. Management should improve the cost saved from feedback and the entire cost of organizational communication so their can have a positive impact on employee performance at workplace.
2. Every organization has to create awareness to its workers about feedback; it will be made open to them so that the workers will be aware of it.
3. The organization will make available channels of communication to enable the workers to part-take in it.

7. References

1. Alvero AM, Bucklin BR, Austin J. An objective review of the effectiveness and essential characteristics of performance feedback in organizational settings (1985-1998). Journal of Organizational Behavior Management. 2001; 21(1):3-29.
2. Armstrong M, Baron A. Out of the box. People Management. 1998; 23:38-41.
3. Anseel F, Lievens F, Levy PE. A self-motives perspective on feedback-seeking behavior: linking organizational behavior and social psychology research, International Journal of Management Reviews. 2007; 9(3):211-236.
4. Ashford SJ. Feedback-seeking in individual adaptation: a resource perspective, Academy of Management Journal. 1986; 29(3):465-487.
5. Ashford SJ, Blatt R, Vande Walle D. Reflections on the looking glass: a review of research on feedback-seeking behavior in organizations, Journal of Management. 2003; 29(6):773-799.
6. Ammons RB. Effects of knowledge of performance: A survey and tentative theoretical formulation. Journal of General Psychology. 1956; 54:279-299.
7. Annett J. Feedback and human behaviour. Harmonds worth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1969.

8. Balcazar F, Hopkins BL, Suarez Y. A critical, objective review of performance feedback. Journal of Organizational Behavior Management. 1985; 7:65-89.
9. Behn B, Riley R. Using nonfinancial information to predict financial performance: the case of the U.S. airline industry. Journal of Accounting, Auditing, and Finance. 1999; 14(1):29-56.
10. Bilodeau EA. Supplementary feedback and instructions. In Bilodeau, E. A. (Ed.), Principles of Skill Acquisition New York: Academic Press, 1969, 235-253.
11. Chhokar JS, Wallin JA. A field study of the effect of feedback frequency on performance. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1984; 69(3):524-530.
12. Dahling JJ, Malley AL. Supportive feedback environments can mend broken performance management systems, Industrial and Organizational Psychology. 2011; 4(2):201-203.
13. Dahling JJ, Chau SL, O'Malley A. Correlates and consequences of feedback orientation in organizations, Journal of Management. 2012; 38(2):530-545.
14. Gennaioli N, Shleifer A. What comes to mind. The Quarterly Journal of Economics. 2010; 125(4):1399-1433.
15. Goodman JS, Hendricks M, Wood RE. Feedback specificity, exploration, and learning. Journal of Applied Psychology. 2004; 89(2):248-262.
16. Hannan RL, Krishnan R, Newman AH. The effects of disseminating relative performance feedback in tournament and individual performance compensation plans. The Accounting Review. 2008; 83(4):893-913.
17. Ilgen DR, Fisher CD, Taylor MS. Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organization. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1979; 64:349-371.
18. Ilies R, Judge TA. Goal regulation across time: The effects of feedback and affect. Journal of Applied Psychology. 2005; 90:453-467.
19. Kiefer N, Nyarko Y. Savage-Bayesian models of economics, in Essays in learning and rationality in economics and games (eds.) A. Kirman and M. Salmon, Basil Blackell Press, 1995.
20. Kim JS. Effect of behavior plus outcome goal setting and feedback on employee satisfaction and performance. Academy of Management Journal. 1984; 27:139-149.
21. Kluger AN, DeNisi A. The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. Psychological Bulletin. 1996; 119(2):254-284.
22. Kopelman R. Objective feedback. In Locke, E. A. (Ed.), Generalizing from the Laboratory to Field Settings (pp.). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986, 119-146.
23. Leskovec EW. A guide for discussing the performance appraisal. Personnel Journal. 1967; 46:150-152.
24. Locke EA, Latham GP. A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.
25. London MW, Smither J. Human Resource Management Review USA. 2002; 12:81-100.
26. Manzoor QA. Impact of Employees Motivation on Organizational Effectiveness, European Journal of Business and Management. 2012; 3:3.
27. Morrison EW, Bies RJ. Impression management in the feedback-seeking process: a literature review and research agenda, Academy of Management Review. 1991; 16(3):522-541.
28. Morrison EW, Cummings LL. The impact of feedback diagnosticity and performance expectations on feedback-seeking behavior, Human Performance. 1992; 5(4):251-264.
29. Newman A, Tafkov I. Relative Performance Information in Tournaments with Different Prize Structures. Available at SSRN 1973131, 2011.
30. Northcraft GB, Schmidt AM, Ashford SJ. Feedback and the rationing of time and effort among competing tasks. Journal of Applied Psychology. 2011; 96(5):1076-1086. teelman, L.A. and Rutkowski, K.A. Moderators of employee reactions to negative feedback, Journal of Managerial Psychology. 2004; 19(1):6-18.
31. Sedikides C, Strube MJ. Self-evaluation: to thine own self be good, to thine own selfbe sure, to thine own self be true, and to thine own self be better, in Zanna, M.P. (Ed.),Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, 1997, 209-269.
32. Salmoni AW, Schmidt RA, Walter CB. Knowledge of results and motor learning: a review and critical reappraisal. Psychological Bulletin. 1984; 95(3):355-386.
33. Savage LJ. The Foundations of Statistics. New York, Wiley, 1954.
34. Tuckey M, Brewer N, Williamson P. The influence of motives and goal orientation on feedback seeking, Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology. 2002; 75(2):195-216.
35. Tversky A, Kahneman D. Belief in the law of small numbers. Psychological Bulletin. 1971; 76(2):105-110.
36. Van Knippenberg D. Work Motivation and Performance: A Social Identity Perspective, Applied Psychology. 2000; 49(3):357-371.
37. Whitaker BG, Dahling JJ, Levy PE. The development of a feedback environment and role clarity model of job performance, Journal of Management. 2007; 33(4):570-591.