Performance reviews leave third of workers feeling less motivated, research reveals - People Management

Source: gnews-performance-review | **Published:** June 18, 2026 | **PMS Relevance:** PMS CORE | **Type:** News/Analysis | **Geography:** United States

Source URL: https://news.google.com/rss/articles/CBMiygFBVV95cUxNTENnZXNoa3dtQ2kzQktTMzFZY1J

Executive Summary

This article addresses the widespread dissatisfaction with traditional performance appraisal processes among UK professionals. The central argument, drawn from a Robert Walters survey of 2,000 UK white-collar workers and corroborated by a People Management LinkedIn poll and Gallup research, is that performance reviews frequently fail to motivate employees and may actively undermine morale. Key findings include: 35 per cent of respondents felt less optimistic about their role following their most recent appraisal; only 16 per cent felt more positive; and Gallup data indicates only 14 per cent of global employees found reviews inspirational. Experts from the CMI, CIPD, Acas, and Genius Within CIC attribute poor outcomes to undertrained managers — 82 per cent of whom enter management without formal training — inconsistent scoring, and the retrospective nature of annual reviews. The article concludes that organisations are increasingly separating development conversations from pay decisions, moving toward continuous feedback models, and cautiously integrating AI tools, while emphasising investment in manager capability as a foundational requirement for effective performance management.

Key Insights

1. 35 per cent of UK white-collar professionals felt less optimistic about their role following their most recent performance appraisal, while only 16 per cent felt more positive.
2. Gallup research found that only 14 per cent of global employees felt performance reviews inspired improvement, with 29 per cent viewing the process as fair and 26 per cent as accurate.
3. 82 per cent of managers enter management roles without formal management or leadership training, according to CMI research, which experts identify as a primary driver of poor appraisal outcomes.

Practical Takeaways

- Organisations are increasingly separating performance development discussions from pay decisions to reduce the conflation of two distinct conversations that can undermine both.
- Appraisal systems grounded in SMART objectives, applied consistently and reviewed regularly, are associated with greater perceived fairness — particularly when linked to pay, bonuses, or promotions.

Frameworks Mentioned

SMART Goals — A goal-setting framework requiring objectives to be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound, cited by Acas as a basis for fair and legally sound appraisals.

Critical Analysis

Strengths: The article triangulates findings across multiple sources — a recruiter survey (Robert Walters, n=2,000), a practitioner poll (People Management LinkedIn, n=361), and a global consultancy dataset (Gallup) — lending the headline claim reasonable credibility. Expert commentary is drawn from institutionally credible sources including the CMI, CIPD, and Acas. Limitations: The Robert Walters survey is conducted by a recruiter with a potential commercial interest in workforce dissatisfaction narratives. The LinkedIn poll is a self-selected convenience sample with low validity. The Gallup statistic is cited without a specific study name, date, or sample size. All primary survey data is UK white-collar specific, limiting generalisability. The 'clean feedback' model referenced by Genius Within CIC is described without evidence of its effectiveness. The article does not present counter-evidence or perspectives defending traditional annual reviews. Bias: The overall framing is reformist — the article consistently positions traditional appraisals as outdated and builds toward continuous feedback and AI-assisted models, which aligns with the interests of several quoted organisations and vendors.

Organizational Practice

Several organisations described as moving away from annual appraisals toward more frequent performance conversations; separating development discussions from pay reviews; using SMART objectives as a basis for consistent scoring; involving employees and trade unions in appraisal system design; appointing substitute appraisers where conflicts of interest exist; and piloting AI-assisted tools to help managers identify patterns and draft feedback.

Strategic Implications

The convergence of survey data across recruiter, practitioner, and global consultancy sources points to a structural legitimacy deficit in traditional annual appraisal models. The emphasis on manager capability — rather than appraisal system design alone — as the primary causal variable suggests that PMS investment in tooling without corresponding investment in management development may yield diminishing returns. The growing adoption of AI in review processes introduces questions about consistency, authenticity, and employee trust that organisations are beginning to encounter operationally. The separation of pay and development conversations represents an emerging structural shift with implications for how performance data is collected, interpreted, and acted upon.

Validation Status: passed
