Appraising Performance of Workers in Organizations: Problems and Solutions

By

Okere Loveday, Ph.D
Professor of Management (HRM)
Faculty of Management Sciences
Department of Management
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.
E-mail: okereloveday22@gmail.com
&
Didia, Paul Amadi Ph.D
Department of Management
Faculty of Management Sciences
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.
E-mail: didiapaul57@gmail.com

Abstract

In the context of performance measurement, performance appraisal represents just one tool in the toolkit. It is a way of eliciting information about the performance of one or more employees against certain predefined criteria or dimensions. Thus, performance appraisal is a system whereby an organization assigns some "score" to indicate the level of performance of a target person or group. This work delved into examining the problems and solutions in appraising performance of workers in organizations. Literature was reviewed extensively to gather information in this aspect of human resource management practice. The study discovered that graphic scales, unclear standards, halo affect, central tendency, leniency or strictness, and bias can undermine manpower performance appraisal. Also, the research revealed that understanding the problem, choosing the right appraisal tool, training supervisors to eliminate rating errors, and diary keeping can assist to avoid manpower appraisal problems. The work suggested that organizations can reduce the adverse effects of appraisal problems by having raters carefully write down positive and negative critical incidents as they occur during the period to be appraisal.

Key Words: Appraising, Performance, Workers, Problems, Solutions, and Organizations.

Introduction

Many of the roots of performance measurement can be traced back to Taylor's time and motions studies. More recently, measurement has been influenced by the development of other business systems, for example, programming and budgeting, zero-based budgeting, and management by objectives. This approach advocated by Drucker (1999), gained much popularity because it encouraged management to set individual objectives for employees at the commencement of the defined time period and to review progress at the end of the period. It provided a relatively easy and clear indication of the extent to which the employees had performance and achieved their predefined targets. In the late 1990s and early 2000 performance measurement became more extensive and arguably, more intensive, to the point where some researchers such as Adair et al, (2003), Haris et al, (2007), Hyde et al (2006), and Bourgon (2008) considered that performance measurement became one of the most striking features of the business agenda and, in particular, a central feature of the public sector reform agenda. Workplace Employment Relations Survey data for 2004 suggest that appraisals constitute one of the main tools used in measuring performance (Amaratunga and Baldry 2002). In 2004, 78% of managers in workplaces reported that performance appraisals were undertaken compared with 73% in 1998. However, performance appraisals were not always conducted on a regular basis or used for all employees (DeNisi 2000). Chard and Katou (2007) opined that two-thirds that is, 65% of all workplaces conducted regular appraisals for most, that is 60% or more of non-managerial employees. This represents an increase since 1998, when the equivalent figure was 48%. Thus, performance appraisal as noted by Fletcher (2001) is "activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, enhance performance and distribute rewards". Mondy et al (2002) also posit that "performance appraisal is a system of review and evaluation of an individual's or team's performance and the process of appraising performance within organizations". It can also be looked as measuring, evaluating, and influencing an employee's job related attributes, behaviours and outcomes, and level of absenteeism to discover at what level the employee is presently performing a job. This involves determining how productive the

employee is and if the employee can perform as or more effectively in the future so that the employee, the organization, and society all benefit (Kavangh 1982). According to Bernardin and Blatt (1985); Bernar din and Cascio (1988), the term performance appraisal system involves (1) the form or method used to gather the appraisal data, (2) the job analysis conducted to identify the appropriate criteria against which to establish standards for evaluating the appraisal data (3) establishing the validity and reliability of the method(s) used, (4) the characteristics of the rate and rate influencing the appraisal and the appraisal feed-back and interview processes, (5) the processes involved in using the appraisal information for development and evaluation, and (6) the evaluation of how well performance appraisal is doing in relation to its stated objectives.

Purposes and Importance of Manpower Performance Appraisal

Organizations are becoming more concerned about effective performance appraisal. Organizations are also becoming more concerned about other behaviours that have less to do with how well employee can do the job and more with how they impact the operation, image, and profitability of the organization (Carroll and Schnerier, 1998). These behaviours include employee theft, alcohol, and drug use, and unethical conduct. In addition to having an impact on productivity, an effectively designed performance appraisal form serves as a contract between the organization and the employees. This contract acts as a control and evaluation system better, and enabling performance appraisal to serve the following purposes:

1. Management development
2. Performance management
3. Performance improvement
4. Compensation
5. Identification of potential
6. Feedback
7. Personnel planning
8. Research on legal compliance
9. Communication

Other purposes of performance appraisal involve demotions, terminations, internal recruitment, and research (Beer, 1981; Carroll and Schneier, 1982). These are often condensed into two general categories, that is, evaluation and developmental. The evaluative purposes include decisions on pay, promotion, demotion, layoff, and termination. The developmental purposes cover research, feedback, management and career development, human resource planning, performance improvement, and communications. Boxall and Purcell (2008), also reported the following purposes of performance appraisal;

1. Promotion, separation and transfer decisions.
2. Feedback to the employee regarding how the organization viewed the employee's performance.
3. Evaluations of relative contributions made by individual and entire departments in achieving higher level organization goals.
4. Criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of selection and placement decisions, including the relevance of the information used in the decisions within the organization.
5. Reward decisions, including merit increases, promotions and other rewards.
6. Ascertaining and diagnosing training and development decisions.
7. Criteria for evaluating the success of training and development decisions.
8. Information upon which work scheduling plans, budgeting and human resource planning can be used.

Accordingly, in many instances the actual appraisal is undertaken via a face-to-face discussion, but it is important to note that this may be changing as the use of information technology and software packages such as "Performance Pro" means that appraisal can easily be undertaken online.

Approaches to Personnel Performance Appraisal

Cilenti et al (2007) report that the scope and method for reviewing performance varies between organizations, but in general, appraisal takes a free text form in which the appraiser and appraise review performance in general, although the problem with such qualitative forms of appraisal is that they have the potential to ignore important areas that would benefit from being appraised, thereby making them highly selective and highly subjective. An alternative is to undertake a

straight ranking of performance against predefined criteria or traits. On the basis of an assessment against the dimensions, employees are given the final rankings. Any approach using predetermined criteria has limitations, especially if the same criteria are employed across a wide range of job roles, as not each criterion may be relevant (DeNisi, 2000). Traits such as resourcefulness, loyalty on enthusiasm may be open to different interpretations by different appraisers and the appraisee, leaving them open to bias and prejudice. Finally, the criteria may become obsolete, for example in the banking sector the use of creativity, innovation and imagination may not be as desirable.

Dealing With Rating Scale Appraisal Problems

Most employers still depend on graphic type rating scales to appraise performance, but these scales are especially subject to several appraisal problems. Specifically, the main problems that can undermine appraisal tools includes graphic rating scales; unclear standards; halo effect, central tendency, leniency or strictness, and bias (Lan and Mantyn, 1992).

Unclear Standards: The problem of unclear standards is shown in table 1.

Table 1: A Graphic Rating Scale with Unclear Standards

	EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
Quality of work				
Quantity of work				
Creativity				
Integrity				

Note: For example, what exactly is meant by "good" "quantity of work" and so forth?

Although the graphic rating scale seems objective, it would probably result in unfair appraisals because the traits and degree of merit are open to interpretation. For example, different supervisors would probably define "good performance" "fair performance", and so on differently (Kevin, 1985). The same is true of traits such as "equality of work".

There are several ways to rectify this problem. In the words of Ted (1986), the best way is to develop and include descriptive phrases that define each trait as

demonstrated in table 1. There the form specified what was meant by "outstanding", "superior", and good quality work". This specificity results in appraisals that are more consistent and more easily explained.

Halo Effect: Halo effect has been defined by Andrew and Charles (1997) as "the influence of a rater's general impression on ratings of specific rate qualities". In practice it might mean, for instance, that your rating of a subordinate on one major trait, such as "gets along with others", biases how you rate that person on other traits, such as "quality of work". This problem often occurs with employees who are especially friendly, or unfriendly towards the supervisor. For example, an unfriendly employee will often be rated unsatisfactorily for all traits rather than just for the trait "gets along well with others", Keki (1984) comment that "being aware of this problem is a major step toward avoiding it". Supervisory training can also alleviate the problem.

Central Tendency: According to Jeanette et al (1989) "many supervisors have a central tendency when filling in rating scales", for example, if the rating scale ranges from 1 to 7, they tend to avoid the highs that is, 6 and 7 and lows that is, 1 and 2, and rate most of their people between 3 and 5. If you use a graphic rating scale, this central tendency could mean that all employees are simply rated "average". Such a restriction can distort the evaluations, making them less useful for promotion, salary or counseling purposes. Rating employees instead of using a graphic rating scale can avoid this central tendency problem, because all employees must be ranked and thus cannot all be rated average.

Leniency or Strictness: Some supervisors tend to rate all their subordinates consistently high, or low, just as some instructors are notoriously high graders and others are not. This strictness/leniency problem is especially serious with graphic rating scales, because supervisors are not necessarily required to avoid giving all their employees high, or low, ratings. On the other hand, if a manager must rank subordinates, he or she is forced to distinguish between high and low performers. Thus, strictness/leniency is not a problem with the ranking or forced distribution approaches.

Leniency may result from the purpose of the appraisal, as well as from the inherent leniency of the person doing the appraising. Personnel psychologists have long hypothesized that performance appraisal rating obtained for administrative purposes, such as pay raises or promotions would be more lenient than rating aimed for feedback or employee development purposes (Jawahar and Charles, 1997). Researchers have investigated this hypothesis, reviewing 22 studies of performance appraisal leniency. They observed that "performance appraisal ratings obtained for administrative purposes were nearly one-third of a standard deviation larger than those obtained for research or employee development purposes" (Wayne, 1978). Their results suggest that supervisors tend to be more lenient when appraising employees for personnel actions that have concrete outcomes for the employee that is, things like pay raises or promotions. On the other hand, they tend to be less lenient when the purpose of the appraisal is counseling the employee, providing feedback, correcting performance deficiencies, and other such employee development purposes, a fact the supervisor should keep in mind.

In fact, if a graphic rating scale is to be used, it may be a good idea to impose a distribution of performance, that say, about 10% of your people should be rated "excellent", 20% "good", and so forth. In order words, try to get a spread.

Bias: Individual differences among ratees in terms of characteristics like age, race, and, sex can affect their ratings, often quite apart from each ratee's actual performance (Wayne, 1978, Jawahar and Charles, 1997). In a study Rosen and Gerdee (1976), found a systematic tendency to evaluate older ratees, over 60 years of age, lower on "performance capacity" and "potential for development" than younger employees. Also, a study of registered nurses provides an interesting picture of how age can distort evaluations. For nurses 30 to 39 years old, they and their supervisors each rated the nurses' performance virtually the same. In the 21 to 29 category, supervisors actually rated nurses higher-than the nurses rated themselves. However, for the 40 to 61 nurse category, the supervisors rated nurses' performance lower than the nurses rated their own performance. One interpretation is that supervisors are together in appraising older subordinates. Specifically, they don't give them as much credit for their success, while attributing any low performance to their lack of ability (Michael and Edward, 1988;

James (1988). The rater's and ratee's race can also affect the rating a person receives. A study by Michael (1997) of 20,000 bosses, 50,000 peers, and 40,000 subordinates illustrate the interplay between the race of the rater and ratee. The researcher concluded that black raters rated black ratees higher than white ratees; that white bosses, but not white subordinates, assigned more favourable ratings to white ratees than to black ratees; and that black raters assigned higher ratings than did white, regardless of the race of the ratees. Such results sound a cautionary signal for employers; since over 90% of appraisal programmes ask the immediate boss to take sole responsibility for appraisals, and since most bosses are white, black managers are likely to find their career progress is largely in white manager's hands, so that "black managers who are rated by white bosses may advance at a lower rate than black managers who are rated by black bosses". However, the research findings are not entirely consistent, in that the bias is not necessarily always against the minorities or women. Also, a study by Duane and Toni (1985), demonstrated that low-performing blacks were often rated significantly higher than were low-performing whites. Similarly, high-performing females were often rated significantly higher than were high-performing males. A study also by Jane et al (1993) illustrated how bias can consciously or subconsciously influence the way one person appraise another. In this work, the researchers sought to determine the extent to which pregnancy is a source of bias in performance appraisal. The subjects consisted of a sample of 220 undergraduate students between the ages of 17 and 43 attending a Midwestern University. The aim of the study was to investigate whether or not the employee's pregnancy influenced the performance appraisal rating she received for dealing with the irate customer, selling the computer system, and dealing with the problem subordinate. The results of this research suggest that pregnant woman may face additional workplace discrimination above and beyond any gender bias that may already exist against women in general. Despite having been exposed to other identical behaviour by the same female employee, the students raters of this study "with a remarkable high degree of consistency" assigned lower performance ratings to pregnant women as opposed to a non-pregnant one. Furthermore, men raters seemed more susceptible to negative influence than did women. Given the fact that most employees still report to male supervisors and that supervisory ratings are often the determinant of one's advancement, the researchers conclude that any bias that exists could make it even harder for women to have both children and

careers. One implication is that raters must be forewarned of such problems and trained to use objectivity in rating subordinates. Kevin et al (1986); Kevin et al (1985), highlighted that "an employee's previous performance can also affect how his or her current performance is perceived". The actual error can take several forms. The rater may systematically overestimate improvement by a poor worker or a decline by a good worker. In some situations, especially when the behaviour change is more gradual, the rater may simply be insensitive to improvement or decline. In any case, the bottom line is to rate performance objectively. Therefore, it will be extremely advisable to try to block out the influence of factors such as previous performance; age, tribe, race, religion, political affiliation, culture etc.

Ways to Minimize Appraisal Problems

There are at least four ways to minimize the impact of appraisal problems such as bias and central tendency.

1. Be sure to understand the problems and the suggestions, like clarifying standards, given for each of them. Understanding the problem can help the manager avoid it.
2. Choose the right appraisal tool, such as the graphic rating scale or critical incident method, has its own advantages and disadvantages.
3. Train supervisors to eliminate rating errors such as halo effect leniency or strictness and central tendency (Bryan and Michael, 1994).
4. Diary Keeping.

Legal and Ethical Issues in Performance Appraisal

Appraisal plays a central role in equal employment compliance (Lary, 1994). According to Shelley and Kenneth (1985) courts have addressed various issues, including promotion, layoff, and compensation decisions, in which performance appraisal play a significant role. Juan and Philip (1996) disclosed that "courts have often found that the inadequacies of the employer's appraisal system were at the root of an illegal discriminatory action. In the words of Lary (1994), "the overall objective of high ethics performance reviews should be to provide an honest assessment of performance and to mutually develop a plan to improve the individual's effectiveness. This requires that we tell people where they stand and we be straight with them".

Gerald and Mary (1987) highlight the guidelines for developing a legally defensible appraisal process includes the following:

1. Conduct a job analysis to ascertain the criteria and standards, such as "timely project completion", required for successful job performance.
2. Incorporate these criteria and standards into a rating instrument.
3. Use clearly defined individual dimensions of job performance, like quantity or quality, rather than undefined, global measures of job performance, like overall performance.
4. Communicate performance standards to employees and to those rating them, in writing.
5. When using graphic scales, avoid abstract trait names, for example, loyalty, honesty, unless they can be defined in terms of observable behaviours.
6. Employ subjective supervisory ratings, such as essays, as only one component of the overall appraisal process.
7. Train supervisors to use the rating instrument properly. Give instructions on how to apply performance appraisal standards, such as outstanding and so on, when making judgements.
8. Allow appraisers substantial daily conduct with the employee being evaluated.
9. Base appraisal on separate evaluations of each of the job's performance dimensions (James et al, 1996).
10. Whenever possible, have more than one appraiser conduct the appraisal, and conduct all such appraisals independently. This process can help to cancel out individual errors and bias.
11. One appraiser should never have absolute authority to determine a personnel action. This is one reason why a multiple raters' performance is becoming more popular.
12. Include an employee appeal process. Employees should have the opportunity to review and make commends, written or verbal , about their appraisals before they become final, and should have a favourable appeals process through which to appeal their ratings.
13. Document all information and reasons bearing on any personnel decision. In fact, James et al (1996) provide that "without exception, court condemn informal performance evaluation practices that eschew discrimination".

14. Where appropriate, provide corrective guidance to assist poor performers in improving their performance. Courts look favourably on this practice.

Jon and Mark (1997) suggest that "performing a job analysis, providing raters with written instructions, permitting employee review of results, and obtaining agreement among raters are the four appraisal practices that seemed to have the most consistent impact across the board in all or most of the judicial decisions. The courts placed little emphasis on whether or not the employer's performance appraisal tools and/or process were formally validated.

Who Should Do the Appraisal?

According to Julie and Lynn (1995) several options exist.

1. **Appraisal by the Immediate Supervisor:** Supervisors' ratings still are the heart of most appraisal systems. Getting a supervisor's appraisal is relatively easy and also makes a great deal of sense.
2. **Using Peer Appraisals:** The appraisal of an employee by peers can be effective in predicting future management success. From a study of military officers, for example, we know that peer ratings were quite accurate in predicting which officers would be promoted and which would not (Glenn and Paul, 1987). In another research that involve more than 200 industrial managers, peer ratings were similarly useful in predicting who would be promoted (Michael, 1984). One potential problem is logrolling. Here all the peers simply get together to rate each other highly. With more firms using self-managing forms, peer or team appraisals are becoming more popular.
3. **Rating Committees:** Many employers use rating committees to evaluate employees. These committees are usually composed of the employee's immediate supervisor and three or four other supervisors. Using multiple raters can be advantages. While there may be a discrepancy in the ratings made by individual supervisors, the composite ratings tend to be more reliable, fair, and valid (Harris and Schaubroech, 1988). Thus, several raters can assist to cancel out problems like bias and the halo effect on the part of individual raters. Furthermore, when there are differences in raters' ratings, they usually stem from the fact that raters at different levels often observe different facets of an employee's performance' the appraisal ought

to reflect these differences (Walter, 1974). Even when a committee is not used, it is common to have the appraisal reviewed by the manager immediately above the one who makes the appraisal. Angelo and Lawrence (1996) found this to be standard practice in 16 of the 18 companies surveyed. Chockalingan (1996) posit that "rating committees are also advantageous in so far as supervisory ratings appear to have higher inter-rater reliability or consistency than do ratings obtained from several peers".

4. **Self-Ratings:** According to Shaul and Vossi (1988); John (1989) "employees' self – ratings of performance are also sometimes used, usually in conjunction with supervisors' ratings. However, George (1980); Cathy et al (1984) observed that "the basic problem with these is that employees usually rate themselves higher than they are rated by supervisors or peers". Forest and Chip (1996) discovered in their study that when respondents were asked to rate their own performances, 40% of the employees in jobs of all types placed themselves either in the top 25%, well above average, or at least in the top 50%, above average. Usually not more than 1% or 2% placed themselves in a below average category, and then almost invariably in the top below average category. The researchers conclude that "individuals do not necessarily always have such positive illusions about their own performance, although in rating the performance of their groups, group members did consistently give their group unrealistically performance". On this note, James and Dorothy (1988), advised that "appraisals and the employees' self appraisals may accentuate appraiser-appraisee differences, and rigidify position". Moreso, even if self-appraisals are not formally requested, each employee will enter the performance review meeting with his or her own self-appraisal in mind, and this will usually be higher than the supervisor's rating.
5. **Appraisal by Subordinates:** More firms today let subordinates anonymously evaluate their supervisors' performance, a process many call upward feedback (Manuel, 1994). When conducted throughout the firm, the process helps top managers diagnose management styles, identify potential "people" problems, and take corrective action with individual managers as required". Such subordinate ratings are especially valuable when used for developmental rather than evaluative purposes (Manuel,

1994). Thus, managers who receive feedback from subordinates who identify themselves view the upward appraisal process more positively than do managers who receive anonymous feedback; however, subordinates not surprisingly, are more comfortable giving anonymous responses; and those who have to identify themselves tend to provide inflated ratings (David, 1994).

6. **360 – Degree Feedback:** Many firms accordingly to Kenneth (1993); Matthew (1994) have expanded the idea of upward feedback into what they call 360 degree feedback. That is performance information is collected "all around" and employee, from his or her supervisors, subordinates, peers, and internal or external customers. In a study Katherine (1993) observe that 29% of the responding employers already use 360-degree feedback, also called "multisource" assessment and 11% had plans to implement it shortly. According to the researcher, the feedback is generally used for training and development, rather than for pay increases.

Conclusions

People want and need feedback regarding how they are doing, and appraisal provides an opportunity to give them that feedback. Most subordinates probably want a specific explanation or examples regarding why they were appraised high or low, and for this, compiling a record of positive and negative critical incidents can be useful. Before the appraisal, manager should make sure to clarify the performance he expect so that the employees know what he or she should be shooting for. However, the appraisal problems to be aware of include unclear standards, halo effect, central tendency, leniency or strictness, and bias. Understanding the problems, choosing the right appraisal tool, training supervisors to eliminate rating errors, and diary keeping can help to avoid personnel appraisal problems.

Recommendations

To improve employees' performance appraisal in organizations, the following points are recommended:

1. Organizations can reduce the adverse effect of appraisal problems by having raters carefully write down positive and negative critical incidents as they occur during the period to be appraised.

2. The purpose of performance appraisal should mostly involve consideration of decisions on pay, promotion, demotion, layoff, termination, research, feedback, management and career development, human resource planning, performance improvement, communications, and internal recruitment and selection of personnel.
3. Straight ranking of performance against predefined criteria or traits should be adopted.
4. Train supervisors to eliminate rating errors such as halo effect, leniency or strictness, and central tendency.
5. Conduct job analysis to ascertain the criteria and standards such as timely project completion, quantity or quality, required for successful job performance.
6. Communicate performance standards to employees and to those rating them in writing.
7. Performance appraisal can be done by employing the employee immediate supervisor, peer group, rating committees, self-ratings, subordinates, and 360 – Degree feedback.

References

Aclair, C.; Simpson, L.; Birdsell, J.; Omelchuk, K.; Case beer A.; Gardiner, H.; Newman, S.; Beckjie, A. and Clelland, S. (2003): Performance management systems in health care services: Models practices and effectiveness. Alberta: The Alberta heritage foundation for medical research.

Amarratunga, D. and Baldry, D. (2002). Moving from performance measurement to performance management. Facilities, 20, 217 – 223.

Andrew, S. and Charles, L. (1997). Examination of the relationship between true halo and halo effort in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 82, 5, 165 – 674.

Angelo, D. and Lawrence, P. (1996). Organization of information in memory and the performance appraisal process: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 81, 6, 717 – 737.

Beer, M. (1984). Performance appraisal: Dlemmas and possibilities. Organizational dynamics, 24 – 36.

Bernardin, H. J. and Cascio, W. F. (1988). Performance appraisal and the law, in readings in personnel and human resource management, 3rd ed., eds. R. Schuler, S. A. Young-blood and V. L. Huber, St. Paul: West.

Bernardin, H. J. and Klatt, L. A. (1985). Managerial appraisal systems: Has practice caught up to the state of the art? Personnel administrator, 79 – 86.

Bourgon, J. (2008). Performance management: It's the results that count: Asian Pascific Journal of Public Administration, 30, 1, 44 – 58.

Boxall P. and Purcell, J. (2008). Strategy and human resource management. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bryan, D. and Michael, M. (1984). Effectiveness of performance appraisal training using computer assistance instruction and behaviour modeling. Personal Psychology, 37, 439 – 552.

Carroll, Jr. S. J. and Schneier, C. E. (1982). Performance appraisal and review (PAR) systems. Glenview, Ill.: Scott. Foresman, 2 – 3.

Chochalingam, V. (1996). Comparative analysis of the reliability of job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 81, 5, 557 – 574.

Christina, B. and Kevin, M. (1985). Toward narrowing the research-practice gap in performance appraisals. Personnel psychology, 38, 2, 335 – 346.

Cilenti, M. Guggenheimer, E. and Kramnick, R. (2007). The volunteer workforce: Legal issues and best practices for nonprofits, New York: Lawyers alliance for New York.

DeNisi, A. (2000). Performance appraisal and performance management: A multilevel analysis. San Francisco, CA: Jossey – Bass.

Drucker, P. (1999). The practice of management. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Duani, C. and Toni, A. (1995). Dilemmas of appraisal. European Management Journal, 20, 620 – 627.

Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74, 473 – 488.

Forest, J. and Chip, A. (1996). The evaluation gap in performance perceptions: Illusory perceptions of groups and individuals. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 81, 4, 369 – 379.

Gerald, B. and Mary, K. (1987). Performance appraisal and terminations: A review of court decisions since Brito V. Zia with implications for personnel practices. Personnel psychology, 40, 3, 489 – 504.

Glenn, M. and Paul, B. (1987). User acceptance of peer appraisals in an industrial setting. Personnel psychology, 40, 4, 785 – 798.

Harris, C. Cortvriend P. and Hyde, P. (2007). Human resource management and performance in healthcare organizations: Journal of Health and Organization Management, 21, 448 – 459.

Harris, M. M. and Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self – supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. Personnel psychology, 41, 43 – 62.

Hyde, P., Boaden R., Cortvriend P., Harris C., Marchingtone, M., Sparrow, P. and Sibbald, B. (2006). Improving health through human resource management. London: CIPD.

James, A.; Peter, V. and Hugh, H. (1996). Legal requirements and technical guidelines involved in implementing performance systems, in Ferris and Buckley. Human resource management, 3rd ed, upper saddle river, NJ: prentice hall, 271 – 288.

James, R. and Dorothy, G. (1988). An analysis of managers' reactions to their own performance appraisal feedback. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 73, 1, 63 – 67.

James, S. (1982). Effect of prior performance information on rating of present performance: Contrast versus assimilation revisited. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 73, 3, 487 – 496.

Jan, C. and Martyn, S (1992). Performance appraisal in practices. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 2, 3, 30 – 94.

Jawahar, I. M. and Charles, W. (1997). Where all the children are above average: The performance appraisal purpose affects. Personnel Psychology, 50, 905.

Jeanette, C. (1989). Multiple uses of performance appraisal prevalence and correlates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 1, 30 – 135.

John, W. L. (1989). Your performance: Appraise it yourself. Personnel, 66, 1, 21 – 33.

Jon W. and Mark, B. (1997). Explaining U.S. courts of appraisals decisions involving performance appraisal: Accuracy, fairness, and validation. Personnel psychology, 50, 1 – 24.

Juan, S. and Philip, D. (1996). A second look at the relationship between rating and behavioural accuracy in performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 81, 1, 7.

Julie, B. and Lynn, H. (1995). Peer performance appraisal: The impact of rater competence, rater location and rating correctability on fairness perceptions. Group and organization management, 20, 1, 39 – 60.

Katherine, R. (1993). Fear of feedback. Management reviewed, 39.

Kavanagh, M. J. (1982). Evaluating performance in personnel management, eds. K. M. Rowland and G. R. Ferris. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 187 – 225.

Keki, B. (1994). Boss performance appraisal: A metric whose time has gone. Employment relations today, 21, 1, 1 – 9.

Kenneth, N. (1993). 360 – Degree feedback: The whole story. Training and development, 69.

Kevin, M.; William, B.; Maura, L. and Elaine, E. (1985). Effects of previous performance on evaluations of present performance. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 70, 1, 72 – 84.

Kevin, W.; Angelo, D.; Druce, M. and Thomas, C. (1986). Initial decisions and subsequent performance ratings. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 71, 2, 189 – 195.

Larry, A (1994). Ethical considerations of performance appraisals. Management review; 83, 3, 62.

Manuel, L. (1994). Agreement between subordinates and self-ratings in upward feedback. Personnel psychology, 47, 349 – 355.

Matthew, B. (1994). The rating game. Across the board, 31, 2, 35 – 38.

Michael, E. B. and Edwart, L. (1988). Delay and distortion: Passive influence on performance appraisal effectiveness. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 73, 3, 507 – 514.

Michael, M. (1994). Psychometric properties of subordinate ratings of managerial performance. Personnel psychology, 37, 4, 687 – 702.

Mondy, R.; Noe, R. and Premeaux, S. (2002). Human resource management, 8th ed. Upper saddle river, NJ: Prentice – Hall. Naff, K. and Kellough E. Journal of Public Administration, 26, 1307 – 1336.

Rosen, B. and Gerdee, T. H. (1976). The nature of job related age stereo-types. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 61, 180 – 183.

Shaul, F. and Vossi, D. (1988). Validity of self-assessment: A field evaluation. Personnel psychology, 41, 3, 581 – 592.

Shelley, B. and Kenneth, D. (1985). Performance appraisal and the law. Personal, 62, 7, 34 – 35.

Ted, C. (1986). Performance appraisal: A case in point. Personnel Journal, 65, 9, 48 – 53.

Walter, B. (1974). Exploring upper limits of reliability and validity in job performance ratings. *Journal of applied psychology*, 68, 135 – 144.

Wayne, C. (1978). Applied psychology in personnel management. Reston publishing, 337 – 345.