

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL ACCURACY: THE EFFECTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF RATER'S MOTIVATION IN PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL CONTEXT; A CASE STUDY OF PAKISTAN HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR

Farhat Saba
PhD Candidate,
School of Business
Faculty of Law & Business
La Trobe University, Melbourne, Victoria, 3086
fsaba@students.latrobe.edu.au

Apollo Nsubuga-Kyobe
School of Business
Faculty of Law & Business
La Trobe University, Melbourne, Victoria, 3086
A.Nsubuga-kyobe@latrobe.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Performance Appraisal (PA) is a key element of Performance Management (PM) but often the former entails controversial practices, among other things impacted by accuracy and effectiveness. Nevertheless, it is generally believed that Performance Appraisal System (PAS) often lead to positive organisational outcomes, yet the “accuracy of the measuring instruments” is still a debatable issue with lots of criticisms. These tend to relate to Rater's Motivation, effect and consequences, accuracy and integrity of the PAS in-place. Using literature review, the foregoing matters are tested as a case study approach by focusing on higher education institutions/Universities in Pakistan. Since Higher education sector increasingly is playing a critical role in economic competitiveness of a country, reviewing Higher Education Sector PA practices provides a developmental causeway in the regards to the other significant institutions. Aiming to assess the impact of the rater motivations in PA processes in Higher Education in Pakistan Sector, can be a critical contribution to Organisational and peoples' performance. Thus, this paper explores the effects and consequences of rater motivation on PA accuracy in the first place. This is in addition to examining the role social contextual variables may play in higher education sector in Pakistan. Identifying other key factors responsible for PA accuracy in the Pakistan's case is equally important.

Keywords: Performance Appraisal, Performance Management, Performance Appraisal Accuracy, Rater Motivation, Higher Education.

INTRODUCTION

This paper focuses on the impact of performance appraisal (PA) accuracy, examined through a case study approach of Pakistan Higher Education Sector (universities), thus it assesses the effects and consequences of the rater's motivation given the context. In today competitive business environment, universities as organisational institutions also seek to use roles, which employees play as a source of competitive advantage (Barney, 1995; Pfeffer, 1996). Perhaps, they are following on Porter's (1990a) observation that a nation's economic prosperity would no longer be tied to abundant natural resources and cheap labour; rather, their "competitive advantage through people" a situation that would be increasingly based on creative and scientific innovations. This new paradigm of economic development positions colleges and universities as primary engines of growth and development (Romer, 1990; 1993), therefore their experiences provide a good ground for lessons.

Since universities as institutions can play key role in economic growth, development and social change of a country, many governments are influenced to expand the sector's capacity and quality for new frontiers. Thus, high quality and capacity of the Higher Education Sector cannot be achieved without continuous assessment and improvement of staff performance evaluations. Given the foregoing, Universities as institutions are used so as to throw some light on the "PA accuracy" and "rater's motivation in PA" basing on case studies from Pakistan. Large, medium, and small organisations do have and implement Human Resource Management (HRM) Policies and Practices that seek to promote employee productivity and efficiency among other things (Brown & Benson, 2005; Linna *et al.*, 2012). One of the HRM functions and practices is performance appraisal (PA). If used effectively, it tends to improve competitiveness, innovation, research and development, employee productivity and efficiency as well as motivation and performance enhancements (Murphy & Cleveland, 1991). These outcomes can be achieved in a number of ways including creating a culture of high performance where all members could be responsible for continuous improvement in their own skills and business processes (Armstrong, 2006). This is sub-divided as follows:

LITERATURE REVIEW

Performance appraisals have increasingly become part of a more strategic approach to integrating human resource (HR) activities and business policies and is now a generic term covering a variety of HR activities. It is through this that organisations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, enhance their performance and distribute rewards (Fletcher, 2001). Muczyk and Gable (1987) believe that the way these activities are managed determine the success/failure of an organization. As PA plays the most crucial role towards the organization's success, it is essential to have an effective PAS, so that employees' performance could be assessed accurately. Also, such a system could adequately support various human resource decisions (Ikramullah, Shah, Hassan, Zaman, & Shah, 2011:37). Mohrman & Lawler, (1983) have listed the PA uses for organisations and they include decisions such as: human resource planning, selection and placement, promotions and development, compensation, training and development, and individuals' feedback. For PA to be useful, regardless of their specific purpose, they should be as accurate as possible.

Some research in PA area has examined performance rating formats and rater training in an attempt to improve the accuracy. However, research focused onto rating formats was only moderately successful in improving rating accuracy, thus researchers like Landy and Farr (1980) called for a moratorium on format research; at the same time they commenting on the inadequacies (Banks & Murphy, 1985; Bemardin & Villanova, 1986). As a result, more recent researchers have started focusing their attention on the factors other than performance appraisal format and rater's training. This is in addition to contextual variables surrounding the performance appraisal process impacting accuracy. One such factor is rater motivation (e.g., Banks & Murphy, 1985; Bemardin & Villanova, 1986; Harris, 1994; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991).

Given the foregoing improving PA accuracy and a better understanding of the rater's motivation, these do represent every important and underexplored component (Banks & Murphy, 1985, Bemardin & Villanova, 1986; Cleveland & Murphy, 1992; Decotiis & Petit, 1978; DeNisi & William, 1988; Fisher, 1989; Harris, 1994; Lawler & Mohrman, 1983; Longenecker, Sims, & Gioia, 1987; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Notable, the work has focused on understanding and improving appraisers' ability (Banks & Murphy, 1985;

Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). More recently, certain researchers have bemoaned the dearth of writing on appraisers' motivation in the performance rating context (e.g., Bernardin & Villanova, 1986; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991). Banks & Murphy, (1985) pointed to the scarcity of published empirical research on the nature, antecedents, and consequences of appraiser motivation (Cleveland & Murphy, 1992; DeNisi & Williams, 1988; Fisher, 1989). Scarcity of conceptual models of rater's motivation in certain developing country's' context has been referenced in regard to the Asian context, particularly in higher education sector in Pakistan (Batool & Qureshi, 2007). Therefore, this paper focuses on rater's motivation seeking key PA determinants in Pakistan context using case study approach.

Several scholars have developed conceptual models of rater's motivation in developed country's context, for example, DeCotiis & Petit, 1978; Mohrman & Lawler, 1983; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991), these have provided the main ground for this work. Thus, the paper starts with the description and discussion of the possible effects and consequences of PA rater's motivation in higher education sector in Pakistan. The work seeks to respond to a more recent call of re-examing the contextual variables surrounding the PA process, e.g. the appraisers' motivational process aspects and the extent of accuracy. More specifically, the main emphasis is on *the motives of managers when rating performance*. Thus, at a very broad level, the purpose of this paper is to contribute to the existing literature on PA with by identifying and explaining the contextual factors, their influences, broad rater's behavior as well as the impacts to the ratee as accompanying behaviors may produce leniency or the opposite, which two situations undermine the integrity and accuracy of the PAS.

Factors affecting Raters Motivation

In order to design effective interventions to improve performance appraisal accuracy, we first need to identify key social factors affecting performance ratings as the performance appraisal process involves a series of behaviors and attitudes during which the appraiser observes, stores, and when necessary, recalls and integrates appraise behavior (Wexley & Klimoski, 1984). A more detailed description of the factors affecting rate motivation in PA context will be discussed in the next section.

Political Behavior

Longenecker, Sims, and Gioia (1987) defined politics as deliberate attempts by individuals to enhance or protect self-interests when conflicting courses of action are possible. They found that raters nearly always had political considerations in mind when they conducted performance appraisals. Specifically, the authors provided documented evidence that raters use discretion, and consider the potential effectiveness and consequences of their ratings when rendering performance ratings. What was perhaps most enlightening about Longenecker et al (1987) findings was that raters confided that they were not often concerned with providing accurate ratings. Rather, ratings were often more a function of such influences as raters' motivations to avoid confrontations, make themselves look like more effective managers, and to procure desired rewards either for themselves or their subordinates. Similarly, Nayyar and Raja (2012) investigated the impact of impression management on organisational politics and posited that in mechanistic system employees more inclined towards impression management to manage their political behavior than in organic organizations. Motives politics behavior and activities in organizational culture in higher educational sector in Pakistan may include inflating subordinates' ratings to avoid confrontations with subordinates and to get rid of troubled employees out of one's department.

Altman, Valenzi, & Hodgetts, (1985) posited that supervisors avoid giving performance ratings that may antagonize employees (e.g., low rating)” and inflate performance ratings in order to maximize rewards offered to their employees (e.g., salary increases, promotions, prestigious assignments, etc.). It has also been observed that raters often use the performance assessment system as an instrument for realizing specific self-centered objectives such as image improvement or affecting positive relationships with subordinates (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). According to Tziner, et al. (2005) raters that believe in such political dimension of performance appraisals are less likely to provide accurate or useful evaluations of their subordinates' performance than raters who see the performance appraisal system as a credible and useful gauge of individuals' performance. Poon, (2004) referred several studies (Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Kacmar et al., 1999; Valle and Perrewe', 2000) which discussed the organizational politics having relationship with job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Arshad, Masood & Amin,(2013) investigated on performance appraisal politics PAP and its relationship with job satisfaction and turnover intentions in Pakistan and validated that PAP influences job satisfaction and turnover, which are in aligned with previous researches (Poon, 2004, Logenecker et al., 1987).

Deliberate Leniency:

Raters have been purported to be lenient for a multitude reasons. Most typically, raters are believed to be lenient to avoid negative interpersonal consequences with ratees (e.g., Bernardin, 1987; Bernardin & Buckley, 1981), to appear successful (Greenberg, 1983), or as a result of organizational norms or discomfort with performance appraisals (e.g., Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Villanova, Bernardin, Dahmus, & Sims, 1993). Rating leniently as a function of organizational norms typically means that raters inflate performance ratings due to a perception that other raters inflate their ratings as well.

Tziner, Murphy, and Cleveland (2002) also examined trust in the performance appraisal process and found that raters who have low trust have a greater propensity to assign higher ratings. Additionally, Villanova et al. (1993) posit that rater discomfort with the appraisal process has also been proposed as a predictor of rating leniency. He further found that raters who scored high on discomfort were more likely to inflate ratings. The suggestion for why uncomfortable raters inflated ratings was that these raters did not want to deal with the negative feedback that would result from giving low ratings. Bernardin and Buckley (1981) provided a list that essentially summarizes the reasons why raters would tend to be lenient. Not surprisingly, many of the reasons are consistent with the reasons stated for political manipulations in performance ratings (e.g., low ratings will negatively affect relationship with subordinate, self-enhancing, culture). A research conducted recently on performance evaluation of university teachers in Pakistan by Aslam (2012) endorses the same opinions that rater avoid having their performance discussion in order to keep themselves away from embarrassment or any disagreements between the parties involved. Segal (2000) summed up some of the deficiencies of carrying out appraisal evaluations accurately because of the following factors affecting performance appraisal accuracy: use of primarily defective appraisals, focus on cheering individual, which automatically depresses

teamwork/collaboration, contradictions in setting and pertaining appraisal criteria, spotlighting on edges (exceptionally good or poor performance), appraisal's hub on accomplishment of short-term goals, propping up the autocrat supervisors, biasness of appraisal results and formation of emotional agony in employees.

Role of culture and value system:

By definition, it is the specific collection of norms and norms shared by people and groups in an organization. These codes are instrumental in controlling their work behavior, their interaction with each other within the organization and with stakeholders outside the organization. Performance appraisal is one norm or value that management utilizes to control and manage employees' behavior. As there hardly exists an absolute organizational culture, an absolute appraisal system cannot be thought of. Researchers (Kavanagh, 1982; Landy & Farr, 1980) after undertaking reviews of the performance appraisal literature conclude that there hardly exists any exclusive performance rating format which may ensure performance rating accuracy.

Although many researchers have studied the link between organizational culture and performance (Ogbonna & Harris, 2000; Rousseau, 1990; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Marcoulides & Heck, 1993), not much research has been done on organizational culture as a contextual factor of performance management (Magee, 2002). Organizational culture manifested in beliefs and assumptions, values, attitudes and behaviors of its members is a valuable source of a firm's competitive advantage (Hall, 1993; Peteraf, 1993), since it shapes organizational procedures, capabilities into a cohesive whole, provides solutions to the problems faced by the organization, and, thereby, hinders or facilitates the organization's achievement of its goals (Yilmaz, 2008).

Organization culture plays an important role in determining the role of the performance appraisal system. Whatever the form of an appraisal system may be its success is heavily conditioned by the organization's tasks and culture. Its crucial role has been elaborated in

these words: "that factors such as the nature of jobs, culture and organizational structure can combine to create an environment in which 'best practice' in the accepted sense of the word may not be an effective strategy" (Wilson & Beaton, 1993: 167). Similarly, an analysis done by Ahmed et al., (2010) indicates that an organisational culture which lacks necessary skills, knowledge, management support and personal priorities, and the discomfort most employees experience when giving and receiving feedback, are the forces inhibiting this critical process to be effective and successful. Failure to set goals and provide ongoing feedback and summary evaluations generally results in employees becoming dissatisfied and result reduced performance. Effective PA systems stand to create a vision of success and a climate in which performers want to give their best and strive for continuous improvement. They confirmed that in-order to bring PA satisfaction among employees and to build their trust on the appraisals in semi-governmental organizations of Pakistan, research based policies are desired. A better PA system integrated with better HR practices will enhance performance appraisal satisfaction and also increase employee job satisfaction and reduce turnover intentions to bring effectiveness in the organizations.

Raters Perception

Diverse studies on appraisal process (Murphy et al., 1996; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995) have talked about the centrality of understanding appraiser-appraiser's attitudes and beliefs about the assessment and about the organizational contexts that such assessments occurs. It has been observed (Banks & Murphy, 1985) that many of the seeming inadequacies of assessment ratings are the consequences of goal-driven, adaptive behaviors rest with the rater and not being the causes of rater's inability to provide true evaluations. These shortcomings cannot be termed as rating errors and thereby cannot be cured by using different rating scales or improved rater training. There is a need of change in raters' perception of organizational norms (Tziner, et al., 2005).

According to Bernardin and Orban (1990) a rater's perceptions of the degree to which others bias their performance appraisals may influence performance appraisals process. This perception of raters inflation or distortion of ratings is likely to reduce confidence in the

performance appraisal system; raters who believe that the prevailing norm is to give high (or low) ratings are likely to distort their own ratings in the same direction (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995).

Rater Motivation and PA Accuracy

Historically, substantial research has sought to understand and improve “ performance ratings” and “appraisal behavior” on relatively ‘cold’ cognitive processes (Metcalf & Mischel, 1999). The latter refers to "Executive Functioning in Typical and Atypical Development" (Zelazo, Philip David; Miller, Ulrich (2002: 445–469) of the rater (e.g. Bretz, Milkovich, & Read, 1992; Landy & Farr, 1980); a perspective that largely ignores the human and social intricacies involved in the processes and PA research (Harris, 1994; Levy & Williams, 2004; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995; Murphy, Cleveland, Skattebo, & Kinney, 2004; Spence & Keeping, 2010; Wong & Kwong, 2007). However, later developments highlighted the importance of the rater motivations in the performance rating process. The task remained to explain how and why managers navigate PA context the way they do?

The exciting development of studying the notion of rater cognitions provided further opportunity to explore performance appraisals from a new perspective. In so doing, it opened up new research avenues and theoretical frameworks upon which PA practices were newly investigated and perhaps improved. Despite voluminous research undertaken in the area, a number of scholars and practitioners argue that the cognitive approach to PA has done little to improve the actual practices in organizations (Banks & Murphy, 1985; Bretz et al., 1992). Notable, criticisms of the cognitive approach are generally followed by calls to investigate non-cognitive influences, such as the PA social context (Banks & Murphy, 1985; Levy & Williams, 2004). As well, there is a relative lack of empirical research, examining non-cognitive influences of PA ratings.

Investigatory responses on rater motivation in PA context have been gaining momentum. For example, Lawler (1979) discussion of control systems advocated paying attention to intrinsic and extrinsic motivators in the implementation of PA control systems. In a similar vein, Mohrman and Lawler (1983) proposed that raters' motivations be evaluated in the

investigations of PA processes. A call was view PA outcomes as “motivated behavior” accordingly seeking examination of PA consequences rather than just measurement issues. It was observed that if rating accuracy is the goal, then it is not enough to simply make someone a better rater, but that raters must also be willing to provide accurate ratings (Banks & Murphy, 1985). The need to provide raters with incentives to rate accurately was similarly echoed by Murphy (1992) in his discussion of forced distributions. He noted that managers tend to show minimal cause of investing time and energy into performance appraisals because such take time away from their more rewarding activities (they pay little attention). Another factor relates to negative interpersonal practices associated with providing distorted (i.e. low and mediocre) ratings.

Harris (1994) has broadly and comprehensively examined rater’s motivations, and developed some theoretical frameworks based on a view that rating is a function of various predictors, that “rater motivations predict performance ratings outcomes”; that rater’s rate accurately if they are motivated to do so (a function of various predictors) and that they rate inaccurately if they are motivated to avoid negative consequences or they are not motivated to rate accurately. Predictors of rater motivations in Harris' framework include such things as having to face the subordinate, the possibility of receiving rewards, and how much performance appraisals interfere with other tasks; these predictors are further examined in detail in the next sections. The concept of “rating motivation” may be a source of confusion as it describes instances in which raters play around with (inflate, deflate, or centralize ratings) (Cleveland & Murphy, 1992; Harris, 1994; Mohrman & Lawler, 1983; Tziner, Murphy, & Cleveland, 2001). Also, raters' lack of motivation to rate accurately (Banks and Murphy, 1985), raters' motivation to rate inaccurately (Cleveland & Murphy, 1992), and raters' disinterest in rating accurately (Harris, 1994).

Some new research has established the extent to which different ratings motive, and how the same can alter performance ratings (e.g., Murphy et al., 2004; Wong & Kwong, 2007). In general, different ratings motive as well account for variability in performance ratings (Murphy et al., 2004). Also, beyond specific rater motives are found engendering different rating patterns. For example, raters' attempts to increase group harmony or decrease rating variability or increase mean ratings (Wong & Kwong, 2007), all these engage slight

manipulations. The overlap across the four different constructs of politics, impression management, leniency, and motivation is considerable. The constructs have in common the same behaviors (e.g., inflating ratings, failing to distinguish amongst ratees) and motives for engaging in the behaviors (e.g., avoid conflict, self-enhance). The situation in which a rater inflates a subordinate's ratings to avoid conflict with the subordinate has been referred to as politics, impression management, and leniency; these are further examined in detail in next sections after a brief discussion on the role of raters motivation in performance appraisal system in Pakistani higher education sector.

Rater motivation in PA context in Pakistan:

Organizational effectiveness is contingent on individual performance (Gong, Law, Chang, & Xin, 2009). Thus, most organizations in Pakistan have some form of performance appraisal system in place to evaluate employee's performance over some period of time usually by his immediate supervisor.

Common PA practice in most public sector universities in Pakistan is Annual confidential report (ACR) which was introduced in 1940s, and is still in use in public sectors as a remnant of the legacy of the British rule over Pakistan like in many other developing countries. This is a comprehensive report written once in a year about the employee by his senior or supervisor for his or her responsible duties and performance in these duties. The reports have no bearing on pay and benefits. Rather these have no immediate effect unless grading is below the minimum acceptable standard. However they have long term impact on promotions as well as selection on merit for lucrative posts and courses. Audiences of these reports are not the employees but the senior management because on this report decisions are made whether the person should be promoted or not. Bad points of this unidirectional practice are, because of no participation of employee there is no feedback about his or her performance which means no learning, no development (Stafylarakis & Eldridge, 2002). Communication gaps, personal biasness, and minimal employee participation are some of the negative aspects of ACR system which makes it an old and ineffective system, which does not help in employees' learning and development, (Stafylarakis et al., 2002; Rasheed et al, 2011). A person promoted

on the basis of ACR is always unaware of the fact that in which part of year and work was he/she the most efficient one.

Since its inception, the system has been rectified many times to clarify some technical issues by higher education commission Pakistan. Although some progress has been made in last decade but the current system is still far from successful in practical operation and world level standards.

These performance evaluations (also called performance evaluation reports: PER) are generally used worldwide to evaluate employee performance to make administrative decisions, determine training needs, and evaluate recruitment and selection processes (Kane & Lawler, 1979; Levine, 1986; Cleveland, Murphy, & Williams, 1989, Rasheed et al., 2011 ; Aslam,2011; Shakil, 2012). But in public sector organizations in Pakistan, an employee's promotion and retention in service mostly depends on what has been recorded in these PERs (PE Guide, 2004). Since the Evaluation reports constitute an aid to selections for appointments/transfers, promotions, confirmations or screening of officials, it is essential that they are written most carefully and accurately. A reporting officer before he embarks on the report writing work should try to comprehend the characteristics listed in the Evaluation Report Forms. The report should give a clear picture of the officer reported upon viz personal qualities, standard of performance, dealings with others, potential growth and his suitability for promotion to special posts according to individual aptitude. Similarly, the countersigning officers should scrutinize the report scrupulously, in accordance with the prescribed procedure before countersigning it as these evaluation reports are supposed to reflect an employee's strong and weak points more objectively and to ensure that such performance evaluation effectively serves its true purpose.

Contradictory to this, as discussed in PE Guide (2004) the deficiencies commonly noted in such reports undermine the effectiveness and accuracy of the PA system by producing subjective ratings of job performance of an employee. As pointed out by Murphy (2008), despite its popularity and importance in organizations, the relationship between actual performance and subjective ratings of job performance is relatively weak (Viswesvaran, Ones, & Schmidt, 1996). Furthermore, performance evaluations are contaminated with non-performance factors such as impression management, rater motivation and politics (Wayne &

Ferris, 1990; Spence, Keeping, 2011, Nayyar and Raja (2012)) and therefore capture less of the relevant criterion space (Austin & Villanova, 1992). As performance ratings do not yield the intended information, the effectiveness of the PA system as well as interrelated organizational systems is diminished (Lawler, 1990; Spence, Keeping, 2011).

Such PA system with diminished effectiveness due to the following commonly noted deficiencies (PE Guide, 2004) is:

(1) Assessment by Reporting Officer

Many reporting officers are overly generous in their assessment based on misjudgments as in some extreme cases, reporting officers rate all officers "very good" because of the effects of rater motivation in this process. Such reporting places equally good employees of the same group working elsewhere at a disadvantage if their work is evaluated under more objective and stricter criteria.

(2) Counseling

Adverse remarks are often recorded by the reporting officers without prior counseling to the officer reported upon. This is contrary to the existing instructions and is, in fact, a reflection on the reporting officer. They are expected to counsel an officer about his weak points and advise him how to improve. Adverse remarks should normally be recorded only when the officer fails to improve despite counseling. Thus this gives the importance of the understanding of how the complex interpersonal relationships inherent in the performance appraisal context, which have been largely neglect in the PA literature in Pakistan, influence rating accuracy (Levy & Williams, 2004). Rasheed et al. (2011) suggest that quality and accuracy of PA can be improved by intermittent counselling of employees by the assessor. Whenever there is a problem, it must be discussed and improvement sought instead of waiting for months when performance will be recorded.

(3) Countersigning

It has been noticed time and again that countersigning officers, when differing with the assessment or remarks given by a reporting officer, neither score these out nor do they give their own assessment in red ink against the relevant remarks. These entries, particularly on "quality and output of work" and "integrity" are of crucial importance when considering an officer for promotion.

Najafi et al (2010) observe that mostly the management as well as lower employees are dissatisfied with the performance appraisal methods. Main reasons of the dissatisfaction are complexity of the process, lack of adequate support by managers, impracticability, and the appraiser's failure in conducting a realistic and fair appraisal. They also state that in government organizations usually performance appraisal (PA) does not make its impact because of indifference of the appraiser and objectivity in PA affects negatively on creativity, perseverance and sincerity of employees. Employees' perception of the PAS in the organization is important because employees are more likely to be receptive and supportive of a given PAS if they perceive the process as a useful source of feedback which helps to improve their performance.

No empirical research has so far been undertaken to investigate the effects of rater's motivation as a conscious rating distortion in appraisal context in higher education sector in Pakistan. Thus a gap exists in the research in this area of strategic importance. The present study is an attempt to address this gap. The present study will offer valuable insight to the management of these organizations about the understanding of the role it plays in appraisal context to have accuracy in performance appraisal process.

Determinants of Rater Motivation

The three important determinants of rater motivation are perceived rewards, perceived negative consequences, and impression management. In turn, these determinants are

hypothesized to be affected by both situational (e.g., accountability) and personal (e.g., mood) variables. Scholars have thoroughly discussed the determinants of rater motivation in performance appraisal context (e.g., Cleveland & Murphy, 1992; Longenecker, Gioia & Sims, 1987; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991) and come up with the following three important determinants of rater motivation that predicts performance ratings (Harris, 1994). A more detailed discussion of the determinants and their effect on PA context will follow in the next section

REWARDS

Attainment of a valued reward is an important determinant of almost any behavior (Kanfer, 1990). In the performance appraisal context, raters are likely to consider the possibility of receiving extrinsic rewards, such as raises and promotions. Majority of the public sector universities performance appraisal is used mostly for promotional purpose. (Anjum, Yasmeen and Khan (2011) labeled this as a major shortcoming of currently using system and demanded that there is a need to fill the gap as PAS can be used for a variety of activities through which organizations seek to assess employees to identify the training needs to develop their competence, and improve their performance, to give open and timely discussions regarding employee performance as well as allocate rewards (Fletcher, 2001) apart from promotion and salary increases. That is, it is possible that engaging in careful information processing, making accurate ratings or providing feedback to subordinates about their performance will be *directly* rewarded by the organization. Likewise, the rater may consider whether engaging in performance appraisal activities will *indirectly* result in achievement of rewards. For instance, providing feedback that leads to improved employee performance may result in improved unit performance. In turn, this could lead to higher pay increases or promotions for the manager.

Alternatively, a rater may value attainment of *intrinsic* rewards from engaging in performance appraisal activities. Some raters, in other words, may find engaging in performance appraisal activities to be inherently satisfying. Providing helpful feedback to subordinates, for example, may result in increased esteem and recognition from subordinates or supervisors. Here again, The result of Anjum, Yasmeen and Khan (2011) research show

that this is another major shortcoming of the performance management system in Pakistan as employees assessments are not discussed with them on regular basis. This shows that the direct or indirect engagement of employees in performance appraisal system is absent and has a very limited scope for being used as a development function, a forward looking approach, directed towards increasing the capacity of employees to be more productive, effective, efficient and satisfied in the future. It covers such things as job skills, career planning, employee motivation and effective coaching between managers and subordinates. It is any endeavor concerned with enhancing attitudes, experiences and skills that improve the effectiveness of employees (Boswell & Bourdeau, 2002).

The limited field research addressing rewards for doing performance appraisals portrays a dismal picture. Napier and Latham (1986) examined managers' expected outcomes (e.g., raises, promotions, employee appreciation) for providing both negative and positive feedback to employees. Other than employee dismay (in the case of negative feedback) and employee appreciation (in the case of positive feedback), respondents generally felt that the primary result would be "nothing." According to the literature e.g. Taylor (1998) appraisal system not only should be open but it should also leave room for discussion. Performance review discussions help in the professional development of employee and successful implementation of appraisal system.

In practice, then, the direct, extrinsic rewards for engaging in performance appraisal activities may be few and infrequent (Murphy & Cleveland, 1991). This is likely to be particularly true for making accurate ratings. There may be, however, greater perceived rewards for giving feedback to employees. As discussed later, some organizations may encourage managers to give feedback to subordinates (e.g., Friedman & LeVino, 1984), but in most of the public sector universities in Pakistan this is a rare phenomenon as employees participation in PA process is minimal making it a one way communication process (Anjum, Yasmeen & Khan, 2011). According to them, employee participation enhances motivation, feelings of fairness and acceptance of performance appraisal system. And to gain these positive effects it must be realized that employee participation is an enriching factor. Cox (2000) also acknowledged that a system which are implemented with meaningful consultation of employees are more effective than those which are implemented unilaterally by supervisor

NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES

A second determinant of rater motivation in the performance appraisal context is the avoidance of negative consequences. There are a number of negative consequences that are associated with performance appraisal activities. These may be organized into five, albeit somewhat overlapping, categories: damage to subordinate-supervisor relationships, demoralization of employees, criticism from the rater's subordinate, criticism from the rater's supervisor, and interference with other tasks.

Many researchers have commented on the potential for performance appraisal activities to negatively affect supervisor-subordinate relationships (e.g., Lawler, 1990; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991). In particular, a common concern expressed by managers is that making accurate (i.e., lower than the employee expects) performance ratings or giving negative performance feedback will hurt their relationship with the subordinate. Similarly, a frequently encountered fear on the part of raters is that making accurate ratings or providing feedback will demoralize rather than motivate the employee (Longenecker et al., 1987).

Possible subordinate criticism of feedback and ratings is also a frequently voiced concern by managers, particularly when the ratings or feedback are negative (Murphy & Cleveland, 1991). In the present context, most managers have a myriad of job responsibilities beyond performance appraisal; time spent on performance appraisal activities may be viewed by the organization and appraiser as detracting from other, more important, tasks (Heneman et al., 1989). This would be particularly true when the appraiser has limited time availability. A recent survey by Bernardin and Villanova (1986) revealed that a common characteristic of the performance appraiser's role was inadequate time to devote to this task. Moreover, lack of time was regarded by supervisors as a major reason for inaccuracy. Thus, while an appraiser may wish to engage in performance appraisal activities, other work-related tasks often take priority.

In Pakistan, too, these issues exist as an unexplored phenomenon embedded in Public sector Performance appraisal system, confidential and one way communication process without getting them involved and engage in it. Performance appraisal in public sector universities

only used at a low level for communication. There is little feedback from appraisers to appraisee and the importance of harmonious peer and subordinate relationships is very limited in such a closed appraisal system (Easterby-Smith et al, 1995; Khan, 2010). The results of performance appraisal usually remain confidential because management feels reluctant to pass on any negative information to appraisees so that direct confrontation is avoided and "face" can be saved (Zhu & Dowling, 1998; Khan, 2010), it is called *Mianzi* (Hofstede; Hwang, 1987).

Obisi (1996) adds that some managers and supervisors involved in performance appraisal ignore periodic counseling after an incident has taken place. The confidential nature of the system tends to generate tension among the ratees and also deprives them of constructive direction for improving performance in the future. This confidentiality creates an environment/culture of secrecy, mistrust and estranges the relationship between both the parties involved. Due to confidentiality appraisees are unable to get adequate performance feedback about the strengths and weaknesses. Likewise, they are unable to ascertain as to where they stand with respect to preset goals/targets and achievement, and future direction for their professional development. Furthermore, there is no provision of appraisal review meeting in the rules, so that appraisees can formally get performance feedback from appraiser. Nevertheless, appraisees get informal performance feedback from superiors during their various interactions throughout the rating periods (Khan, 2010).

General perceptions of the performance appraisal in practice are seems to be unhelpful as an improvement tool as their participation is almost nil. Therefore, the performance appraisal is perceived as a work expectation (a duty or a routine activity), which provides minimal support to identify areas of professional development (Obisi, 1996). Among all the responses, it is clearly indicated and supported that perception of confidentiality persists in PAS (Khan, 2010) in public sector organizations and this has created more problems than resolving the issue. These annual confidential reports are like a closed system which is non transparent and open to favoritism, corruption and tribalism in public sector institution and universities.

Impression Management Concerns

Villanova and Bernardin (1989: 299) defined impression management as “any behavior that alters or maintains a person's image in the eyes of another and that has as its purpose the attainment of some valued goal”. They discussed impression management as the tendency for supervisors to provide appraisal ratings that either directly or indirectly forward their self-interests. Impression management activities are abundant in the workplace (Ferris & Judge, 1991; Gardner & Martinko, 1988). Nayyar and Raja (2012) researched the impact of Impression management on organisational politics and posited that in mechanistic system, employees both male and female are more inclined towards impression management to manage their political behavior than in organic organizations. Motives for both politics and impression management activities in organizational culture in higher educational sector in Pakistan may include inflating subordinates' ratings to avoid confrontations with subordinates and to promote troubled employees out of one's department.

Most of the research regarding this construct in the performance appraisal situation has been directed towards subordinate behavior (e.g., Wayne & Ferris, 1990; Wayne & Kacmar, 1991), researchers have also acknowledged that raters also engage in impression management activities (Villanova & Bernardin, 1989). Ferris and Judge (1991) observed that the behavior evinced by a supervisor giving feedback may be more influenced by how their behavior will look to their superiors than by the anticipated effect on the subordinate. According to Zerbe and Paulhus (1987) impression management activities include self-impression management and management of other's impressions. Self-impression management is the desire to have highly rated subordinates to maintain one's self image as a successful manager and perceptions of one's role as a manager. Management of other's impressions is concerned with maintaining an appropriate image regarding one's subordinates, i.e. that one has successful subordinates.

In sum, these three facets determining motivation discussed above are in turn determined by both situational and personal variables (Harris, 1994). The situational variables include accountability, organizational strategy, task/outcome dependence, trust, and rating forms. Harris (1994) postulated that accountability to subordinates should lead to inflated ratings because of supervisors' concerns that negative ratings will reduce subordinates' motivation and damage supervisors' relationship with subordinates. Accountability to raters' supervisors should lead to more accurate performance ratings as long as the supervisors' positions regarding the ratee are unknown. Recent research has found that accountability may lead to more accurate ratings as long as supervisors' or subordinates' views are not known to the rater (Jones, 1992; Klimoski & Inks, 1990; Mero & Motowidlo, 1995). Furthermore, according to Harris (1994), task outcome dependence should increase rater motivation: the greater the extent to which the supervisor's outcomes are linked to the subordinate's work (task dependence), the more likely the supervisor will provide accurate ratings and accurate feedback. The last situational variable to be discussed, trust in the performance appraisal system, is likely to increase rater motivation: Increased trust in the system is related to increased motivation to provide accurate ratings. Low trust has been shown to be related to rating leniency (Bemardin & Cardy, 1992; Bemardin, Orban, & Carlyle, 1981). The personal variables affecting the three facets of rater motivation include the amount of information, self-efficacy, and mood. According to Harris (1994), insufficient information regarding the ratee and raters' low self-efficacy should adversely affect rater motivation, but raters' negative moods should be linked to increased motivation to provide accurate performance ratings (Forgas, 1992).

Furthermore, in keeping with the model of performance appraisal these all factors have potential effect on rater's motivation, which in turn affects all steps of performance appraisal process from observation, storage, retrieval, integration, rating, to feedback. Social psychological theorists have suggested that motivation affects the type of information processing used by the rater (Chaiken, 1980; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; Tesser & Shaffer, 1990; Tetlock, 1985). They have postulated two quite different information processing strategies; a rater may use a very thorough, analytic approach called deliberate processing, or a quick, heuristic-based approach which is called non-deliberate processing to judgment and decision-making. The general proposition here is that motivated raters will be more likely to

use deliberate processing, while non-motivated raters will be more likely to use non-deliberate processing (Mitchell & Beach, 1990; Feldman, 1981).

Consequences of Rater's motivation

In addition to its effects on various steps in the performance appraisal process, appraiser motivation is likely to have several other consequences. These are discussed next.

Appraiser behavior:

A number of other appraiser behaviors may be affected by motivation. It seems plausible that motivated raters will be more likely to maintain a diary of subordinates' behavior. And the rating form that rater who keeps the record and maintain diaries will have significantly less leniency and halo effect, and, most important, have a greater inter-rater agreement (Bernardin and Walter , 1977). It is likely that appraiser motivation will affect the time and energy spent preparing for feedback sessions. According to Neuberg (1989), the more motivated the appraiser is, the more likely the appraiser will seek out performance-related information from a variety of sources, including peers, customers, and others. Finally, appraiser motivation is likely to affect whether a performance appraisal form is completed accurately or not (Fried et al., 1992).

Appraisee reactions:

Ratee reactions are a frequently employed indicator of performance appraisal system effectiveness (e.g., Dipboye & de Pontbriand, 1981; Giles & Mossholder, 1990; Landy, Barnes & Murphy, 1978), and there are several reasons to believe that rater motivation will increase employee satisfaction with the performance appraisal system. Kaleem, Jabeen, and Twana (2013) explored the significance of satisfaction in performance appraisal context in Pakistan and analysed how work performance can be increased by fairness of organizational justice perceptions among the employees of an organization. The results indicated that there is mediating role of performance appraisal satisfaction in the organizational justice and work performance relationship that increase the work performance. Similarly, according to Sabeen

and Mehboob (2008), employee perception of fairness of performance appraisal has been shown to be linked to satisfaction with the system.

A research carried out by Folger and Konovsky (1989) and Greenberg (1986) has indicated that the performance appraisal process (e.g., whether the appraiser was familiar with the appraisee's work) is separate from performance appraisal outcomes (e.g., size of one's raise) and both of these constructs play a role in ratee reactions to the system. Given that appraiser motivation is hypothesized to increase the amount of information gathered and recalled, the thoroughness with which this information is processed, and so forth, it seems likely that higher rater motivation to engage in performance appraisal activities will result in superior procedural justice perceptions, which in turn will improve appraisee reactions to the appraisal system. Giles & Mossholder, (1990) assumed that rater motivation will lead to more specific, timely, and accurate feedback, subordinates should also be more satisfied with the performance appraisal session. Hence, it is hypothesized that higher rater motivation will result in greater employee satisfaction with the appraisal process. The opportunity to communicate information in the decision adds to judgments of the fairness of the decision making process. The most important performance appraisal issue faced by organizations is perceived fairness of the appraisal review and the performance appraisal system. The performance appraisal process can become a source of extreme dissatisfaction when employees believe the system is biased, political, or irrelevant.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

A number of researchers have recently suggested that rater motivation is a key factor in understanding performance appraisal issues: for instance, lack of rater motivation may account for the greatest amount of variance in the quality of data (Schmitt & Klimoski 1991: 189). Murphy and Cleveland (1991) argued the similar argument in this way; that raters do not fail to give accurate ratings because they are incapable of accuracy but rather because they are unwilling to rate accurately. The present paper provides researchers with the opportunity to explore performance appraisals from a new perspective; never has been explored before in Pakistan as a developing country context. In so doing, it opened up new

research avenues and theoretical frameworks upon which performance appraisals could be investigated and improved.

Pakistan faces many challenges in the education sector. Although subsequent governments have made different efforts to improve the education situation, these efforts have not led the system to the desired outcomes. Indeed studies over the past 15 years (Ahmad, 2009; Andrabi, Das, & Khwaja, 2002; Farah, 1996; Simkins, Garrett, Memon, & Nazir-Ali, 1998) have concluded that in spite of various innovations and substantial financial assistance poured into the national education system by both foreign and local aid donors, there appears to be no significant change in the quality of the education system in Pakistan (National Education Policy, 1998- 2010). It would seem that in Pakistan education is in a more serious state of decline than it was at the time of independence in 1947 (Hoodbhoy, 2004).

Common PA practice called Annual confidential report (ACR) which was introduced in 1940s, and is still in use in public sectors as a remnant of the legacy of the British rule over Pakistan. Since its inception, the system has been rectified twice to clarify some technical issues. Although some progress has been made in last decade but the current system is still far from successful in practical operation. To improve its implementation among government universities, the Pakistani performance appraisal system needs to address some challenging issues, including the following: better connection of the performance appraisal system with other human resource management (HRM) systems, consideration of the employee participation in performance appraisal system, and improvement of performance appraisal system while understanding the relationship it has with its social context like rater motivation and so on.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. (1999). The Emerging Effectiveness for Human Resource Management: An Exploratory Study with Performance Appraisal, *The Journal of Management Development*, 18 (6), 543-556
- Ahmed, A., Hussain, I., Ahmed, S., & Akbar, M. F. (2010). Performance appraisals impact on attitudinal outcomes and organisational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(10), 62-68.
- Altman, S., Valenzi, E., & Hodgetts, R. (1985). *Organizational Behaviour – Theory and Practice*, New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Anjum, A., Yasmeen, K., and Khan, B. (2011) Performance Appraisal Systems in Public Sector Universities of Pakistan , *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 1(1), 41-51.
- Andrabi, T., Das, J. & Khwaja, J., A. (2002). Private Schooling in Pakistan: Catering to the Urban Elite? Available at ksghome.harvard.edu/~akhwaja/papers/Pakschool%20March29.pdf.
- Aslam, H.D. (2011) Performance Evaluation of Teachers in Universities: Contemporary Issues and Challenges, *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 1(2), 11-31.
- Armstrong, M. (2006) *Key strategies and Practical Guidelines*: 3rd edition, London, Kogan Page.
- Arshad, M. A., Masood, M. T., & Amin, G. (2013). Effects of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction, turnover intention and loyalty to supervisor: Study with reference to the telecom organizations of Pakistan. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2(3), 653-673.
- Austin, J. T., & Villanova, P. (1992). The criterion problem: 1917-1992, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 836-874.
- Banks, C.G. & Murphy, K.R. (1985). Toward narrowing the research-practice gap in performance appraisal. *Personnel Psychology*, 38, 335-345.
- Barney, B. J., (1995). Looking inside for Competitive Advantage, *The Academy of Management Executives*, 9 (4), 49-61
- Batool, Z and Qureshi, R.H. (2007) *Quality Assurance Manual for Higher Education in Pakistan*, Higher Education Commission, Pakistan.
- Bemardin, H. I, & Cardy, R L. (1982). Appraisal accuracy: The ability and motivation to remember the past, *Public Personnel Management Journal*, 119,352-357.

Bernardin, H. J., Orban, J., & Carlyle, J. (1981). *Performance ratings as a function of trust in appraisal and rater individual differences*, Proceedings of the Academy of Management Meetings (311–315).

Bernardin, J. H., & Orban, J. A. (1990). Leniency effect as a function of rating format, purpose for appraisal, and rater individual differences. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 5(2), 197-211.

Bretz, Jr. R. D., Milkovich, G. T., & Read, W. (1992). The current state of performance appraisal practice: concerns, directions, and implications, *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 321-352.

Bernardin, H. J., & Villanova, P. (1986). Performance appraisal. In E. A. Locke (Ed.), *Generalizing from laboratory to field settings* (pp. 43–62). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Brown, M., & Benson, J. (2005). Managing to overload? Work overload and performance appraisal processes, *Group & Organization Management*, 30(1), 99-124.

Murphy, K., Cleveland, J., Skattebo, A., & Kinney, T. (2004). Raters who pursue different goals give different ratings, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 158–164

DeNisi, A.S. & Williams, K.J. (1988). Cognitive approaches to performance appraisal. Pp. 109-155 in C.R. Ferris & K.R. Rowland (eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management*, Vol. 6. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Djurdjevic, E., & Wheeler, A. R. (2014) A Dynamic Multilevel Model of Performance Rating, *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 32, 147-176.

Dipboye, R.L. & de Pontbriand, R. (1981). Correlates of employee reactions to performance appraisals and appraisal systems. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66, 248-251.

Ferris G.R., Kacmar K.M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational politics, *Journal of Management*, 18, 93 – 116

Feldman, J.M. (1981). Beyond attribution theory: Cognitive processes in performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66, 127-148.

Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 74, 473-487.

Folger, R., Konovsky, M. A. & Cropanzano, R. (1992). “A Due Process Metaphor for Performance Appraisal,” In Staw, B. M. and Cummings, L.L. (Eds.), *Research In Organizational Behavior*, 14, 129-177. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

Fisher, C.D. (1989). Current and recurrent challenges in HRM, *Journal of Management*, 15(5), 157-180.

- Friedman, S.D. & LeVino, T.P. (1984). *Strategic appraisal and development at General Electric Company*. Pp. 183-201 in C. Fombrun, N.M. Tichy & M. A. DeVanna (eds.), *Strategic human resource management*. New York: John Wiley.
- Gong, Y., Law, K. S., Chang, S., & Xin, K. R. (2009). Human resources management and firm performance: The differential role of managerial affective and continuance commitment, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 263-275.
- Hall, R., (1993). A framework linking intangible resources and capabilities to sustainable competitive advantage, *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(8), 607–618.
- Harris, M. (1994). Rater motivation in the performance appraisal context: A theoretical framework. *Journal of Management*, 20, 737–756
- Hoodbhoy, P. (2004). *Can Pakistan Work? A Country in Search of Itself*, Retrieved 22nd October, 2014, from <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/60285/pervez-hoodbhoy/can-pakistan-work-a-country-in-search-of-itself>.
- Hoodbhoy, P. (1999). *Education and the State: Fifty Years of Pakistan*, Pakistan, Oxford University Press.
- Ikramullah, M., Shah, F. S., Zaman, B., Hassan.Ul. & Shah, I. A. (2011). Effects of leaders styles of decision making on perceived organizational effectiveness: An example from Pakistan, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(22), 297-307.
- Iqbal, M.Z. (2012) Expanded Dimensions of the Purposes and Uses Of Performance Appraisal, *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 17(1), 41–63
- Kaleem, M. M., Jabeen, B., & Twana, M. J. (2013) Organizational justice in performance appraisal system: impact on employee's satisfaction and work performance, *International Journal of Management Organizational Studies*, 2(2), 28-37.
- Kacmar, K.M., Bozeman, D.P., Carlson, D.S., & Anthony, W.P. (1999). An examination of the perceptions of organizational politics model: Replication and extension, *Human Relations*, 52, 383-416.
- Kane, J.S. & Lawler, E.E. (1978). Methods of peer assessment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85, 555-586.
- Khan, M. A. (2010). Effects of Human Resource Management Practices on Organizational Performance –An Empirical Study of Oil and Gas Industry in Pakistan. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 24, 1450-2275.
- Khan, S., Kazmi S., & Latif. Z. (1999). *The State of Basic Education in Pakistan: A Qualitative, Comparative, Institutional Analysis*, SDPI Working Paper Series # 47, Islamabad.

- Kotter, P., & Heskett, L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Landy, F. J. & Farr, J. L. (1980). Performance Rating, *Psychological Bulletin*, 87 (1), 72-107.
- Levy, P. E., & Williams, J. R. (2004) The Social Context of Performance Appraisal: A Review and Framework for the Future. *Journal of Management*, 30, 881-905.
- Lawler, E. (1979). Control systems in organizations. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (1247–1291). Minnesota: Rand McNally.
- Liu, X. & Dong, K. (2012). ‘Development of the civil servants’ performance appraisal system in China: challenges and improvements’, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 32, 149–168
- Linna, A, Elovainio, M., Van den Bos, K., Kivimäki, M., Pentti, J., & Vahtera, J. (2012). Can usefulness of performance appraisal interviews change organizational justice perceptions? A 4-year longitudinal study among public sector employees. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(7), 1360–1375.
- Longenecker, C., Sims, H., Jr., & Gioia, D. (1987). Behind the mask: The politics of employee appraisal. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 1, 183–193.
- Magee, K. C. (2002). *The impact of organizational culture on the implementation of performance management* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 3047909).
- Marcoulides, G., & Heck, R. (1993). Organizational culture and performance: Proposing and testing a model. *Organization Science*, 4(2), 209-225
- Mero, N, Motowidlo, S. and Anna, L. (2003). Effects of accountability on rating behavior and rater accuracy. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(12), 2493-2514.
- McGregor, D. (1957). An uneasy look at performance appraisal. *Harvard Business Review*, 35, 89–94.
- Metcalfe, J., & Mischel, W. (1999). A hot/cool-system analysis of delay of gratification: Dynamics of willpower. *Psychological Review*, 106, 3–19.
- Mohrman, A., & Lawler, E. (1983). Motivation and performance-appraisal behavior. In F. Landy, S. Zedeck, & J. Cleveland (Eds.), *Personel Performance Measurement and Theory*, (173–189).

Mitchell, T.R. & Beach, L.R. (1990). Do I love thee? Let me count.. .Toward an understanding of intuitive and automatic decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 47, 1-20.

Muczyk, J. P. (2004). A Systems Approach to Organizational Effectiveness: The Alignment of Critical Organizational Dimensions with Selected Business/Competitive Strategies. *Journal of Comparative International Management*, 7(1), 3-9

Murphy, K. R. (1992). Performance measurement and appraisal: Motivating managers to identify and reward performance. In W. J. Bruns (Ed.), *Performance Measurement, Evaluation and Incentives*, (pp. 37–62). Boston: Harvard Business School.

Murphy, K.R. & Balzer, W.K. (1989). Rater errors and rating accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 619-624.

Murphy, K.R. & Cleveland, J.N. (1991). *Performance appraisal: An organizational perspective*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding Performance Appraisal : Social Organizational and Goal-Based Perspectives*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Murphy, K.R., Cleveland, J.N., Skattebo, A. L., & Kinney, T. B. (2004). Raters who pursue different goals give different ratings, *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 158–164.

Ministry of Education (1998), *National Education Policy 1998-2010*, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad.

Ministry of Education (2002), *Education Sector Reforms Action Plan 2001-2005*, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad.

Najafi, L., Hamidi, Y., Vatankhah, S. & Puranajaf, A.,(2010). Performance Appraisal and its Effects on Employees' Motivation and Job Promotion. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 4(12), 6052-6056

Nayyar, S, & Raja, N.T. (2012). The Impact of Impression Management Behaviour on Organisational Politics Among Female employees in Organic and Mechanistic System of Pakistan Telecommunication sector, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3 (9), 914-924.

Neuberg, S.L. (1989). The goal of forming accurate impressions during social interactions: Attenuating the impact of negative expectancies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 374-386.

Obisi C., (1996). *Personnel Management*, Freman Publications Ibadan

Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. (2000). Leadership style, organizational culture and performance: Empirical evidence from UK companies. *International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 11(4), 766-788.

A Guide to Performance Evaluation (2004), Pakistan Public Administration Research Wing, Establishment Division, Islamabad.

Peteraf, M. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view, *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(3), 179–191.

Poon, J. M. L. (2004). "Effects of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction and turnover intention", *Personnel Review*, 33, 322-334.

Porter, M.E. 1990a. *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. New York: Free Press, MacMillan.

Pfeffer, J. (1997). *New directions for organization theory*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Rasheed M. I, Aslam H. D, Yousaf S. & Noor A. (2011). A Critical Analysis of Performance Appraisal System for Teachers in Public Sector Universities of Pakistan: A Case Study of the Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB). *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(80), 3297-3301.

Romer, P.M. (1993). Idea Gaps and Object Gaps in Economic Development," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 543-573.

Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous Technological Change," *Journal of Political Economy*, 96, 71-102.

Romer, P.M. (1990)."Increasing Returns and Long—Run Growth," *Journal of Political Economy*, 94, 102—1037.

Rousseau, D. (1991). Quantitative assessment of organizational culture. *Group and Organizations Studies*, 15(4), 448-460.

Sabeen, Z. & Mehbob, A. (2008). 'Perceived Fairness of and Satisfaction with Employee Performance Appraisal and Its Impact on Overall Job Satisfaction,' *The Business Review - Cambridge*, 10 (2), 185- 192.

Schein, E. (1990). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Segal, J., (2000). Your Appraisal Process? *HR Magazine*, 45(10), 199-214.

Shakeel, Mohsin; Muhammad Mazhar Khan & Dr. Muhammad Aslam Khan (2011) "Impact of culture on Business Ethics", *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business*, 3 (2), page numbers

Shakil. M. A (2012) Impact of Organizational Culture on Performance Management Practices in Pakistan, *Business Intelligence Journal*, 5(1), 50-55.

Simkins, T., Garrett, V. Memon, M. & Nazir Ali, R. (1997). The headteachers' perception of the demands, choices and constraints related to their role: A case of Pakistan '. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association (BERA) Annual Conference, York University, September, 1997.

Spence, J. R., & Keeping, L. M. (2010). The impact of non-performance information on ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 587–608.

Stafyarakis, M. & Eldridge, D. (2002) HRD and Performance Management, MSc in Human Resource Development Reading 5, IDPM University of Manchester.

Smith, D.E. (1986). Training programs for performance appraisal: A review. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 22-40

Schmitt, N. & Klimoski, R.J. (1991). *Research methods in human resources management*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing.

Tziner, A., Murphy, K., & Cleveland, J. (2001). Relationships between attitudes toward organizations and performance appraisal systems and rating behavior, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 226–239.

Tziner, A., Murphy, K., & Cleveland, J. (2002). Does conscientiousness moderate the relationship between attitudes and beliefs regarding performance appraisal and rating behavior? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 218–224.

Tziner, A., Murphy, K. R., and Cleveland, J. N. (2005), Contextual and rater factors affecting rating behavior, *Group & Organization Management*, 30, 89-98.

Valle, M. and Perrewe, P. L. (2000), Do politics perceptions relate to political behaviours? Test of an implicit assumption and expanded model, *Human Relations*, 52, 359-386.

Villanova, P., & Bernardin, H. J. (1989). *Impression management in the context of performance appraisal*. In R. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Villanova, P., Bernardin, H. J., Dahmus, S., & Sims, R. (1993). Rater leniency and performance appraisal discomfort. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 789–799.
- Wayne, S.J. & Ferris, G.R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory study and field study, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 487-499.
- Wayne, S.J. & Kacmar, K.M. (1991). The effects of impression management on the performance appraisal process, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 48, 70-88.
- Wexley, K.N. & Klimoski, R. (1984). Performance appraisal: An update. Pp. 35-79 in G.R. Ferris & K.R. Rowland (eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management*, 2. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Whisler, T. (1958). Performance appraisal and the organization man. *Journal of Business*, 31, 19–27.
- Wiersma, U. & Latham, G.P. (1986). The practicality of behavioral observation scales, behavioral expectation scales, and trait scales. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 619-628.
- Wong, K. F. E., & Kwong, J. Y. Y. (2007). Effects of rater goals on rating patterns: Evidence from an experimental field study. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 577–585.
- Yilmaz, C., & Ergun, E. (2008). Organizational culture and firm effectiveness: An examination of relative effects of culture traits and the balanced culture hypothesis in an emerging economy. *Journal of World Business*, 43, 290–306.
- Zerbe, W.J. & Paulhus, D.L. (1987). Socially desirable responding in organizational behavior: A reconception. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 250-264.