

## NEED TO EXAMINE HUMAN BIASES IN PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

S. A. MUFEED<sup>1</sup> & JENIFUR MAJID<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Director, the Business School, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, India

<sup>2</sup>Research Scholar, the Business School, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, India

### ABSTRACT

Much research has been directional towards the need to examine the human biases in performance appraisals particularly the gender bias. Performance appraisals are a linkage between effective functioning of an organisation, the career growth and development of its employees. It creates a pathway within the organisation to identify good performers from the weak performers thereby acting as an opportunity to the employees for improvement in the future, and at the same time rewarding the distinguished performances. The implementation of an effective performance appraisal programme, however, is challenging to any organisation to arrive at. The present paper reviews performance appraisals in the light of human biases that possibly find their way into performance appraisals affecting their effectiveness and credibility at the same time. Four telecom players have been compared based in Jammu & Kashmir: BSNL, Airtel, Vodafone and IDEA. In this research paper, an attempt has been made to assess the perception of the appraisee managers towards the occurrence of gender bias in their existing performance appraisal system.

**KEYWORDS:** Gender Bias, Job Performance, Employee Empowerment, Performance Evaluation, Favouritism, Managerial Satisfaction

### INTRODUCTION

Literary evidences witness racial differences in performance are found persistently pointing towards favouritism, stereotyping and hostility. Excessively high or low scores are given only to certain individuals or groups based on the rater's attitude towards the rate, not on actual outcomes or behaviours. This includes bias on the basis of gender, race, friendship and the like. *Hayness (1978)* has suggested four ways to reduce the possibility of the personal bias: (a) by introducing second level review, (b) group appraisals, where the judgement of the assessor is supplemented by others who have an appropriate relationship with the employee being evaluated, (c) multiple appraisal, and (d) field review specialists, under this supervisors prepare an appraisal report from the data obtained.

*Ronam & Prien (1971); Rao, 1992; Borman, 1975 & Thorndike (1920)* are of the view that apart from the rater errors arising out of appraisers likes and dislikes, many other factors such as difference in the information available to the different appraisers, recency effects, first impression errors. Variations in the implicit definitions of the performance criteria used by the individual assessor, certain assessor and assessee characteristics and the nature of the interpersonal relationship between the assessor and assessee also have been identified as the source of errors in subjective measures of performance.

*Ford et al. (1986)* conducted a meta analysis across 53 studies showing that blacks receive slightly lower performance scores than whites on both subjective and objective measures. Studying a sample of supermarket cahiers, *Du*

*Bois et al. (1993)* showed that black-white rater differences also were significant. The evaluation favoured whites on four different performance criteria that reflected two separate performance domains (accuracy & speed) as well as measure of typical performance. Thus its mandatory that the appraiser is aware of personal biases and is willing to take action minimise their effect and such perceptions during an evaluation are kept at bay. It can also be ensured that the rater has checklist to obtain and review job related information. The rater must focus attention on performance related behaviours over which the rater has better control than in other aspects of evaluation. The rating scores by raters of one group or organisation are summarised and compared with those by other raters.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Gender biases are also very common as research indicates occurrences. The relationship between gender and performance has received some investigation. *Pulakos et al. (1989)* found that males were rated significantly higher than females by peers. However, this difference was not observed for supervisors. All main and interactive effects associated with rater and ratee gender on performance ratings were small, accounting for a minimal amount of rating variance. The study noted easier by *Woehr & Roch (1996)* showed that females tend to receive relatively lower ratings compared with males when being rated after the evaluation of low performing ratee. One hypothesis put forward to explain why groups might differ is that the antecedents of job performance may not be the same for men and women. *Pulakos et al.* further tested this hypothesis using structural modeling, and their data suggest that the antecedents of performance are similar across gender and racial groups. *Parvez et al., 2010 & Fiona et al., 2011* suggest that female workforce is a missing pillar in HRD & needs urgent reformation in times of globalization.

The issue of whether rating type of format has anything to do with differential ratings given to racial minorities, women or older employees is explored in a review by *Bernardin et al. (1995)*. They observed that expert witnesses working for plaintiffs in discrimination case often testify that age, race or gender bias in performance ratings is due to the use of performance appraisal systems that are too subjective or insufficiently specific which is but negatively correlated with supervisory ratings there was some evidence that job type moderated the relationship observed; performance ratings showed more positive relationship with age for professionals compared with non professionals.

Eliminating any personal associations can also make the PAS objective and unbiased (*Lisa, 2014*). She further suggested that if the rater doesn't feel he/she can be objective in a performance evaluation, the ethical thing to do is defer the task to another manager or superior. This is especially important if he/she has a dislike for a staffer, has a history of conflict/disagreement or are otherwise prejudiced against that person and unable to evaluate her in an ethical and unbiased manner. *Bianca (2014)* suggests that it must be understood that appraisal is part of consolidating and verifying agreed action, which must be effectively done to lead to employee empowerment.

### Objectives

In the light of the domain for research identified so far, the following objectives have been set for the present study;

- To measure the perception of managers (male and female appraisees) on the existing PAS in the study units
- To find out the differences in perception of managers towards existing PAS in the sample study units

- To find out the deficiencies if any, and suggest the ways for improvement in the existing PAS in order to reduce gender based bias.

### Hypothesis

The following hypothesis has been laid down for the present research study:

**Ha:** There is a significant difference in perception based on gender of the appraisees with respect to the existing PAS in the sample units under study.

### Research Design And Approach

The research study is based in J&K, India, on four telecom organisations, BSNL, Vodafone, IDEA and Airtel which have been selected using purposive sampling. Further, the study is based on manager appraisees only, which have been selected on the basis of stratified random sampling, from all the three levels of managerial hierarchy. Out of 404 managers in total, 228 sample size was considered, out of which 176 minimum response rate was ensured (Vodafone: 22, Airtel: 21, IDEA: 18 and BSNL: 115). A closed ended questionnaire (based on ranking order) was used in this research study based on similar research studies *Pareek (2002)*, *Mehta (1994)* and *Mufeed (2011)*. Independent t test was done and p value was determined to reach at the conclusions. Further, interviews were conducted with the managers from all the four organisations in order to assess their perceptions about the occurrence of gender bias in the existing appraisal systems used in their respective organisations. Performance appraisals in all these organisations under study is done annually.

**Table 1: T Test for Significance of Difference across Gender in the Sample Study Organisations**

Statements	Gender	BSNL Appraisees (N=115)				Vodafone Appraisees (N=22)				IDEA Appraisees (N=18)				Airtel Appraisees (N=21)			
		MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value
<b>Design Variables</b>																	
1. Expectations on the Job	Male	3.38	0.92	2.11	0.037	2.94	0.87	-1.12	0.27	3.00	1.03	1.886	0.07	3.00	1.03	0.91	0.37
	Female	2.96	1.01			3.50	1.00			2.00	0.001			2.57	0.97		
2. Expression on Training Needs	Male	3.64	0.76	3.85	<0.01**	2.77	0.73	-1.11	0.28	2.42	0.85	-1.43	0.88	3.00	1.03	0.91	0.37
	Female	2.96	1.01			3.25	0.95			2.50	1.00			2.57	0.97		
3. Self Appraisals	Male	3.20	0.98	-2.76	0.01**	2.61	0.77	-0.83	0.42	3.35	0.84	-8.78	0.39	2.57	0.93	1.59	0.12
	Female	3.71	0.46			3.00	1.15			3.75	0.50			2.00	0.001		
4. Objectives of Performance Appraisal	Male	3.41	0.91	2.24	0.02*	3.05	1.05	0.48	0.63	2.00	0.001	-4.91	0.63	1.72	0.46	-1.59	0.12
	Female	2.96	1.01			2.75	1.50			2.00	<0.01			2.00	0.001		
5. Improvement In Communication	Male	3.36	0.93	-0.27	0.78	2.77	1.16	0.04	0.96	2.72	0.99	-1.43	0.88	3.42	0.93	1.949	0.066
	Female	3.42	0.92			2.75	1.50			3.00	1.15			2.57	0.97		
6. Personality Factors	Male	2.58	0.91	-1.92	0.05*	3.50	0.71	0.001	1.00	2.42	0.85	1.134	0.27	2.28	0.46	1.59	0.12
	Female	2.96	1.01			3.50	1.00			2.50	1.00			2.00	0.001		
7. Proper Feedback	Male	3.34	0.94	0.43	0.66	2.66	0.97	-1.55	0.13	2.78	0.89	-1.43	0.88	2.64	0.93	0.56	0.58
	Female	3.25	0.82			3.50	1.00			2.25	0.50			2.42	.53		
8. Development Needs	Male	2.35	0.76	-7.22	<0.01**	2.83	1.04	-0.67	0.51	2.42	0.85	0.84	0.41	2.64	0.92	0.56	0.58
	Female	3.54	0.85			3.25	1.50			2.50	1.00			2.42	0.53		
9. Opportunity for Performance Discussion	Male	3.69	1.31	4.23	<0.01**	2.38	1.41	-1.08	0.29	4.22	0.89	-1.193	0.25	3.14	1.71	2.79	<0.01*
	Female	2.48	1.52			3.25	1.50			3.75	1.25			1.28	0.48		
10. Redressal of Grievances	Male	2.68	0.95	-7.67	<0.01**	2.55	1.09	-1.07	0.29	3.42	0.93	0.85	0.40	2.57	0.93	1.59	0.12
	Female	4.00	0.001			3.25	1.50			4.00	0.001			2.00	0.001		
11. Future Roles & Responsibilities	Male	2.61	0.92	0.16	0.87	2.27	1.32	-1.31	0.20	3.00	1.03	1.16	0.26	2.85	0.86	2.59	0.02*
	Female	2.58	0.92			3.25	1.50			2.50	1.00			2.00	0.00		
12. Mutual Understanding	Male	2.55	1.48	-1.37	0.17	3.11	1.61	-0.45	0.65	2.07	0.92	-0.14	0.88	2.28	0.46	1.59	0.12
	Female	2.96	1.31			3.50	1.29			1.50	0.57			2.00	0.00		
13. Accomplishment of Tasks	Male	2.68	0.95	0.51	0.61	1.61	1.03	1.15	0.26	2.42	0.85	0.25	0.79	2.28	0.46	1.59	0.12
	Female	2.58	0.92			1.00	0.001			2.50	1.00			2.00	0.00		

Statements	Gender	BSNL Appraisees C(N=115)				Vodafone Appraisees (N=22)				IDEA Appraisees (N=18)				Airtel Appraisees (N=21)			
		MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value
14. Insight Into Strengths & Weaknesses	Male	3.17	1.24	0.31	0.75	2.66	1.18	0.62	0.53	2.92	1.07	0.22	0.82	2.28	1.13	-1.06	0.30
	Female	3.09	1.13			2.25	1.25			2.75	1.71			2.85	1.22		
15. Performance Planning	Male	2.91	1.21	-0.36	0.71	2.61	1.03	-0.63	0.53	2.93	1.38	-0.05	0.95	3.07	1.26	0.88	0.39
	Female	3.00	1.34			3.00	1.41			2.75	1.50			2.57	1.13		
16. Improvement In Performance	Male	3.11	1.41	0.03	0.97	2.00	1.18	0.001	1.00	2.71	0.92	0.02	0.90	3.21	1.05	0.73	0.47
	Female	3.09	1.32			2.00	0.81			2.75	2.06			2.85	1.06		
<b>Process Variables</b>																	
17. Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal	Male	3.54	0.76	3.75	<0.01	2.77	0.73	-1.11	0.28	2.42	0.85	-0.143	0.88	3.00	1.03	0.81	0.37
	Female	2.86	1.01			3.25	0.95			2.50	1.00			2.67	0.97		
18. Orientation Programmes	Male	3.30	0.98	-2.66	0.01**	2.61	0.77	-0.83	0.42	3.35	0.84	-0.878	0.39	2.57	0.93	1.69	0.12
	Female	3.61	0.46			3.10	1.15			3.75	0.60			2.01	0.001		
19. Priority in terms of time	Male	3.51	0.95	2.34	0.03	3.05	1.05	0.48	0.63	2.00	0.001	-0.481	0.63	1.72	0.46	-1.59	0.12
	Female	2.86	1.02			2.85	1.60			2.10	0.001			2.00	0.001		
20. Support in Performance Planning	Male	3.36	0.93	-0.26	0.88	2.77	1.16	0.04	0.96	2.62	0.99	-0.143	0.88	3.42	0.83	1.99	0.066
	Female	3.42	0.92			2.75	1.50			3.00	1.15			2.57	0.97		
21. Key Task Related Discussions	Male	2.58	0.91	-1.92	0.05*	3.50	0.71	0.001	1.00	2.42	0.85	1.134	0.27	2.28	0.46	1.59	0.12
	Female	2.96	1.01			3.50	1.00			2.50	1.00			2.00	0.001		
22. Objective and Unbiased Assessment	Male	3.34	0.94	0.434	0.66	2.66	0.97	-1.55	0.13	2.78	0.89	-0.143	0.88	2.64	0.93	0.56	0.58
	Female	3.35	0.82			3.50	1.00			2.25	0.50			2.42	0.53		
23. Factors Affecting Performance	Male	2.35	0.76	-7.22	<0.01**	2.83	1.04	-0.67	0.51	2.42	0.85	0.84	0.41	2.64	0.92	0.56	0.58
	Female	3.54	0.85			3.15	1.50			2.50	1.00			2.42	0.53		
24. Quality and Effectiveness	Male	3.59	1.41	4.23	<0.01**	2.48	1.41	-1.08	0.29	4.22	0.89	-1.193	0.25	3.14	1.71	2.79	0.01**
	Female	2.58	1.52			3.35	1.50			3.75	1.25			1.28	0.48		
25. Participation in Performance Interview	Male	2.57	0.95	-7.67	<0.01**	2.15	1.09	-1.07	0.29	3.42	0.93	0.85	0.40	2.57	0.93	1.59	0.12
	Female	4.00	0.001			3.25	1.50			4.00	0.001			2.00	0.001		
26. Overrating Performance	Male	2.61	0.92	0.16	0.87	2.27	1.32	-1.31	0.20	3.00	1.03	1.16	0.26	2.95	0.86	2.59	0.02*
	Female	2.58	.92			3.25	1.55			2.50	1.10			2.00	0.001		
27. Performance Interview	Male	2.55	1.68	-1.37	0.37	3.11	1.71	-0.65	0.65	2.07	0.92	-0.14	0.98	2.78	0.46	1.59	0.12

Statements	Gender	BSNL Appraisees (N=115)				Vodafone Appraisees (N=22)				IDEA Appraisees (N=18)				Airtel Appraisees (N=21)			
		MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value
<b>Outcome Variable</b>																	
28. Underrating Performance	Male	2.27	1.14	-1.6	0.11	3.33	1.13	0.88	0.38	2.00	0.67	0.001	1.00	3.35	1.59	1.11	0.28
	Female	2.67	1.35			2.75	1.50			2.00	0.82			2.57	1.39		
29. Corrective Actions	Male	3.20	1.47	1.49	0.14	2.05	1.31	-0.27	0.78	4.23	0.89	2.26	0.03*	2.57	.93	1.59	0.13
	Female	2.74	1.43			2.25	1.25			3.00	1.15			2.00	0.001		
30. Administrative Purposes	Male	2.68	0.95	-4.45	<0.01*	2.77	1.16	0.04	0.96	3.42	0.93	1.73	0.11	3.14	0.94	0.66	0.52
	Female	3.54	0.85			2.75	1.50			2.50	1.00			2.85	0.89		
31. Identification of Training Needs	Male	2.49	0.85	-5.891	<0.01*	1.00	0.001	-1.18	0.25	2.42	0.85	-0.14	0.88	3.00	0.78	0.001	1.00
	Female	3.54	0.85			1.00	0.001			2.50	1.00			3.00	0.001		
32. Performance Appraisal Related Decisions	Male	2.91	0.92	-0.63	0.53	3.44	0.92	-1.01	0.32	3.00	1.03	-1.88	0.07	2.57	0.93	0.69	0.49
	Female	3.03	1.02			4.00	0.001			4.00	0.00			2.28	0.75		
33. Poor Performance	Male	3.41	0.92	6.51	<0.01*	3.27	0.89	0.76	0.45	3.23	0.89	2.04	0.05*	2.64	0.92	0.56	0.58
	Female	2.29	0.46			3.75	0.50			2.25	0.50			2.42	0.53		
34. Development Purposes	Male	2.94	1.01	-4.09	<0.01*	3.11	0.83	-0.37	0.72	2.78	0.89	-2.04	0.05*	2.57	0.93	1.59	0.13
	Female	3.71	0.46			2.75	0.95			3.75	0.50			2.00	0.00		
35. Career Growth & Learning	Male	3.08	0.91	-2.49	0.01**	3.05	0.93	0.44	0.66	3.57	0.93	1.99	0.06	2.57	0.93	1.59	0.12
	Female	3.54	0.85			3.25	0.95			2.50	1.00			2.00	0.001		
36. Favouritism	Male	2.61	1.32	-0.92	<0.36	2.77	1.16	-0.92	0.36	2.92	1.43	1.84	0.08	3.28	1.13	0.79	0.43
	Female	2.87	1.43			2.50	1.00			1.50	1.00			2.85	1.22		
37. Desirable Behaviour	Male	2.62	1.11	-0.52	0.61	2.88	1.23	0.27	0.75	2.35	0.84	0.75	0.46	3.00	1.03	0.28	0.78
	Female	2.74	1.12			3.50	1.00			2.00	0.82			2.85	1.22		
<b>Organisational Context</b>																	
38. Satisfaction With Organization	Male	2.77	0.98	-3.89	<0.01*	3.38	0.77	-0.24	0.80	2.87	1.02	0.61	0.54	3.14	1.02	2.90	<0.01**
	Female	3.54	0.85			3.50	1.00			2.50	1.00			2.00	0.00		
39. Task Definition	Male	3.34	0.76	-4.78	<0.01*	2.77	1.00	0.50	0.62	3.78	0.42	0.14	0.88	2.64	0.92	0.56	0.58
	Female	4.00	0.001			2.50	1.00			3.75	0.50			2.42	0.53		
40. Organization Policies &	Male	2.88	0.90	-2.02	0.04*	3.22	1.00	-0.50	0.62	2.21	0.42	-0.14	0.88	2.57	0.93	1.59	0.12

Statements	Gender	BSNL Appraisees (N=115)				Vodafone Appraisees (N=22)				IDEA Appraisees (N=18)				Airtel Appraisees (N=21)			
		MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value	MS	SD	T-Value	P-Value
41. Parameters of Performance	Male	2.61	0.92	-6.30	<0.01**	3.55	0.51	-0.69	0.49	2.92	0.91	-0.61	0.54	2.71	0.91	1.15	0.26
	Female	3.70	0.46			3.75	0.50			3.25	0.95			2.28	0.48		
42. Sharing of Information	Male	2.52	0.78	-6.07	<0.01**	3.55	0.51	-0.69	0.49	2.42	0.85	-0.14	0.88	2.71	0.91	1.15	0.26
	Female	3.54	0.85			3.75	0.50			2.50	1.00			2.28	0.48		
43. Rewards & Job Performance	Male	3.27	0.96	-1.41	0.16	2.77	0.73	-1.10	0.28	2.85	1.02	-0.23	0.81	2.57	0.93	1.59	0.12
	Female	3.54	0.85			3.25	0.95			3.00	1.15			2.00	0.001		
44. Rewards & Encouragements	Male	3.29	0.85	1.32	0.18	3.16	0.85	-1.90	0.07	2.85	1.02	0.61	0.54	2.71	0.99	-0.30	0.76
	Female	3.06	0.72			4.00	0.001			2.50	1.00			2.85	1.06		
45. Confidence & Trust	Male	2.47	1.14	-2.70	<0.01**	2.88	1.02	-2.13	0.04*	3.28	0.99	0.49	0.63	3.28	0.99	0.90	0.37
	Female	3.06	0.72			4.00	0.001			3.00	1.15			2.85	1.06		
46. Standard of Performance	Male	3.47	1.08	1.95	0.05*	2.77	1.00	0.50	0.62	4.00	0.001	-0.08	0.93	2.71	0.91	1.15	0.26
	Female	3.03	1.01			2.50	1.00			2.75	0.50			2.28	0.48		
47. Philosophy of Management	Male	2.81	0.87	-4.01	<0.01**	3.38	0.77	-0.24	0.80	2.71	0.82	1.21	0.24	2.57	0.93	1.59	0.12
	Female	3.48	0.50			3.50	1.00			2.75	0.50			2.00	0.001		
48. Awareness of Problems	Male	2.50	0.86	-5.90	<0.01**	3.16	0.85	-1.90	0.07	3.28	0.82	-0.08	0.93	2.07	0.26	0.69	0.49
	Female	3.48	0.50			4.00	0.001			2.75	0.50			2.00	0.001		
49. Development on the Job	Male	3.14	0.98	-1.83	0.06	3.11	1.02	-0.69	0.49	2.71	0.82	1.72	0.10	2.85	0.86	2.59	<0.01**
	Female	3.48	0.50			3.50	1.00			2.75	0.50			2.00	0.001		
50. Information & Inputs	Male	3.01	1.00	2.00	0.03*	2.83	0.85	-1.37	0.18	3.42	0.93	-2.04	.058	2.64	0.92	1.80	0.08
	Female	2.58	0.92			3.50	1.00			2.50	1.00			2.00	0.001		
51. Criticism	Male	2.61	0.92	-0.69	0.49	3.44	0.92	-1.18	0.25	2.78	0.89	-1.04	.313	3.14	1.02	2.90	<0.01**
	Female	2.74	0.81			4.00	0.001			3.75	0.50			2.00	0.001		
52. Non Performance	Male	3.11	1.33	0.65	0.51	2.83	1.15	-0.62	0.54	2.78	1.18	-0.60	0.50	2.14	1.02	0.65	0.52

Statements	Gender	BSNL Appraisees (N=115)				Vodafone Appraisees (N=22)				IDEA Appraisees (N=18)				Airtel Appraisees (N=21)			
		MS	SD	t-value	p-value	MS	SD	t-value	p-value	MS	SD	t-value	p-value	MS	SD	t-value	p-value
<b>Appraisee's Satisfaction with PAS (ASPAS)</b>																	
53. Reconsideration of Performance Ratings	Male	2.75	1.58	2.14	0.03*	4.44	0.78	1.67	0.18	2.50	1.45	0.91	0.37	3.21	1.62	-0.29	0.76
	Female	2.06	1.36			3.75	0.50			1.75	1.50			3.42	1.39		
54. Supervision	Male	3.92	0.68	0.20	0.83	3.44	0.92	-1.18	0.25	4.00	0.001	-0.98	0.33	3.21	0.97	1.97	0.06
	Female	3.90	0.30			4.00	0.001			4.00	0.001			2.42	0.53		
55. Bias Free Ratings	Male	3.11	0.99	-3.62	<0.01**	3.33	0.90	-0.87	0.39	3.57	0.85	1.37	0.18	2.28	0.46	0.69	0.49
	Female	3.80	0.60			3.75	0.50			4.00	0.001			2.14	0.37		
56. Satisfaction with Grievance Handling	Male	2.80	0.94	-2.44	0.02*	3.38	0.77	2.14	0.04*	3.21	0.89	-1.67	0.12	3.00	0.78	-2.19	0.04*
	Female	3.29	0.97			2.50	0.57			2.50	1.00			3.71	0.48		
57. Satisfaction with Training & Development	Male	2.70	0.91	-3.46	<0.01**	4.00	0.80	-1.97	0.06	2.57	0.64	-1.67	0.13	2.71	0.99	-0.30	0.76
	Female	3.35	0.83			4.00	0.001			3.25	0.95			2.85	1.06		
58. Esteem/Recognition Needs	Male	2.55	0.86	-4.45	<0.01**	2.77	0.94	-1.37	0.18	2.57	0.64	-0.14	0.88	3.42	0.85	0.71	0.48
	Female	3.35	0.83			3.75	0.50			3.25	0.95			3.14	0.89		
59. Feedback for Improvement	Male	2.51	0.88	-3.35	<0.01**	2.77	0.94	-2.00	0.05*	2.42	0.85	0.44	0.66	3.00	0.78	2.19	0.04*
	Female	3.16	1.00			3.50	1.00			2.50	1.00			2.28	0.48		
60. Linkage to Remuneration	Male	3.09	1.05	-0.75	0.45	1.94	1.10	0.90	0.28	2.07	1.30	0.81	0.20	1.92	0.73	0.19	0.84
	Female	3.25	0.99			3.25	1.50			1.75	0.95			1.85	0.89		

- **Scoring Scale:** 5=Strongly agree, 4=Agree, 3=Not Sure, 2=Disagree and 1=Strongly Disagree
- Higher mean score indicates strongly favorable perception of appraisees towards the overall PAS in the respective organization and a lower mean score indicates vice versa.
- \*\* denotes highly significant values. Significance level 0.05. \* denotes significant values.
- MS = Mean score & SD =Standard deviation
- Design Variables-PAPO=Performance Appraisal Policies and Objectives, Process Variables-PAM=Performance Appraisal Methods/Process, PAE=Performance Appraisal Evaluation/Effectiveness, Organizational Context

Variables-OC= Organizational Context and ASPAS= Appraisee's Satisfaction with Performance Appraisal System for onward references as well

Table 1, depicts the result of independent t test (equal variances assumed) for the perceptual differences across gender in BSNL, Vodafone, IDEA and Airtel as per the variable dimensions. From the table, it is observed that the mean score is highest in case of male gender for design variable in case of BSNL at statement no. 9 with the scores MS: 3.64 and SD 0.76, followed by statements 2 and 1, which implies that there is high level of satisfaction in case of male gender in BSNL with respect to these statements.

Further, there is a significant difference with respect to statements 1 (t value=2.11 and p value= 0.037), followed by statements 2, 3,4, 6, 8, 9, and 10, with a p value ranging below 0.05% level of significance and in case of statements 5, 7,11,12,13,14,15 and 16 in the design variable record there is a non significant difference between BSNL male and female appraisees with p value above 0.05%, which implies that the null hypothesis is accepted. In statements 2, 3,9,10 there is a high significant difference (less than 0.01), which indicates acceptance of the alternate hypothesis for design variable in BSNL, It may be noted that redressal of grievances is an important factor of PAS. Many times the ratees end up with dissatisfaction towards their ratings by the supervisors. Grievance handling therefore plays a vital role in removing the clouds of doubt about ratings from the appraisee's perception.

Conversely, there is an observed high level of satisfaction expressed from amongst the female gender in BSNL at statement no's 10, 3 and 8, the mean score recorded highest as 4.00 with SD=0.001.

In case of design variables for Vodafone appraisees, the highest mean score from amongst the male gender has been noted at statement no. 6 (MS= 3.50 and SD =0.71), followed by statements no's 12 and 4. Similarly, in case of female appraisees, highest mean score is 3.50 with S at statement no.1, 6, 7 and 12, followed by statement no's 2,9, 10, 11 and 3 and 15. Over all, it is observed for Vodafone, that there is an insignificant difference between male and female appraisees; hence the null hypothesis is accepted for the design variables.

Further, it is observed that the mean score is highest in case of male appraisees at statement no.9 (MS= 4.22, SD= 0.89), followed by statement no. 10 and 2 in design variables, indicating a higher perceptual difference. The mean scores are higher at statement no's 10, 9, 3 and 5 recorded for female appraisees. The table (for design variable) indicates that there is an insignificant difference between male and female respondents with respect to all the statements regarding design variables in IDEA, therefore accepting null hypothesis.

Observations from the Airtel appraisees analyzed data, male depict high mean score at statement no. 5 with a mean score MS= 3.42 and S.D= 0.93, followed by statements 16 and 9. Similarly for female respondents statements 14 and 16 record highest mean score leading to the conclusion that there is highest level of satisfaction, followed by statements 1,2,5 and 15. Further, it is observed that there is a significant difference between male and female appraisees with respect to statement no. 9 and 11. The statements 1 to 8 and 12 to 16 including statement no.10, there is an insignificant difference between male and female respondents in Airtel as the p value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the alternative hypothesis is rejected in favour of null hypothesis incase of design variables.

In table 1, it is observed that the mean score for process variable in BSNL, is recorded at statement no. 24, (MS= 3.59, SD=1.41) indicating a high level of satisfaction in case of male respondents towards quality and effectiveness

standards in their organization, followed by statements 17 and 19. The female respondents have shown highest satisfaction at statement no. 25 (MS= 4.00 and SD= 0.001) which depicts a status of strongly agree, which implies that all the female ratees participate actively in their performance interviews. The highest mean score in females is followed by the statements 18 and 23. The statements 17,18,19,21,23,24,25 indicate p value within 0.05, from which it can be concluded that the alternative hypothesis is accepted, and there is a significant difference between male and female respondents in BSNL with respect to these statements.

The process variables in case of Vodafone appraisees (male) record a high mean score at Key task related discussions, statement no. 21, (MS=3.50 and SD=0.71), followed by statements 27 and 19. For female respondents, the highest mean score is observed at statements 27 (MS= 3.60, SD= 1.29), followed by statements 21, 22, 17, 24, 25 and 26. Overall, there is an insignificant difference between male and female respondents in Vodafone; hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

IDEA male appraisees record highest mean score at statement no. 24 (MS=4.22, SD=0.89), followed by statements 25 and 18, which means there is a high degree of satisfaction expressed at these statements. Female appraisees have recorded highest mean score at statement 25 (MS=4.00 and SD= 0.01), followed by the statements 18, 24 and 20. It is further noted that there is an insignificant difference between the male and female respondents in case of IDEA for process variables.

Airtel male appraisees record a highest mean score at statement 20, regarding support in performance planning by the superior (MS=3.42 and SD= 0.83) indicating a high level of satisfaction, followed by statements 24 and 17. In case of female respondents the highest mean score is recorded at statement 17 (MS= 2.67 and SD= 0.97), followed by 20, 22 and 23. Overall for process variable in Airtel, there is an observed insignificant difference between male and female appraisees, hence rejecting the alternative hypothesis in favour of null hypothesis.

The outcome variable is related to the performance appraisal evaluation and effectiveness in organization. The design and process variable are all directed towards the outcome variable for accomplishment of organizational goals. In case of BSNL, the highest mean from table 5.3, outcome variable, in case of male respondents is witnessed at statement no. 33 with a mean score MS=3.41 and SD=0.92, indicating a high level of satisfaction, followed by statements 29 and 35. For female respondents, the highest mean score is recorded at statement 34, development purpose, MS= 3.71 and SD= 0.46, followed by statements 30, 31, 35, 32. It is also observed that there is a significant difference between male and female respondents at statement no's 30, 31, 33 and 34, which concludes that the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The statements 28, 29,32,35,36 and 37 show an insignificant difference between male and female respondents in BSNL; therefore the null hypothesis is accepted.

Vodafone male appraisees for outcome variables, show highest mean score at statement 32 (MS=3.44 and SD=0.92) followed by statements 28 and 33, indicating highest level of satisfaction. For female respondents, it is observed that highest mean score is recorded at statement 32, (MS= 4.00 and SD= 0.00), followed by statements 33 and 37, indicating high level of satisfaction. It is observed further that there is an insignificant difference between male and female respondents for outcome variable in Vodafone; hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The IDEA male respondents in case of outcome variables record their highest mean score at statement 29, for

corrective actions with  $MS = 4.23$  and  $SD = 0.89$ , indicating that corrective actions are taken after evaluating the performance of the male appraisees in IDEA. It must be understood that performance appraisal is part of consolidating and verifying agreed action. If done effectively employees are empowered to play a leading role in their appraisals. However, confidentiality remains a concern for all appraisal related information, which can show a lapse in managerial discretion. Statements 35 and 30 follow highest mean scores.

The female IDEA appraisees (outcome variables) have shown a high level of satisfaction at statement no.32 ( $MS = 4.00$  and  $SD = 0.001$ ), followed by statements 34 and 29. It is noted that there is an insignificant difference between male and female respondents in IDEA for outcome variable; hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Airtel male respondents for outcome variables show highest mean at statements 28,  $MS = 3.35$  and  $SD = 1.59$ , followed by statements 36 regarding favouritism, endorsing that the male appraisees do not find any favouritism in their ratings by supervisors. This is followed by statement no. 30 in case of male respondents.

The female Airtel respondents record highest satisfaction level at statements at statement no. 31, ( $MS = 3.00$ ,  $SD = 0.001$ ), followed by statements 30,36,37 and 28. Conversely, it is scrutinized that there is an insignificant difference between male and female appraisees in Airtel for outcome variable, hence endorsing the acceptance of null hypothesis.

Considering the organizational context variables sample unit wise, the BSNL male respondents have shown highest mean value at statement no. 46, with  $MS = 3.47$  and  $SD = 1.08$ , standard of performance, followed by statements 39 and 44, indicating a high level of satisfaction, while as in case of female respondents in BSNL, statements 39, 41 and 43 show the highest mean scores with the highest values  $MS = 3.47$  and  $SD = 1.08$ . Moreover, there is an indicative significant difference between male and female respondents with respect to the statements 38, 39, 41, 42, 45, 47 and 48, as a result of which the null hypothesis is rejected in favour of alternative hypothesis.

Vodafone male appraisees record their highest mean scores at statement 41 ( $MS = 3.55$  and  $SD = 0.51$ ) and statement 42, ( $MS = 3.55$  and  $SD = 0.51$ ), followed by statements 51 and 38. Supplementally, there is an insignificant difference between male and female respondents in Vodafone for organizational context variable, resulting in the acceptance of null hypothesis.

In case of IDEA male appraisees considering organizational context, statements 46 denotes highest mean scores ( $MS$  ranging highest at 4.00,  $SD = 0.001$ ), followed by statements 39 and 50. The female respondents have shown highest mean score at statement no. 39, task definition with  $MS = 3.78$  and  $SD = 0.42$ , followed by other statements 52 and 41. Additionally, there is an observed significant indifference between male and female respondents in IDEA; hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Considering organizational context variable in case of Airtel appraisees, the highest mean score is recorded at statement no.45,  $MS = 3.28$ ,  $SD = 0.99$ , followed by statements 38 and 51, concluding that there is a high level of satisfaction with respect to these statements. The female respondents have recorded a highest mean score at statement no. 44 and 45 ( $MS = 2.85$ ,  $SD = 1.06$  for both the statements), followed by statements 39, 41, 42 and 46 indicating high level of satisfaction regarding these statements. Further, statements 38, 49 and 51 depict a significant difference between male and female respondents in Airtel for organization context variables, hence the null hypothesis is rejected for these statements, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. There is also an insignificant difference depicted between male and female



respondents for statements 39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,50 and 52, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted in these cases.

In case of the dimension ASPAS (appraisees' satisfaction with PAS), the highest mean score is recorded by statement 54,  $MS = 3.92$ ,  $SD = 0.68$  in case of BSNL male respondents, followed by the statements 55 and 60 indicating high level of satisfaction. The female respondents have shown highest mean score at statement 54,  $MS = 3.90$ ,  $SD = 0.30$ , followed by statements 55 and 58. Further for statements 53, 55, 56, 57, 58 and 59 the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted as the significance level for all these statements is within 0.05%.

Vodafone male respondents have shown highest mean score at statement 53,  $MS = 4.44$ ,  $SD = 0.78$  indicating highest level of satisfaction, followed by statements 57 and 54. For female respondents, the highest mean score is witnessed at statement 54 and 57,  $MS = 4.00$  and  $SD = 0.001$  in both the cases, followed by statements 53, 55, 58 and 59. The alternative hypothesis is accepted for statements 56 and 59, which means that the satisfaction level of appraisees is far from a satisfactory status in case of these statements in Vodafone across gender.

Moreover, the IDEA male appraisees have indicated highest satisfaction level at statement no. 54, supervision, with  $MS = 4.00$ ,  $SD < 0.01$ . This is followed by statements 55 and 56 depicting high mean scores. For female respondents, statements 54 and 55,  $MS = 4.00$  and  $SD = 0.01$  for both the statements, followed by statements 57,58,56,59. There is further an insignificant difference between male and female appraisees in IDEA, for variable ASPAS, which indicates that the null hypothesis is accepted.

Besides the above, it is imperative to mention that considering table 1, dimension ASPAS, the Airtel male appraisees have shown highest level of satisfaction at statement no. 58,  $MS = 3.42$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ , followed by statements 53, 54 and 59. In case of female respondents, the statements 56 ( $MS = 3.71$  and  $SD = 0.48$ ), followed by 53, 58. The statements 56 and 59 indicate a significant level of difference between male and female respondents in Airtel for ASPAS dimension, resulting in acceptance of alternative hypothesis.

## CONCLUSIONS & SUGGESTIONS

Performance appraisals are critical to the functioning of an organisation as well as to the employee's career growth and development. The organisation needs to rate its employees so that people can be identified to assume positions of leadership. Employees need to have their work reviewed so that they may be acknowledged and rewarded when appropriate or they could be suggested for improvement. The implementation of an effective performance appraisal programme, however, is complicated by the difficult task of obtaining a truly fair and accurate appraisal of an employee's performance. In BSNL, Vodafone and IDEA, female appraisees are more satisfied as compared to the male appraisees, while as in Airtel, male appraisees are more satisfied as compared to female appraisees. This calls for an introspection and awareness on part of the appraisers to be aware of the occurrence of such biases that bring the credibility of performance appraisals into question. HR department has a role to offer for grievance redressal if any, in time.

## REFERENCES

1. Bernardin H.J., Hennessey H.W. (1995). Age, racial and gender bias as a function of criterion specificity, *Human Resource Management Review*, 5: 63-77.

2. Bianca, A. (2014). Moral and ethical challenges of a performance evaluation, [www.cornerstoneondemand.com](http://www.cornerstoneondemand.com) (access date: 20th Jan, 2015)
3. Borman, W.C. (1975). "Effects of instructions to avoid halo errors on reliability and validity of performance evaluation ratings", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, (62): 64-69.
4. Du Bios C.L., Sackett P.R., Zedeck S., Folgi L. (1993). "Further exploration of typical and maximum performance criteria: definitional issues, prediction, and white-black differences". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2): 205-11.
5. Fiona J., Zeenaz J. Elizabeth and Mir Parvez A. (2011). "Female workforce- A missing pillar in the human resource development". *International Journal of Commerce, IT, Management*, 1(7):21-85.
6. Ford, J.K., Kraiger, K., Schechtman, S.L. (1986). "Study of race effects in objective indices and subjective evaluations of performance: a meta-analysis of performance criteria". *Psychol. Bull.*, 99(3): 330-37.
7. Hayness, G. (1978). "Developing an appraisal program", *Personnel Journal*, 57(1): 14-19.
8. Lisa Mc. Q. (2014). "Ethics in performance evaluations", [www.cornerstoneondemand.com](http://www.cornerstoneondemand.com) (access date: Dec 2014) Mehta, P. (1994). "Social achievement motivation, concept", New Delhi.
9. Mufeed, S.A. (2011). "Employee appraisal system – instrument for developing superior performance". *Desh Bhagat Journal of Management and Research*, 1(1).
10. Parvez, Mir A., Fiona J. and Zeenaz Elizabeth J. (2010). "A study on female workforce under the influence of globalization", *Gumbad Business Review*, 5(2): 1-8.
11. Pareek, U. (2002). "Training instruments in HRD and OD", second edition, Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Ltd. New Delhi.
12. Pulakos, E.D., Schmitt, N. and Chan, D. (1989). "Models of job performance ratings: examination test validity in selection: a red herring". *J. Appl. Psychol.* 66(5): 166-85.
13. Rao, T.V. (1992). "Appraising and development of managerial performance", *Academy of Human Resource Development*, Ahmedabad.
14. Ronan, W.W. and Prien, E.P. (1971). "Perspective on the measurement of human performance", New York, Appleton-Century-Crafts.
15. Thorndike, K.L. (1920). "A constant error in psychological ratings". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, (4): 25-29.
16. Woehr, DJ, Roch SG. (1996). "Context effects in performance evaluation: the impact of ratee sex and performance level on performance ratings and behavioural recall". *Organisational Behavioural Human Decision Processes* 66 (1):33-41.