

## **PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL MECHANISM IN INDIAN HIGHER ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS**

**Seema Singh, Research Scholar\***

**Dr.Anurika Vaish, Associate Professor \***

---

### **Abstract**

The present study investigates the perception of academic staff about current performance appraisal mechanism in their institutions and factors influencing appraisal. The study consists of sample from various private, public and deemed Universities across UP and Delhi. The analysis of the data was done using tables and ANNOVA. The study reveals relatively higher number of faculty members from UP were not satisfied with mechanism and execution of the performance appraisal in comparison to faculty members from Delhi. The variation in appraisal format and its implementation is significantly different in private, public and deemed institutions. It has been proposed that academic institutions need to improve their faculty evaluation mechanism and implementation process.

**Keywords: Performance Appraisal; Appraisal mechanism; Appraisal Implementation; Satisfaction.**

---

\* **Indian Institute of Information Technology,Deoghat, Jhalwa, Allahabad,India.**

## 1. Introduction

The present organizational environment is dynamic and globally competitive. Organizations cannot afford unsatisfied, unmotivated, uninterested and uncommitted employees. In this respect the role of performance appraisal system is very important. Motivated and committed employees can be built by implementing effective performance appraisal system. In order to create a successful organization, it requires that organizations' goals and objectives be translated in such a way that they are in accordance with the exact objectives of the individual employee. The support and commitment of the top management towards employee should also be evident. Efficient performance appraisal process is a key constituent of an organization. It lets all employees to feel that they are a part of organization's success and recognizes one's contribution for the same [2].

Consequently, performance appraisal and decision on rating the performance index has taken an essential part in current organizations regardless of the place and context. Evaluation of performance is the most effective and critical mechanism of HRD with varied areas and purposes. This mechanism is used to assess the behavior, input and prospects of the employees. It is applicable at all such places where people work in a group for the accomplishment of a common objective.

Everyone working in an organization is in pressure to give ones' best in today's competitive world. This is because his performance is being evaluated and compared in various perspectives. Organizations, in particular, follow the practice of performance evaluation. They make sure that their employee's performance should steadily improve. Not only this, but performance appraisal is also required to place the employees at their right place in the organization. This helps in utilizing their talent to its full extent. There are various practices adapted for the measurement of performance appraisal according to the different situations and organizational characteristics [28]. A well organized employee's performance evaluation mechanism and its execution plays an imperative role in encouraging the employees of the organizations to put in better effort. It helps in improving their performance as individuals and as team members to come together to accomplish a common goal [6].

Employees' performance evaluation is a management practices. It is mainly used for taking personal decision like transfer, promotion and pay fixation. Apart from this it also deals with issues like employees advancement. Earlier, performance appraisal mainly focused on employee's evaluation in term of their achievements. The major objective of assessment system is to find out the output of an employee, for to vindicate the compensation offered. Furthermore, it is essential to put adequate measures to get righteousness and appropriate of evaluation system. The appraisal system always drives direction to get result-oriented environment in the course of the altering of organizational culture and climate of organization [8], [27], [3].

It is known that there are different types of appraisal system for developed, developing and underdeveloped countries for education and industrial sector. The developed countries are in far better position with respect to

others. Appraisal system for industries is working well all over the world which has helped for its fast growth but in education system it is far behind.

### **Review of Literature**

[15] concluded that quality education requires efficient teachers. They should be accountable and should deliver quality education. [23] found that institutions require their workforce to be flexible and innovative. [16] concluded that appraisal systems should be based on research and involved in ongoing studies of validity and reliability.

[29] revealed that well-organized mechanism of employee's performance evaluation not only enhance employees satisfaction, morale and productivity of organization, but also this technique works as powerful tool to improve quality and contribution of an individual's performance in an organization.

[6] well organized employee's performance evaluation mechanism and its execution plays an imperative role in encouraging the employees of the organizations to put in better effort, improving their performance as individuals and as team members to come together to accomplish a common goal. [7] Considers appraisal system as a waste of time, invaluable, purposeless by the teachers and hence they give very little attention and devotion to it. These results of survey can be very helpful in providing cognizance to the institutions which are working and in process of look over their evaluation systems and policies. [18] worked on (i) Issues with the mismanagement of the system, (ii) Issues which are due to the authorities performing evaluation and (iii) Issues from the candidates. [18] expressed and identified that these issues are the vital limitation in expediting education distribution and development. Hence, he recommended to Thailand's Ministry of Education to come up with improvements in existing teacher performance assessment system. [24] has worked on the formal and organized appraisal process. [24] suggested that to make the faculty aware about their strengths and weaknesses as per the comments of peers and students.

It is found that existing teacher appraisal system integrates both accountability and developmental models of appraisal and as most of the teachers found this fearsome and hence not accepted. [19] suggest to modify or design new effective and consistent performance appraisal system for the university faculty and create a close link between appraisal and faculty future improvement and development matters.

[11] identified the major shortcomings associated with current performance appraisal of faculty in most of the Engineering colleges. The performance appraisal of teachers in engineering college is also in practice. However, they identified certain shortcomings associated with current performance appraisal of faculty in most of the Engineering colleges. They are as follows:

- a) Lack of clarity and objectivity.
- b) Insufficient involvement of teaching staff in developing the performance evaluation scheme.
- c) Lack of agreed performance evaluation parameters and standards.

- d) Absence of no sincere thought or brainstorming between the head of institutions/ head of department and the concerned teacher/s on the targets/goals, percentage of target/goal achieved and productivity while performing the activity.
- e) A complete disconnect between assessment system and staff improvement and development process.

### **Recent development in appraisal system**

A new appraisal and evaluation process has been initiated by IIM-A in 2012 which considers the score accumulated via teaching and non-teaching activities against set targets and assigned scores. Pay and perks will be decided as per acquired scores.

A variable pay has been introduced by IIM-Lucknow for their teaching staff, which will be decided on the basis of multiple parameters like percentage target achievement, number of research papers, number of students guided to carry out their research, consistency in class room teaching and its quality, availability for consulting students, their participation and engagement in consulting projects among others.

IIM-Calcutta emphasize on the thought that, every individual has its own strength and weakness. Like, there is a possibility that a good classroom teacher is not good in research activities and similarly good researcher doesn't guarantee's to be a good class room teacher. Hence, faculty members at the institute themselves decide and make their three-year plan.

In principle, every IIM is independent to make a decision on their policy (whether to introduce appraisal system for their teaching and non-teaching staffs for deciding their compensation and incentives). However, there is a definite requirement of such system. But the issue is how to measure research. There must be some key performance indicators for evaluating the quality and effort of research [25].

### **Recent Performance based appraisal system introduced by UGC**

Several regulations were established by University Grant Commission (UGC) for faculties of higher academic institutions. UGC recognized these guidelines concerning minimum qualifications for appointment of faculties in Universities and colleges in year 1956 from Ministry of Finance and later in year 2000 and revised in year 2008. The Gazette is formally issued in India 2010. These guidelines clarify qualifications for applicants and eligibility for recruitment and promotion to higher positions and under Career Advancement Scheme. These qualifications are related head of institutions, faculties, sports staff and librarians of higher academic institutions. In 2010, the sixth pay came with inclusion of API (Academic Performance Indicator) and PBAS (Performance Based Appraisal System). It has made teachers more accountable towards teaching and publications which is to link with their promotions.

In 2010 the API was protested in wide manner by Teachers unions. According to them the system had many drawbacks as it promoted discrimination in selection. The HRD ministry has asked UGC to re-look it and remove

API. In October 2012, in its 489<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Revisit Committee recommended on granting of exemption to PhD holders from NET.

In 2013 the Commission decided to scrap the PBAS with API. Scrapping the API was not judicious but holding of inflexible parameters of UGC's API may worsen faculty shortage scenario across Universities. Scrapping of the API apparently gave the Universities and other higher academic institutions flexibility to develop their own instruments to screen faculty performance. Scrapping the PBAS has induced criticism in academia. But the Ministry of HRD intervened and asked the UGC to take adequate step and work out with necessary modifications to improve the system. It has been decided that PBAS with API is mandatory requirement for selection as well as promotion of faculty members.[1].

### **Satisfaction and performance**

Employee satisfaction is the basic cause of organizational success. Employee satisfaction is defined as how individual's personal expectations are lined up with job outcomes. Employees enjoy and make every effort to work in organizations where encouraging work environment. The organizations accordingly continuously struggle hard to satisfy their valued employees [13].

[22] have contradictory findings that performance increase satisfaction but not the reverse. [21] support partial reciprocal relationship between satisfaction and performance. However, [26] support reciprocal relationship. The third model claimed that job satisfaction and job performance were mutually influential. As with the two previous models, the results of the studies were inconclusive

Findings of few other studies, [4] found weak correlation between satisfaction and performance [17] founds slightly higher correlation between satisfaction and performance. [12] found average correlation between satisfaction and performance. We can conclude that the correlation between job satisfaction and job performance is substantial and modest at best.

[10] proposed the third model of this study claimed that job satisfaction and job performance were mutually influential. As with the two previous models, the results of the studies were inconclusive.

[9], [14], [17] had revealed strong linkage between job satisfaction and job performance. All these studies have given the impetus to test the association between the job satisfaction of teachers and their performance.

### **Research Methodology**

**The objective of the study is given as follows:**

1. The study aims at realizing the problems in evaluation mechanism of higher academic institutions.
2. To investigate the satisfaction level of teachers with respect to the mechanism and executions of performance appraisal system in vogue in their respective institutions.

### Research Questions

The study is conducted to answer the following research questions:

1. Are the teachers adequately satisfied with the mechanism and its execution of performance appraisal system adopted in their organization?
2. Is there any difference in the satisfaction level of teachers of UP and Delhi with respect to the mechanism and execution of performance appraisal system in their respective organizations?

### Hypotheses of the study

Hypothesis deals with the expected results to be obtained from research inquiry. Hypotheses are generally based upon the scientific theory, allowing for both prediction and testability. The hypotheses of this study are listed below:

1.  $H_{01}$ : There is no significant difference in the perception on format of performance appraisal system among private, public and deemed institutions.
2.  $H_{02}$ : There is no significant difference in the perception on implementation of performance appraisal system among private, public and deemed institutions.

### Research Design

The study is descriptive as well as exploratory in nature. The research design is employing both quantitative and qualitative research approaches. Quantitative approach is focused on numerical presentation and analysis of data. Qualitative approach is popular in Psychological research. The research is an applied research to examine whether the performance appraisal instrument design is good to understand and faculties are satisfied with appraisal system or it requires some improvement. This chapter describes the research methodology used for the study. The primary data was collected through personal interaction and informal interview with faculty. The collected data has been statistically analyzed by using SPSS. The detail research methodology can be described as follows:

1. **Sampling unit:** The faculties of academic institution are considered as the sampling unit for this study, having familiarity with the existing performance appraisal system.
2. **Collection of Data:** The research has been conducted based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected using structured questionnaire by personally visiting to academic institutions, post/mail and with the help of telephonic requests made in the higher academic institutions. The data was collected from 504 numbers of faculty members from different academic institutes of UP and Delhi. The respondents who were personally interviewed have cooperated to a great extent and helped in collecting satisfactory responses from among their peer group. Subsequently, the data so collected was tabulated to analyze the behavior of the data and accordingly gathered findings from the same.

Secondary data was also utilized in this study. To accumulate the secondary data, evaluation formats of higher academic institutions, related journals, periodicals, newspapers, text books internet and other related materials and web pages of institutions etc. were consulted and utilized as reference.

**3. Development of questionnaire:** The survey instrument used to carry out this survey was questionnaire. Questionnaire was drafted using Microsoft word document. It has been designed to examine the satisfaction of faculty's with evaluation procedures and the perception of faculty's toward the appraisal system of their academic institutions. The questionnaire consisted of four sections. For enacting all confidentiality, the name of the respondents was not included in the questionnaire. The first section consisted of six questions based on basic general enquiries about the gender, educational qualification, and year of service in the same institution, type of institution i.e., public/private/deemed university and their designation in that institution.

The second section of the questions dealt with the appraisal system and faculties' perception on appraisal mechanism and their satisfaction with the current appraisal system in binary format (Yes/No).

In the third section, questions are for understanding the perception of faculties on the implementation of appraisal in institutions. The respondents were asked to respond on Yes/ No types.

**4. Pilot Study and validating the questionnaire:** For validity, the survey instrument was demonstrated to 20 faculty members of public and private Universities. Few members suggested to stile out some statements which were found to be vague in the questionnaire initially drafted followed by useful suggestions to be included in the survey instrument, some questions were rearticulated for better understanding and was accordingly incorporated in the instrument before finally circulated for collecting the responses.

**5. Population and sample size of study:** Sampling is concerned with the selection of subset of individuals from within a statistical population to estimate characteristics of whole population.

All the teachers working in different public, private and deemed universities type academic institutions constitute the universe for this study.

**6. Sampling Procedure:** The survey was designed to include faculty members from various departments of academic institutions. In addition, the sample considered both the genders at the level comprising of Professors, Associate professors, Assistant professors and Lecturers of higher academic institutions. Most of the sample units were from Assistant professor Level with Ph. D degree. Faculties were from different backgrounds namely Arts, Science, humanities, technical and management. While, the age range chosen was between 25 to around 60 years having work experience of 2 to 30 years. The qualification of respondents was from Post Graduate to Ph.D. respondents were chosen using simple random sampling.

**7. Data Analysis:** The collected surveyed data have been examined and verified while taking account various segments of data like data entry, editing, and data analysis. All statistical analyses are conducted using SPSS version 17.0. The study used tables and ANNOVA for testing objectives and hypothesis.

The analysis is based on academician's perception on current appraisal system and future perspective of evaluation mechanism.

### Frequency of performance appraisal

Table 1 and table 2 present the frequency of performance appraisal in vogue in the respective institutes surveyed and frequency of performance appraisal desired by the faculty members.

It is evident in the table 1 and table 2 that majority of the respondents wants annual performance appraisal, whereas in reality half-yearly appraisal is also practiced in large number of institutions.

Table 1

Frequency of performance appraisal in force

Frequency	Percentage
Half Yearly	3.17
Annually	52.38
Occasionally/Rarely	44.45

Source: Compiled from questionnaire

Table 2

Frequency of performance appraisal desired by the faculty members

Frequency	Percentage
Half Yearly	3.76
Annually	95.24
As per Requirement	1

Source: Compiled from questionnaire

### Variation in the satisfaction level for appraisal mechanism and its execution in UP and Delhi

This section deals with the analysis of factors affecting faculties' performance in the institutions at the level of design/framework, inspiration and bonus in an appraisal system. It is explained through some more sub-objectives and hypothesis and thereby deducing outcomes accordingly.

Faculty's satisfaction level for appraisal mechanism and its execution in academic institutions in Uttar Pradesh (UP) and Delhi. The Study of data elucidates that 70% of the faculty members were not satisfied while 30% showed their satisfaction with the appraisal mechanism within the academic institutions in U.P.

In Delhi 95% of the faculties were satisfied and 5% of the faculty members showed their dissatisfaction with the appraisal mechanism of faculty evaluation.



While, deciphering on the execution/implementation side of academic institutions in UP, 67% of faculties have shown their dissatisfaction and 33% have shown their satisfaction.

In Delhi, 92% of faculties were satisfied and 8% were dissatisfied. Thus, indicating that there exist a huge gap between satisfaction of faculty in UP and Delhi with respect to mechanism and execution of appraisal system.

### **Perceptual variation of design and implementation procedure between the Public, Private and Deemed academic institutions**

In this section, [ $H_{01}$ : There is no significant difference in the perception on format of performance appraisal system among private, public and deemed institutions] has been tested.

To compare mean for more than two groups ANOVA is used. The variance ratio for Deemed, Private and Public was 104.153 for design/instrument side. For  $df_1=2$  and  $df_2=273$ , at 5% level of significant the critical value of F is 3.04. From table 3, it is seen that the calculated F value is higher than its table value. It means that the differences among the means are significant. Thus, the variation with respect to perception on format of performance appraisal system among Deemed, Private and Public Institutions are significant. To explain further, the p value of statistics is also known as value of significant and is mentioned in the last column. It is less than 0.05 (5% level of significance). Thus, it can be deduced that hypothesis  $H_{01}$  [ i.e., there is no significant difference in the perception on format of performance appraisal system among private, public and deemed institutions]; cannot be accepted and the alternate hypothesis is accepted, given the test and methodology.

In this section, [ $H_{02}$ : There is no significant difference in the perception on implementation of performance appraisal system among private, public and deemed institutions] has been tested.

In the implementation side the variation ratio of Deemed, Private and Public Institution was 15.466. At 5% significant level  $df_1=2$  and  $df_2=273$  the critical value of F is 3.04. From table 3, it is evident that calculated F value is higher than its table value. It shows the variation in Deemed, Private and Public Institutions are significant. To explain further, the p value of statistics also known as value of significant and is mentioned in the last column. It is less than 0.05 (5% level of significance). Thus, it is deduced that hypothesis  $H_{02}$  [There is no significant difference in the perception on implementation of performance appraisal system among private, public and deemed institutions] cannot be accepted and thus, alternate hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 3**  
**Public, Private and Deemed Universities on Evaluation System**

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Deem_priv_publ_instrument	Between Groups	340.891	2	170.446	104.153	.000

	Within Groups	446.761	273	1.636		
	Total	787.652	275			
Deem_priv_publ_implimentation	Between Groups	115.855	2	57.928	15.466	.000
	Within Groups	1022.533	273	3.746		
	Total	1138.388	275			

Source: Author's own compilation from questionnaire

### Conclusion and policy implications

It was found that majority of the faculty members were of the opinion that performance appraisal is a mechanism used to evaluate employees of an institutions and very few faculty members were viewing it to be related to the satisfaction of employees'.

This is an area of concern for the policy makers. The study deduced that majority of the respondents want annual performance appraisal, whereas in reality rarely and occasionally appraisal is also practiced in large number of institutions. Policy makers should frame policy for annual basis performance evaluation of faculty in those institutions where it is yet not to be practiced.

It was revealed that 70% of the faculty members were not satisfied with the performance appraisal mechanism within the academic institutions in U.P. However, in Delhi 95% of the faculties were satisfied with the appraisal mechanism of faculty evaluation. With respect to execution/implementation side of academic institutions in UP, 67% of faculties have shown their dissatisfaction, but only 8% in Delhi have shown their dissatisfaction. This requires attention for the authorities in UP. As supported by [29] well-organized mechanism of employee's performance evaluation not only enhance employees satisfaction, morale and productivity of organization, but also this technique works as powerful tool to improve quality and contribution of an individual's performance in an organization .Number of researches has confirmed with research that productivity of organization increases around 43 percent through healthy appraisal process [30].

The study deduced that format of performance appraisal system and its implementation is significantly different in case of private institutions, public institutions and deemed universities. Thus, the policy makers should frame policy for performance appraisal and its implementation considering the nature of institute. [20] clearly revealed that faculties in IUB needs translucent and systematic evaluation system, As focused by [5] systematic performance evaluation always give better results when staff have trust on the system.

### Limitations of study

1. The study includes only teachers who are currently teaching in the higher academic institutions. In the last several years, many teachers left their teaching profession for various reasons such as quitting jobs for doing research work or switchover or reputed post in industry or other sectors.
2. The results of this study are limited to the research sample of urban areas only.
3. The study in subject indicates that implementation procedures improve performance and satisfaction of academic staff. While, the perceptual data is only gathered from appraisee and not with all stake holder reflecting incomplete scenarios and a holistic approach.

### Scope of future research

The study includes only teachers who are currently teaching in the higher academic institutions. The teachers who have left their job recently should also be considered in future for generalizing the findings of the study. Future research may be done by including higher academic institutions situated nearby rural areas and thus, a comparative study between institute of urban areas as well as institute of rural areas may be conducted. It may help in exploring the policies of evaluation system and its implementation procedures.

### Reference

- [1] Baroniya, S.S., "Status of Academic Performance Indicator (API) for College Teachers of Madhya Pradesh: A Review," *Research Journal of Educational Sciences*, vol.2, no.5, pp.5-13, 2014.
- [2] Boice, D. F. and Kleiner, B.H., "Designing effective performance appraisal systems," *Work Study*, vol 46, no 6, pp.197–201, 1997.
- [3] Boyd, N. and Ken, K., "Expanding the view of performance appraisal by introducing social justice concerns," *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 249-77, 2004.
- [4] Brayfield, A. H., and Crockett, W. H., "Employee attitudes and employee performance," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 52, pp 396-424, 1955.
- [5] Cokins, G., "Performance management. Finding the missing pieces and closing the intelligence gap," *John Wiley and Sons. Australia*, 2004.
- [6] Fisher, C. D., Schoenfeldt, L. F., Shaw, J B., "Human Resource Management," *Boston: Houghton-Mifflin*, 2003.
- [7] Gratton, Robert, "Teacher Appraisal: A Lesson on Confusion over Purpose," *International Journal of Educational Management*, vol. 18, no.5, pp. 292-296, 2004.
- [8] Grote, D., "Public sector organizations," *Public Personnel Management*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 1-20, 2000.
- [9] Hamdan, M. H., "Mediators of the relationship between person-organization fit and individual outcomes," PhD thesis, Queensland University of Technology. Retrieved April 19, 2012, from [http://eprints.qut.edu.au/46695/1/Mahani\\_Haji\\_Hamdan\\_Thesis.pdf](http://eprints.qut.edu.au/46695/1/Mahani_Haji_Hamdan_Thesis.pdf), 2011.
- [10] Jae, V.B., "Job Satisfaction and Job Performance at the Work Place", *Arcada*, 2011.
- [11] kumar P. S and Brahadeeswaran D., "Performance appraisal of faculty of higher educational institutions in India," *AMET Journal of Managemen*, 2011.
- [12] laffaldano. M. T. and Muchinsky, P. M., "Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 97, pp251-273, 1985.

- [13] Malik, M.I., Bibi, S. and Rahim, S.H., "Non Financial Measures of Layoff Survivors Satisfaction," *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, vol.2.no.8,pp 62-68, 2010.
- [14] Organ, D. W., "A Reappraisal and Reinterpretation of Satisfaction Causes Performance. Hypothesis," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 2,pp. 46-53, 1977.
- [15] Perraton, H., "Open and Distance Learning in the Developing World," *Routledge, London*, 2000.
- [16] Peterson, K. D. , "Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices," (2nd ed.). *Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press*, 2000.
- [17] Petty, M. M., Mcgee, G. W., Gail, D. E. and Cavender, J. W., "A Meta-analysis of the Relationships between Individual Job Satisfaction and Individual Performance," *Academy of Management Review*, vol 9. no.4.pp. 712-721,1984.
- [18] Pimpa, N, "Teachers performance appraisal in Thailand:Poison or panacea," *education research for policy and practice*,vol.4.pp 115-127,2005.
- [19] Punia1 B. K. and Renu Siwatch., "Performance Appraisal Practices in Indian Universities: A Study of Awareness Level and Perceived Significance," *Asia-Pacific Business Review*, vol. V, no. 3, pp. 71-88, 2009,
- [20] Rasheed, M.I., Aslam, H.D.,Yousaf.S. and Noor,A., "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*, vol. 5.no.9, pp. 3735-3744, 2011.
- [21] Sheridan. J. E. and Slocum, J. W., "The direction of the causal relationship between job satisfaction and work performance," *Organizational Behavior and Hitman Performance*, Vol.14, pp.159-172, 1975.
- [22] Siegel, J. P.and Bowen, D., "Satisfaction and performance: Causal relationships and moderating effects," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. I, pp.263-269,1971.
- [23] Simmons, J., "An expert witness "perspective on performance appraisal in universities and colleges," *Employees Relation*, vol.24 no.1.pp 86-100,2002.
- [24] Stronge, J.H., "Evaluating Teaching," 2nd. Ed, California.Corwin Press,2006.
- [25] Umarji V and Pathak K., "IIMs' faculty worked up over appraisal scores Faculty members' teaching and non-teaching activities are assigned scores for earning incentives under new scheme," Retrieved on 21 may 2013 <http://www.business-standard.com>.2013.
- [26] Wanous, J. P., "A causal- correlational analysis of the job satisfaction and performance relationship," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 59, pp.139-144, 1974.
- [27] Weiss, W., "Appraising employee performance Supervision," vol. 62 no. 10, pp. 10-13,2001.
- [28] Wilson, J.P. and Western, S., "Performance appraisal: an obstacle to training and development," *Journal of European Industrial Training*, vol. 24 no. 7, pp. 384-91,2000.
- [29] Yusuf, A.A., "Performance Appraisal Issues, Challenges and Prospects," Pearson,2003.
- [30] Zemke R., "The service edge. Incentive," vol. 177, pp.59-60,2003.