

Fairness Perceptions of Performance Appraisal System: An Empirical Study of Civil Servants in District Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan

Malik Ikramullah

Department of Public Administration
Gomal University
29050, Dera Ismail Khan,
Pakistan

Bahadar Shah

Faculty of Law and Administrative Sciences
Hazara University Mansehra
21300, Mansehra
Pakistan

Faqir Sajjad ul Hassan

Department of Public Administration
Gomal University
29050, Dera Ismail Khan
Pakistan

Tariq Zaman

Department of Public Administration
Gomal University
29050, Dera Ismail Khan
Pakistan

Hamad Khan

Department of Public Administration
Gomal University
29050, Dera Ismail Khan
Pakistan

Abstract

This study was undertaken to explore appraisees' /ratees' fairness perceptions of performance appraisal system (PAS) in the civil service of Pakistan. Previously, this aspect of PAS in the civil service has never been investigated. We determined appraisees' fairness perceptions of PAS by applying four factor of organizational justice namely; procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informational. Data was collected from the civil servants working in two departments in far flung district Dera Ismail Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The results show that appraisees' perceive the system fair as diagnosed by four factors of justice. Moreover, high interpersonal justice and distributive justice also revealed issues with the system. However, on few aspects of the system, appraisees' have mentioned their neutral responses. In the article we discuss literature on PAS and organizational justice along with methods. Subsequently, we proffer some recommendations. Finally, we give directions for future research in the PAS of civil service.

Keywords: Performance Appraisal system, Fairness Perceptions, Organizational Justice

1. Introduction

In today's world, almost every organization whether it is public or private sector, requires a performance appraisal system (PAS) to assess the performance of its employees. Moreover, in work settings PASs are also utilized for several important administrative and developmental decisions, like, pay, promotion, training, and also documentation for legal purposes (Dubinsky, Skinner, & Whittler, 1989; Thomas & Bretz, 1994; Taylor, Tracy, Renard, Harrison, & Carroll, 1995). So PASs are declared as an integral part of organizational human resource management functions (Dulebohn & Ferris, 1999).

The role of PAS in an organization is very important, according to Muczyk and Gable (1987), success or failure of an organization is determined by means through which employees' performance is managed in that organization. So an efficacious PAS can play vital role in success of an organization. On the other hand, designing and implementing an effective PAS in an organization is indeed a complicated process (Boice & Kleiner, 1997) and also it may be expensive (Brown & Benson, 2003). Likewise, Folger, Konovsky, and Cropanzano (1992) stated that it is exigent to construct an efficacious PAS that has valid, reliable and objective performance measures. The literature reveals that PAS effectiveness research initially concentrated on rating format improvement and checking psychometric soundness of the format. However with the passage of time two other factors attracted attention of researchers, which include; perceived utility and perceived fairness of PAS. It was found by research that a psychometrically sound PAS will fail, if system users (rater and ratee) do not accept and support it (Carroll & Schneier, 1982; Cascio, 1982). As a result, a PAS will not be successful unless concerned people perceive it as a fair system (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991).

Similarly, Erdogan, Kraimer, and Liden (2001) asserted that employees' fairness (justice) perceptions of the PAS are helpful in determining the system success and usefulness. Therefore, successful working of PAS depends on appraisees' fairness perceptions and reactions to various aspects of the system (Jawahar, 2007). In this article, our focus is on appraisees' fairness perceptions of PAS in the civil service of Pakistan. We are utilizing Organizational Justice (OJ) theory to determine fairness perceptions of PAS, as (OJ) furnishes a rich theoretical base for studying employees' fairness perceptions of PAS (Murphy & Cleveland, 1991). In the same way, more than 30 years of OJ research, expresses that human beings always care about fairness of the outcomes (distributive justice), procedures (procedural justice) and interpersonal treatment (interactional justice) (Ambrose, 2002). Similarly, Bies (2001) contended that in work settings, employees are always concerned about the fairness. While in the context of PAS, Greenberg (1986a) was the first to apply OJ theory. A typical PAS constitutes a mechanism in which performance is appraised by supervisors, moreover, appraisal ratings are assigned and information related to appraisal is disseminated (Giles & Mossholder, 1990).

Moreover, research in both laboratory and field settings proposes that various processes and procedures involved in performance appraisal are related with fairness (Stoffey & Reilly, 1997). In the same way, PAS in the civil service Pakistan has various process and procedures which are related with appraisees' fairness perceptions. The PAS in the civil service of Pakistan is problematic and it has been censured due to various defects (see e.g. Crisis Group Report, 2010; NACS, 2002). In addition, many reforms efforts which have been made in the civil service of Pakistan, in which PAS was overlooked and it is difficult to find any substantial advancement in this specific area (National Commission for Government Reforms [NCGR], 2008). On the other hand, few discomposed efforts were made to construct the system efficacious. But, unfortunately, these endeavors were inadequate and restricted only to changing the rating format. This study gets data from civil servants about their perceptions of fairness of PAS in the civil service by using the four factors of justice i.e. distributive, procedural, informational and interpersonal. Thus, the article will give insight into appraisees' fairness of PAS in the civil service. Furthermore, it will give authorities a clear view of appraisees' perceptions of the fairness regarding the system. The article starts with the overview of PAS and then it describes the fairness of PAS. Next, the methods are discussed, then, it reports perceptual data gathered from appraisees. Finally, limitations of the study and directions for future research are presented.

2. Performance Appraisal System

Performance appraisal is one of the widely researched topics in the field of industrial/organizational psychology (Fletcher, 2001; Holbrook, 1999). So there is no scarceness in the availability of performance appraisal literature. It has been defined in many ways by organizational researchers, for example, Griffin and Ebert (2002, p. 216) described performance appraisal as the "formal evaluation of an employee's job performance in order to determine the degree to which the employee is performing effectively". It is a formal process of employee monitoring (Cardy & Dobbins, 1994; Murphy & Cleveland, 1991) and usually involves "evaluating performance based on the judgments and opinions of subordinates, peers, supervisors, other managers and even workers themselves" (Jackson & Schuler, 2003, p.455), whereas, a performance appraisal system (PAS) deals with all processes and procedures governing the performance appraisal in an organization (Jawahar, 2007). The history of performance appraisal process can be traced back to thousands of years. According to Coens and Jenkins (2000), the exact beginning of performance appraisal is unknown, but it is in practice since the third century when emperors of Wei Dynasty (221-265AD) appraised the performance of the official family members.

Wren (1994) asserted that performance appraisal started in the industry in early 1800s when Robert Owen's used "silent monitors" to assess the performance of employees working in the cotton Mills of Scotland. Silent monitors were wooden colored blocks which were used to represent the performance grade of worker at end of each working day (Wiese & Buckley, 1998). Conventionally, performance appraisal was considered as a tool for assessment of employees performance, but nowadays it is expressed as a social and communication process (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995), and more emphasis is given to processing of information within the performance appraisal decision making process (Ahmad & Ali, 2004). In a typical PAS there are three main steps of communication i.e. rater (appraiser) sets performance targets for employees, continuous performance feedback is given on progress toward set targets during the evaluation cycle, while the final feedback is furnished when supervisor/rater concludes performance appraisal cycle with assessment of subordinate's performance in the form of a numerical/graded assessment (Brown & Benson, 2003). The PAS starts when supervisor set performance targets for subordinates in the beginning of period under review. Performance targets setting helps subordinates to know the performance level which organization or supervisor wants from them.

According to Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970, p.152), "if an employee does not know what he has the authority to decide, what he is expected to accomplish, and how he will be judged, he will hesitate to make decisions and will have to rely on a trial and error approach in meeting the expectations of his superior". Thus, it is mandatory for a supervisor to communicate performance expectations to subordinate and also set his/her performance goals. Additionally, in goal setting process, individual's performance goals should be aligned with overall organizational goals, because this will give direction to employee that how (s)he can work for the success of an organization (Storey & Sisson, 1993). Another important step is continuous performance feedback from supervisor; it helps employees to know where they stand in terms of goal achievement on regular basis. And, the final step in the communication process is provision of final feedback in the form of appraisal ratings at the end of period under review. This type of feedback gives complete picture of employee performance during the year under review. Furthermore, employees also want to get final performance feedback (i.e. final ratings) (Ilgen et al., 1979) as they also want to their performance level and also various other decisions are linked with final appraisal ratings. An employee perceives his/her self-valued contributor to an organization, if he/she receives positive performance feedback (Taylor, Fisher, & Ilgen, 1984).

3. Fairness of Performance Appraisal System

Employees want fair dealing in PAS, which is a vital component of organization's HRM. The literature reveals that fairness perceptions about various components of PAS have very serious implications not only for employees, but also for an organization (e.g. Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Latham & Wexley, 1994). Due to importance of PAS's fairness, it is a significant topic of investigation among researchers in the field of organizational psychology (e.g. Martin & Bartol, 2003; Stoffey & Reilly, 1997) and discussion continues among the scholars about (un)just nature of PASs (Boyd & Kyle, 2004). In the context of performance appraisal, variables pertaining to fairness are: knowledgeable supervisor, chance given to employee for expressing his/her appraisal related feelings and appraisal frequency in a rating year (Landy, Barnes, & Murphy, 1978). If employees have an opportunity to change their ratings (Gabris & Ihrke, 2001; Taylor et al., 1995) or have given simply right to raise their voice against ratings which they perceive unfair (Cawley, Keeping, & Levy, 1998; Gabris & Ihrke, 2001; Taylor et al., 1995) then this will result in fair perceptions of PAS. Similarly, Blau (1999) also argued that employees' satisfaction with various aspects of PAS, like, performance targets setting and performance feedback are related to fairness of appraisal system. Likewise, Gilliland and Langdon (1998) claimed that employees' fairness perceptions of PAS have significant effect on the performance appraisal rating's acceptance, rates' satisfaction with performance appraisal process and organizational commitment.

Many organizational researchers (e.g. Greenberg, 1986a, b; Greenberg & Folger, 1983; Landy et al., 1978) have expressed fairness of performance appraisal in terms of Organizational Justice (OJ). In work settings, organizational justice deals with employees' fairness perceptions of various organizational procedures or outcomes (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). The study of fairness or organizational justice came out from Adam's equity theory in the social-psychology literature (Adams, 1965). Employees' perceptions of fairness depend on one or more of their perceptions concerning the various organizational outcomes which they receive from the organization (distributive justice), procedures used to make those decisions (procedural justice) and the treatment which they receive from organization or agents (i.e. managers) (interpersonal justice) and all the required information related to various outcomes is provided within an organization (informational justice).

Distributive justice deals with outcomes fairness and in performance appraisal context, appraisal ratings are outcomes (Erdogan, 2002; Jawahar, 2007). The second factor, procedural justice is associated with the fairness perceptions of the standards followed, methods and processes used for appraising performance of employees. The third factor is called interpersonal justice, which deals with appraisees' perceptions about the treatment of supervisor. Fourth factor in PAS related to fairness is called informational justice, it means providing appraisees all the information relevant to decisions or appraisal process (Greenberg, 1993a). Employees always anticipate that organization will appraise and reward their performance fairly without concealed purposes (Cawley et al., 1998). So it is necessary to establish a fair PAS in organization so that employees could be rewarded or punished on the basis of their actual job performance, rather than on personal likes or dislikes of supervisor or other irrelevant assessment criteria. Likewise, it is also important that management should give full attention to employees' fairness perceptions of PAS (Roberson & Stewart, 2006) to get users view about the system. Ultimately, this will help management to design and implement the appraisal system according to desires of its users. Once organization has established a fair PAS, then responsibility for its operation just and consistent manner, lies on the shoulders of people who conduct appraisal (Cook & Crossman, 2004).

4. Method

4.1 Procedures

For the study, data was collected with the questionnaire distributed among the employees working in two public sector organizations in District Dera Ismail Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. The Respondents were gazetted employees (civil servants) working in the Basic Pay Scale (BPS) 16 to 19, whose performance needs to be appraised annually by their superiors. For the data collection from eligible employees, we personally administered questionnaire with a covering letter explaining purpose of the study. Researchers also provided envelope to respondents, so that confidentiality of their responses could be ensured. Moreover, during data collection process participants were encouraged to complete questionnaire in break time and they were also requested to immediately return back questionnaire after completion. Respondents were also told to fill questionnaire as an appraisee in the PAS.

4.2 Participants

The questionnaires were distributed among 273 eligible employees. The survey obtained data from 261 employees with response rate of (95%) in which 259 questionnaire were usable for data analysis. In participant 212 were males and 47 females. Employees working in BPS 16, 17, 18 and 19 were 172, 73, 10 and 4 respectively. Majority of the respondents belonged to race group Saraiki 192, while 228 employees were reported their sect as Sunni. In respondents 28 were also performing duties as an appraiser in their departments. Majority of the respondents 118 were between the age groups of 36-45. While most of the respondents 85 have working experience (in department) between 6-10 years.

4.3 Measures

Fairness Perceptions: Appraisees' fairness perceptions of PAS were measured through scales distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice (see Appendix A). These scales were adapted from Thurston (2001) and used by Walsh (2003). Modifications were made into items of the scales, so that they can match the requirements of the current study. Additionally 5-items were included in procedural justice scale, so that appraisees' perceptions about rating format called performance evaluation report (PER) could be measured. This addition was based on previous research (see e.g. Keeping & Levy, 2000; Levy & Williams, 2004; Mount, 1984; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995; Roch, Sternburgh, & Caputo, 2007). Procedural justice was measured with 4 scales consists of 19-items, scales include; "Setting Performance Targets", "Reporting Officer Confidence" "Seeking Appeals" "Performance Evaluation Report (PER)". While the sample items of each scale includes; "My performance targets are set on the basis of job description", "My department assigns me a reporting officer who is fully aware of my work", "In my department performance rating is challenged if it is unfair" and "PER influences personnel decisions" for each scale respectively. Distributive justice was assessed with 2 scales consists 13-items, scales include; "Accuracy of Performance Ratings" "Concern over Ratings". The example of the distributive justice items includes; "My reporting officer gives me genuine rating even if it might irritate me", "In my department performance rating is based on quantity of my work". Interpersonal justice was measured with 2 scales consists of 8-items, scales includes "Respect By Reporting Officer", "Sympathy of Reporting Officer". The sample items of the scales interpersonal justice consists; "My reporting officer is nice to me", "My reporting officer is responsive to my feelings".

Informational justice perceptions were measured through 3-scales consists of 15 items, scales includes; “Clarification of Performance Targets”, “Performance Feedback”, “Explanation of Rating Decisions”. While the sample of the items of the scales includes; “My reporting officer clearly explains regularly about his/her expectations of my performance”, “My reporting officer regularly lets me know how I am doing my job” and “My reporting officer always explains the decisions that concern me”. Except the demographic variables, other items were measured on five-point Likert response scales with 1(Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). Moreover, an interpretive scale for average responses is also used in line with the previous research (Wash, 2003) in such a way that: 1.50 or less = Strongly Agree; 1.51-2.5 = Agree; 2.51-3.49 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 3.50-4.49 = Disagree; and 4.5 or greater = Strongly Disagree.

5. Results

Researcher used statistical package SPSS version 17 for determining the validity and reliability of the scales. For checking validity of the scales “Factor Analysis” was performed by researcher with the conditions that all items of the scale should be combined into a single factor. Thus for verification of the unity scales minimum factor loading .50 was established. The factor loading of all the items were above the specified range. For reliability, all the variables have shown good internal consistency Cronbach’s alpha for all the scales was above .89. Respondents agreed with 19-items out of 24-items of 4 procedural justice scales, while they recorded neutral response for 5-items of the scales. Moreover, the respondents agreed with all the 12-items of the 2 distributive justice scales and 8 items of the 2 interpersonal justice scales. In case of 3 scales of informational justice, respondents agreed 13-items out of 15, while for 2-items they recorded response neither agree nor disagree. The overall score (see table 1) for each of the scale i.e. procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice was (Mean=2.23, SD=.86), (Mean=2.21, SD=.58), (Mean=1.99, SD=0.69), (Mean=2.25, SD=.89) respectively.

Insert Table 1 here

6. Discussion of the Research Findings

The results of the present study revealed that appraisees of the selected departments have shown their agreement on eleven scales measuring respondent perceptions about procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice regarding PAS. The overall score of items on each scale ranged between (mean score 1.87 to 2.38) which are classified into “Agree” response category of interpretive scale given above, while the overall score for all the four factors was (Mean=2.17) which also falls in “Agree” response category. Therefore, the result revealed that appraisees perceived the PAS fair as determined by four factors of justice i.e. procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informational justice.

Moreover, the results showed that appraisees agree with all the item of distributive justice and interpersonal justice scales. So appraisees perceived both the outcome decisions (i.e. appraisal ratings) and treatment of supervisor fair. This might be due to getting high ratings from appraiser, as in the PAS of the civil service, this issue is highlight in the booklet “A Guide to Performance Evaluation” (PPARC, 2004) that most of the appraiser gives inflated ratings and are very generous in this regard. Holbrook (1999) argued that when appraisees receive favorable outcomes i.e. high appraisal ratings, then they perceive distributive fairness and procedural fairness in PAS. In work settings appraisers give high ratings try to maintain good interpersonal relationship with appraisees. This is because, PAS is considered as a major source of conflict between appraisers and appraisees (Greenberg, 1991) and it creates tension between both parties (Jenks, 1991). Therefore, for avoiding conflicts and maintaining better interpersonal relations, appraisers rate subordinates performance leniently and assigns ratings generously.

Furthermore, sometimes raters also assign high rating not only to avoid various conflicts, but also on personal likes/dislikes or due to political pressure (Longenecker, Gioria, & Sims, 1987; McCarthy, 1995). So appraisees’ fair perceptions for all the items of distributive and interpersonal justice regarding PAS in the civil service might be due to unrealistic and high appraisal ratings assigned by appraisers. Respondent have recorded response “Neither Agree nor Disagree” for few items of the eleven scales. For example, in the scale “Setting Performance Targets” respondent neither agreed nor disagreed with the item “My performance targets are set at the start of each calendar year” (mean =2.54), which shows supervisor are not consistent in setting the performance targets of their subordinates in the start of each year. Therefore, procedural weakness in the PERS exists as “Setting Performance Targets” an important element of due process approach of (Folger et al., 1992) is missing or not followed by supervisor. This discrepancy creates big performance problem for subordinates, because, if employees don’t know that what they are to do, then they might work to achieve the wrong targets.

Similarly in the “Seeking Appeal” scale respondent didn’t show their agreement and reported response “Neither Agree nor Disagree” with the item “In my department, performance rating disagreement is freely communicated to reporting officer” (mean=2.53) which shows that ratees’ are unable to communicate their disagreement to supervisors regarding their appraisal ratings or they have never been asked to give views about their ratings. This procedural justice problem might exist due to absence of a very important part of PERS i.e. *Performance Appraisal Review* meeting between the supervisor and the subordinates. In which ratings are discussed by appraiser with appraisee. In this study researcher has also included (PER) appraisal rating format in the procedural justice scales. This scale was included to get deep insight into ratees’ perceptions about the PER which is being used in civil service. Respondent reported their response as “Neither Agree nor Disagree” for the items, like, “My performance is not evaluated fairly with the existing PER” (mean=2.59) reverse coded, “PER influences personnel decisions” (mean= 2.52) and “The existing PER reflects all components of my job and related behavior” (mean=2.55). This shows that ratees’ have less or no information about the PER and they do not know the importance of appraisal report in PAS.

However, in practice the PER is suffering from various problems, for example, same appraisal rating format is used to appraise performance of all the civil servants working on different jobs in different departments. While there is difference in appraisal form i.e. PER for different Basic Pay Scales (BPS), which means that appraisal forms only differ for grade of an officer, but not for job nature. However, there is exception for some technical jobs in BPS 16 that have different PERs. Research suggests that appraisal form should be designed according to job nature of appraisee (see e.g. Lee, 1985). This is main discrepancy in the PAS, which should be addressed. Respondent recorded “Neither Agree nor Disagree” response, while reporting their response for items of the scale “Performance Feedback” i.e. “My reporting officer routinely compares my performance with already set performance targets” (mean=2.53). This neutral response might implies that ratees have no information to record agree or disagree reaction.

So there is possibility that in the year under review, performance of subordinates might not be checked by supervisor regularly. If, this is the case then subordinates do not know how they are performing, and it also creates problem for them to improve performance in case of any shortcomings or weaknesses. Therefore, it is necessary for supervisors to tell subordinates regularly about how they are working so that they can improve in case of any weakness (O’Reilly & Anderson, 1980). Similarly in the scale “Explanation of Rating Decisions” respondent recorded response “Neither Agree nor Disagree” for item “My reporting officer gives me clear examples from a diary to justify his/her ratings” (mean=2.79). This shows that the diary keeping for recoding important performance events is not in practice, as respondent recorded neutral response for this item. But in the rules of PAS given in booklet “A Guide to Performance Evaluation” it is clearly mentioned that supervisor should keep “Katcha register” to record important events of subordinate’s performance during the appraisal period. This diary keeping has been recommended by Greenberg (1986b).

7. Future Research

As there is very limited research on PAS of the civil service, we recommend that future researchers should investigate this topic more deeply. Future research should study the relationship among four factors in Pakistani context, moreover, impacts of perceived fairness on various individual and organizational outcomes. Similarly, future efforts should investigate the influence of various demographic variables on appraisees’ fairness perceptions of PAS. In addition, the rating format which is used in the civil service should be checked, whether it is psychometrically sound?

8. Limitations

Like other studies this research has also few limitations. First, the research was conducted in the two departments of far-flung area of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa; therefore the results may not be generalized to civil servants (appraisees) working in other Departments/Districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa or to the civil servants working in the country. Secondly, it has determined fairness perceptions of PAS of appraisees’ who were in BPS 16-19. Therefore, it was unable to measure the perceptions of appraisees working in the scales lower than BPS 16 and above BPS 19.

9. Conclusion

Current study has provided useful insights into appraisees’ fairness perceptions of PAS in the civil service.

The four factors of justice determined that appraisees perceive the system fair i.e. procedurally, distributively, interpersonally, informationally fair. However, the system has few discrepancies embedded in it, for example, issues of performance target settings, lack of appraisal review meeting and regular performance feedback. Moreover, assigning high ratings to appraisees' either to maintain good interpersonal relationship or due to other reasons is also a serious problem associated with the PAS. Though the study was conducted in the District Dera Ismail Khan, but still it highlights few issues related with PAS in the civil service, as the same PAS is in practice for civil servants working throughout the country. The high ups in the civil service should revisit the whole system and make changes in the system based on scientific investigation. This will help to develop efficacious PAS in the civil service of Pakistan.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (2, pp 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Ahmad, R., & Ali, N.A. (2004). Performance appraisal decision in Malaysian public service. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 17(1), 48-64.
- Ambrose, M. L. (2002). Contemporary justice research: A new look at familiar questions. *Organizational Behavior Human Decision Process*, 89(1), 803-812.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Beatty, R. W. (1984). *Performance appraisal: Assessing human behavior at work*. Boston: Kent-Wadsworth.
- Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 89-118). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Blau, G. (1999). Testing the longitudinal impact of work variables and performance appraisal satisfaction on subsequent overall job satisfaction. *Human Relations*, 52(8), 1099-1113.
- Boice, D. F., & Kleiner, B. H. (1997). Designing Effective Performance Appraisal Systems. *Work Study*, 46(6), 197-201.
- Boyd, N. M., & Kyle, K. (2004). Expanding the view of performance appraisal by introducing social justice concerns. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 26(3), 249-278.
- Brown, M., & Benson, J. (2003). Rated to exhaustion? Reactions to performance appraisal processes. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 34(1), 67-81.
- Cardy, R. L., & Dobbins, G. H. (1994). *Performance appraisal: Alternative perspectives*. Cincinnati, Ohio: South Western Publishing Company.
- Carroll, S. J., & Schneier, C. E. (1982). *Performance appraisal and review systems: The identification, measurement and development of performance in organizations*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman.
- Cascio, W. F. (1982). Scientific, legal, and operational imperatives of workable performance appraisal systems. *Public Personnel Management*, 11(4), 367-375.
- Cawley, B. D., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (1998). Participation in the performance appraisal process and employee reactions: A meta-analytic review of field investigations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(4), 615-633.
- Coens, T., & Jenkins, M. (2000). *Abolishing performance appraisals: Why they backfire and what to do instead*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers
- Cook, J., & Crossman, A. (2004). Satisfaction with performance appraisal systems: A study of role perceptions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(5), 526-541.
- Crisis Group Asia Report N°185 (2010). Reforming Pakistan's civil service. Retrieved from <http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/asia/south-asia/pakistan/185%20Reforming%20Pakistans%20Civil%20Service.ashx>
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317-372.
- Dubinsky, A. J., Skinner, S. J., & Whittler, T. E. (1989). Evaluating sales personnel: An attribution theory perspective. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 9(1), 9-21.
- Dulebohn, J. H., & Ferris, G. R. (1999). The role of influence tactics in perceptions of performance evaluations' fairness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(3), 288-303.
- Erdogan, B. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of justice perceptions in performance appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(4), 555-578.

- Erdogan, B., Kraimer, M. L. & Liden, R. C. (2001). Procedural justice as a two-dimensional construct: An examination in the performance appraisal context. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 37(2), 205-222.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4), 473-487.
- Folger, R., Konovsky, M. A. & Cropanzano, R. (1992). A due process metaphor for performance appraisal. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 14, 129-177.
- Gabris, G. T., & Ihrke, D. M. (2001). Does performance appraisal contribute to heightened levels of employee burnout? The results of one study. *Public Personnel Management*, 30(2), 157-172.
- Giles, W. F., & Mossholder, K. W. (1990). Employee reactions to contextual and session components of performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(4), 371-377.
- Gilliland, S.W., & Langdon, J.C. (1998). Creating performance management systems that pro-mote perceptions of fairness. In J.W.Smith (Ed.), *Performance Appraisal: State of The Art In Practice*, (209-243). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Greenberg, J. & Folger, R. (1983). Procedural justice, participation, and the fair process effect in groups and organizations. In P.B. Paulus (Ed.), *Basic Group Processes*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Greenberg, J. (1986a). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 340-342.
- Greenberg, J. (1986b). The distributive justice of organizational performance evaluations. In H. W. Bierhoff, R. L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Justice in Social Relations*, (337-351). New York: Plenum Press.
- Greenberg, J. (1991). Using explanations to manage impressions of performance appraisal fairness. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(1), 51-60.
- Greenberg, J. (1993a). The social side of fairness: interpersonal and informal classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Griffin, R. W. & Ebert, R. J. (2002). *Business*, (6th ed.). London: Prentice Hall.
- Holbrook, R.L. (1999). Managing reactions to performance appraisal: The influence of multiple justice mechanisms. *Social Justice Research*, 12(3), 205-221.
- Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, S. M. (1979). Consequences of Individual Feedback on Behavior in Organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64(4), 349-371.
- Jackson, S. & Schuler, R. S. (2003). *Managing human resources through strategic partnership* (8th ed.). Canada: Thompson.
- Jawahar, I. M. (2007). The influence of perceptions of fairness on performance appraisal reactions. *Journal of Labor Research*, 28(4), 735-754
- Jenks, J. M. (1991). Do your performance appraisals boost productivity? *Management Review*, 80(6), 45-47.
- Keeping, L. M., Levy, P. E. (2000). Performance appraisal reactions: Measurement, modeling, and method bias. *Journal Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 708-723.
- Landy, F. J., Barnes, J. L., Murphy, K. R. (1978). Correlates of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(6), 751-754.
- Latham, G. P. & Wexley, K. N. (1994). *Increasing Productivity through Performance Appraisal*. Reading Massachusetts: Addison Wesley.
- Lee, C. (1985). Increasing performance appraisal effectiveness: Matching task types, appraisal process, and rater training. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(2), 322-331.
- Levy, P. E., & Williams, J. R. (1998). The role of perceived system knowledge in predicting appraisal reactions, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *The Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 53-65.
- Longenecker, C. O., Sims, H. P., & Gioia, D. A. (1987). Behind the mask: The politics of employee Appraisal. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 1(3), 183-193.
- Martin, D. C., & Bartol, K. M. (2003). Factors influencing expatriate performance appraisal system success: An organizational perspective. *Journal of International Management*, 9(2), 115-132.
- McCarthy, B. J., (1995). *Rater Motivation in Performance Appraisal*. Unpublished Dissertation for Ph.D., University Of WI, Madison.
- Mount, M. K. (1984). Psychometric properties of subordinate ratings of managerial performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 37(4), 687-702.

- Muczyk, J. P., & Gable, M. (1987). Managing sales performance through a comprehensive performance appraisal system. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 7(3), 41-52.
- Murphy, K. R. & Cleveland, J. N. (1991). *Performance Appraisal: An Organizational Perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Murphy, K. R., Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational and goal-based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- National Accountability Bureau. (2002). *National anti-corruption strategy*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Author.
- National Commission for Government Reforms (2008). *Reforming the government in Pakistan* (Report). Islamabad, Pakistan: Author.
- O'Reilly, C. A. & Anderson, J. C. (1980). Trust and the communication of performance appraisal information: The effect of feedback on performance and job satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, 6(4), 290-298.
- Pakistan Public Administration Research Center. (2004). *A guide to performance evaluation*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Establishment Division.
- Rizzo, J., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(2), 150-163.
- Roberson, Q. M. & Stewart, M. M. (2006). Understanding the motivational effects of procedural and informational justice in feedback processes. *British Journal of Psychology*, 97(3), 281-298.
- Roch, S. G., Sternburgh, A. M., & Caputo, P. M. (2007). Absolute vs relative performance rating formats: Implications for fairness and organizational justice. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(3), 302-316.
- Stoffey, R. W., & Reilly, R. R. (1997). Training appraisees to participate in appraisal: Effects on appraisers and appraisees. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12(2), 219-239.
- Storey, J. & Sisson, K. (1993). *Managing human resources and industrial relations*. Buckingham: The Open University Press.
- Taylor, M. S., Fisher, C. D., & Ilgen, D. R. (1984). Individuals' reactions to performance feedback in organizations: A control theory perspective. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (81-124). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.
- Taylor, M. S., Tracy, K. B., Renard, M. K., Harrison, J. K., & Carroll, S. J. (1995). Due process in performance appraisal: A quasi-experiment in procedural justice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3), 495-523.
- Thomas, S. L., & Bretz, R. D., Jr. (1994). Research and practice in performance appraisal: Evaluating performance in America's largest companies. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 59(2), 28-37.
- Walsh, M. B. (2003). *Perceived fairness of and satisfaction with employee performance appraisal*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Louisiana, United States of America.
- Wiese, D. S., & Buckley, M. R. (1998). The evolution of the performance appraisal process. *Journal of Management History*, 4(3), 233-249.
- Wren, D. A. (1994). *The evolution of management thought*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Table 1. Appraisees' Fairness Perceptions of Performance Appraisal System

Variable	N	Mean	SD
Distributive justice	259	2.23	.86
Procedural justice	259	2.21	.58
Interpersonal Justice	259	1.99	.69
Informational Justice	259	2.25	.89
Overall Score	259	2.17	.60