

# Performance Appraisal Practices in Different Countries – A Review

Sujith A S

Research Scholar

Mahatma Gandhi University, Kerala, India

**Abstract**— In recent years, many companies have attempted to move away from the traditional performance appraisal system to increase creativity and create better corporate culture. Because corporate culture is such an important part of success for a company, employers are finding new ways to bring flow and openness into office. And this new flow and openness are also finding their way into the changing appraisals is conducted. These changes include implementing self-evaluation system, technology, and/or group evaluations. To create a new and innovative system, inspiration is available from companies all over the world. This article discusses about the performance appraisal practices in different countries and find out how they use their employee evaluation systems.

**Key words:** Multinational Performance Appraisal, Performance Appraisal Practices in Different Countries

## I. INTRODUCTION

With the world economic development quickly moving toward a more globally integrated direction, the pace of the multinational performance appraisal (PA) in human resources management enforcement and reform should also closely be kept up and aim to provide sufficient power protection for employees. PA is considered an important employee evaluation tool and core measurement in human resource management. The role of PA will be increasingly important as a strategic partner to guarantee the organization's business results could be achieved through effective implementation and monitoring of a robust performance management process. The application of performance appraisal system is different from one country to another.

### A. Definition Performance Appraisal

PA is defined as “a managerial process through which an individual employees' behavior and accomplishments for a fixed time period are measured and evaluated” (IGNOU cited from Human Resource Management V. Balu, (2006)). Broad definition of PA given by Fletcher (2001) is “activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, enhance performance and distribute rewards”. In other words, PA is a tool used in an organised and objective way to measure the actual performance of employees to the standards set by the organization followed by formal or informal feedback from the superior in judging the relative worth or ability of the employee performing his or her task.

### B. Uses of Performance Appraisal

In general terms, performance appraisal plays two roles in an organization, and these roles are often seen as potentially conflicting. The first role is to measure performance for the purpose of rewarding or otherwise making administrative decisions about employees. Promotions and layoffs also hinge on the ratings, sometimes making it difficult.

Another role is development of individual potential. In this case, the manager is featured more as a counselor than

as a judge, the atmosphere is often different. The developmental function of performance appraisal can also be identified in areas of employee organization.

## II. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PRACTICES IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

### A. China

China is a country whose culture relies on individuality and collectivism and therefore group and individual evaluations are done annually. In the past, China would do its evaluations based on political affiliations, seniority, and harmonious relations, focusing very little on the actual job responsibilities of the employee. Following the economic reform of 1978, China made significant changes in its performance appraisal system by adopting western style evaluation techniques. While historically, performance evaluations were only about accuracy, now employees review development, ownership, input, teamwork, and perception of value. This newly adopted western also use evaluation related pay system, which is becoming more and more prevalent in the Chinese culture. Incorporating and rewarding individual input is helping produce satisfaction and motivation to work harder throughout the year.

However, because these evaluations still lack openness, transparency, and mutual influence there pervades a sense of scepticism regarding performance assessments that often causes employees to not take them as seriously as they should. Many different objectives employees feel should be used in the evaluations and play a role in the evaluation system, including attitude toward supervisor's age, role behaviours, and social skills. There is also a sentiment that outcomes and efforts should be implemented and discussed over time.

Many companies in China are still developing performance evaluations and ways in which to improve satisfaction and efficiency. They are continuing to follow the western style and thus far very few employees have submitted complaints or disagreement.

### B. Japan

In Japan the appraisal system heavily influences salary and promotion. Salary is also affected by age and seniority. However, Japanese firms focus very little on further development or improving employee skills. Appraisals and reviews are also not used to develop communication between supervisors and employees. In fact, this system is only important for the purposes of wages and salaries.

Recently, Japan has attempted to adopt the American way of evaluating, but there are still glitches in the Japanese application of this system. There are several companies that do not use a specific system and other companies do not utilise evaluations at all. Although normally unionized firms do not conduct evaluations, some studies show that unions are beginning to incorporate appraisals.

Typically, employees in Japan are evaluated on skills, overall performance, and attitudes. And while managers undergo this same type of evaluation their attitudes are not taken into account. In recent years, the method by which an evaluation is related to pay has changed to performance in salary based decision making, rather than focusing on age and seniority as had done in previous years. Unfortunately, these reviews still do not accurately analyze an employee's performance or any improvements achieved over the prior year. This issue causes many Japanese workers to only do the most fundamental work required. Often, no employee is willing to work above and beyond to increase efficiency. Japanese appraisal systems do not promote morale or job satisfaction. The little evidence found on these employee performance reviews shows how underused and underdeveloped these evaluations are in the Japanese culture.

#### C. South Korea

In 1983, a reform took place changing many governments invested enterprises and the performance evaluation system in South Korea. In fact, the reform had such a positive impact on the system that many other countries followed South Korea's lead. Although this system has become respected and used across South Korea, there are still some issues. For example, South Korea is known as a very harmony oriented country and therefore managers tend to be more lenient in some cases. There are also some issues with the ranking of qualitative criteria and some divergence in the incentives for employee's motivation linked to performance.

Here, the performance evaluation system provides the information necessary for a company or publicly owned organisation to be credited in the eyes of the government and other public sectors. All individuals are offered incentives to enhance job performance. Those who show improvement or rank highly are often rewarded with monetary compensation or other rewards such as promotions. However, the main objective of these reviews is to create improvement and efficiency in the companies. Evaluations look at the achievement of the employees as well as previously agreed upon targets goals that the individual is expected to reach. These goals are outlined at the beginning of each year by the manager and the employee. Unfortunately, due to the leniency of the system, improvement among individuals as the year progresses doesn't materialise. And yet, no one sees the system as unfair or biased against particular people.

Performance appraisal in South Korea covers a range of criteria. Before any job begins, a set of job related behaviours is stated and an employee is evaluated on such behaviours during the annual review. Each organisation has different sets of criteria and rating scale used to measure those behaviours. Currently, South Korean companies are not only analysing the amount of work and quality produced by the employee, but also personally traits, attitudes, harmony, cooperation, and loyalty evaluations. This allows for a well rounded evaluation as it determine teamwork abilities, whether an employee is doing well individually as well as cooperatively within the environment of the company. The performance appraisal system is still being improved and new techniques are being implemented. So far these reviews have accurately depicted the work of employees and it is credited by most South Korean companies.

#### D. Malaysia

Prior to the early 1990's, Malaysian organisations were using an evaluation system that seemed beneficial however; there were still a few weaknesses. These include no link between performance and salary or rewards, absence of formal performance review discussion, and lack of well defined standards and methods. Because of these issues, a performance appraisal system was implemented in 1992 by the New Remuneration System "NRS" to meet current needs of the Public Service. Many of these improvements have been introduced to create a more objective and transparent system. Several respective Malaysian service groups have had influence on the new criteria for these evaluation systems. Performance weightage is relevant to the aspects recognised by many managers as necessary with the roles, responsibilities, and competencies expected of each employee. These systems incorporate five categories for evaluating and ranking an individual:

Major competencies: interpersonal skills, intellectual capability, planning and organising capabilities, motivation, career orientation, and others similar criteria that reflect company objectives. The different performance appraisal methods followed in Malaysian companies are: HR accounting, BARS, 360 degree appraisal: Management by Objectives.

Malaysia is becoming more and more concerned with employee productivity and how much an individual contributes to the company or organisation. Additionally, leadership skills, knowledge and expertise, personal traits, and activities performed outside the realm of official duties are taken into account. While performance related pay was implemented 1990s, currently these could be instances of unfair implementation, so far, no issues have been reported outlining unfair practices or abuse of power by managers during performance evaluations.

#### E. Philippines

The Philippines uses three different phases for the performance evaluation system. The first is known as 'Performance monitoring and coaching'. During this time, the rater or individual conducting the assessment periodically monitors the employee on quality of work output and progress. Raters are obligated to address elements that are either helping or hindering the employee and strategies may be implemented as needed.

Next is performance review and feedback phase. During this particular step, managers are analysed on four additional categories. This phase is used to measure the employee's demonstrated commitments throughout the evaluation period. The rater identifies and states issues or gaps in the expected outcomes and actual outcomes in the employee's job performance. Tracking tools are used in the process to allow for more accurate scores. These tools include a performance ranking scale and the Managerial competency rating scale, a computerised based questionnaire assessing managerial competence. This questionnaire measures managers in four different areas: technical competence, management of work, management of people, and management of funds and resources. There are some additional objectives that can measure depending on the company or organisation. Managers are required to score well on all of these categories.

Finally, there is the performance evaluation and development planning phase. Here employees are placed in clusters and categories based on work complexity, accountability, and results from the previous section. During phase, the rater and employee discuss gaps in work performance, opportunities to minimise gaps, and if necessary, different career paths and alternatives.

Performance evaluation in the Philippines aims to maintain and improve employee performance as well as the organisation's ability to achieve corporate objectives. These goals are achieved through strategy developments, motivational techniques, and other team morale and efficiency boosters.

#### F. Lebanon

The most common types of the performance appraisal employed in the Lebanese firms are graphic rating scale and the management by objectives. In all the firms, a performance feedback is given to the employees once a year during November and December by their direct managers. Feedback should focus on solving the problem causing a poor performance. In most of the companies, employees are asked to complete a self-assessment before the feedback session and managers are the only source used to rate the employees. When asking about performance appraisal purposes, they use performance appraisal information for salary administration, promotions and recognition.

Regarding the problems generated by the performance appraisal in Lebanon firms are classified into five different heads: an unfair perceived performance appraisal system, the use of inconsistent criteria which may lead to negative attitude towards the appraisal system, unskilled appraisers who lack communication skills, and consequently are not able to conduct an effective performance feedback, absence of tools aiming to improve the performance appraisal system and finally the lack of the senior management support. In Lebanon organisation's many areas to be improved in the appraisal system such as the use of explicit evaluation criteria, an open and sincere feedback, a greater senior management support, a process perceived as being fair by employees and finally a structure in which improvements in performance appraisals may be facilitated.

#### G. Singapore

The tropical island of Singapore uses a system known as the Potential Appraisal System (PAS) developed by Shell Petroleum Company in the 1990s. Presently, the country conducts performance based-evaluations according to several pieces of criteria. First is the 'helicopter quality', which by definition is, an individual's ability to examine the problem or issues taking into account all important factors. These important factors refer to all tasks an individual must complete and how obstacles are handled in the work setting. Secondly, Singapore assesses 'intellectual qualities'. These include power of analysis, creativity, and imagination while still maintaining a sense of reality. Next is an employee's result orientation, reflecting how much output or activity an employee has accomplished since the last evaluation. Finally, superiors analyse an individual's 'leadership quality'. Typically this is only used when individuals are currently in a leadership position or if there is potential for promotion. The most important part of an evaluation in Singapore is the 'potential' section which assesses an employee's 'currently

estimated potential' done by matching job level with salary grade. It can determine employee's long term development prospects, which in turn can influence promotional recommendations made by the appraiser.

Promotion and salary are linked with the outcome of an individual's performance review. Singapore is a country that prides itself on professional education and the structure of civil service. This service has four divisions, all of which must undergo a PAS throughout the years. Though this service has an excellent structure for performance evaluations, it is not used as often as in other countries. Additionally, senior civil servants are compensated with bonus more frequently than individuals who are young or those who have not been in the current position for much time. Corruption is limited in this society due to the government's persistence in revising legal sanctions.

The PAS for senior civil servants has an extra two part process conducted after the initial PAS. Part one is known as the 'work review' which focuses more on the positives of an employee's performance. This section also allows for the employee to comment on the supervisor's assessment creating the opportunity for the employee to contribute to the evaluation and in turn minimise confrontational problems. The second part of the senior PAS is the 'development assessment' which rates employees on ten qualities also developed by Shell. Employees are ranked on a four-point scale ranging from 'high' to 'below'.

#### H. Sri Lanka

Performance appraisal in Sri Lankan organisation reveals a significant gap between what should exist and what in fact is existing. There is a highly felt need for developing a good performance appraisal system and implement it in a planned way. Following are the possible reasons for not having an effective high quality performance appraisal system in most of the organisations in Sri Lanka:

- It seems that responsible managers do not believe that performance appraisal is a driver of job performance and business performance and it has a variety of utility. In fact they do not have the right attitude about performance appraisal.
- Some organisations have a culture that is not valuing excellence in work. Majority of employees are moderate in terms of job performance and having a fear and a dislike to get their job performance evaluated. Also they have reluctance to see that few employees are excellent at work and are better than them owing to jealousy and inability to face competition.
- Line managers in some organisations do not take performance appraisal as a serious method as it has no link with rewards and training and development.
- The performance appraisal system has been introduced in some organisations as a human resource management programme, not as a general management programme initiated by the top management. Also doing performance appraisal has not been specified as an essential duty of job description given to managers.
- In some cases, there is no objective high quality performance appraisal system developed due to lack of expertise in performance appraisal and HRM.

### I. South Africa

South Africa does not participate in performance appraisals as often or to the same degree as many other countries. In fact, 60% of South African business organisations do not use or do not have a formal management system. All the same, when reviews are conducted, typically three types of criteria are used and measured. Each type has its advantages and disadvantages and depends on the specific objective and requirements that an employee is to complete in a certain time frame. The type of organisation also influences the type of performance appraisals.

The three different criteria are trait based, behaviour based, and results or outcome based. Trait based criteria focus on the personal attributes and/or characteristics of an employee. The second type of criteria is behaviour based which examines the specific behaviours that lead to job success. They do not rank according to an individual's leadership abilities but rather rank of qualities such as working well with co-workers.

The final criteria for performance appraisals is results or outcome-based. This is where companies focus on the quantity and quality of the employee's output during the year. Typically, most companies will analyse how the product or output was produced so they can create a more efficient output arrangement. At the same time, if South African companies were to study more in-depth how output is produced, progressive changes could be made through finding new ways to maximise product output and create an environment that allows for creativity. This in turn could boost morale and satisfaction in the work place.

### J. Nigeria

Performance Appraisal Systems in Nigeria have been largely characterised non-disclosure of appraisal results to the employees. This apparent secrecy over performance result tends to put in the hands of supervisors and managers, a potential tool of cracking down on 'recalcitrant' employees with impunity.

The major concern of performance appraisal is basically with a review of the individual's performance during a set period to identify his area of strengths and weakness, and establish targets for him to achieve within the overall corporate objectives of the organisation. They identify the two major elements of the performance appraisal system:

- What the organisation wants from the exercise, and
- What the individual employee wants from it

In Nigeria, performance appraisal is viewed as a means of bringing about motivation in employees – since motivators are those factors that contribute to job satisfaction. Performance appraisal is thus a panacea for staff development promotion, salary administration and other ancillary rewards.

In Nigeria, Performance appraisal is a tall dream in most organisations. Perhaps because such organisations are not bothered with the current global challenges and unfortunately, the few organisational that practice Performance appraisal are not conscious of its objectivity and its implementation in the work place. That is, the practice of performance appraisal is with gross bias. That is, it is not always done scientifically to be benefits of all the employees and the organisation at large. This affects negatively the morale of the employees to put in their total committed in their specialised work in order to attain organisational goals.

### K. Argentina

In Argentina, soccer players are evaluated by their skills on the field. In Argentinian corporations, employees are evaluated by a new system called Sistema Nacional para la Profesion Administrativa (SINAPA). Evaluations are done by an evaluation committee established by the Human Resource department. This committee ensures that the immediate supervisor does not assign 'good' reviews to keep favoured employees as permanent civil servants, and to guarantee that the employer is not abusing power. Because employees who fall below average are often dismissed immediately rather than given opportunities for improvement this harsh result can influence employers to rank employees higher on the scale. The committee in needed to create an environment that produces honest and credible evaluations. While conflicts regarding this system have arisen, many employees and employers still feel it is necessary when doing performance appraisal.

Argentinian law states that promotions are to be directly linked with performance appraisals. As such, 2 to 4 stunning performance appraisal can constitute a salary increase or promotion. Because most of employees receive these stunning reviews rather than more honest reviews that would result in dismissal, promotions are assigned primarily to employees with seniority. In a study done analysing the relationship between the manager's perception of employee motivation and the resulting performance appraisals, it was found that employees are more intrinsically motivated. There is no particular system that Argentina uses to evaluate employees. Based on lack of evidence, it can be assumed that evaluation criteria differ from company to company and employer preferences. This could be a result of the economic downfall in 2001 which lead to many organisations cutting all findings for human resource development programs.

### L. Brazil

On the sunny beaches of Brazil, evaluations are characterised as informal and very constructive. Brazilians tend to be more sensitive when it comes to work evaluations are typically done in a subjective manner, focusing in the positives rather than the negatives. Brazilians are also very relationship oriented and have a Confucianism mindset. This can coerce an employer to remain biased towards positivity during an evaluation in order to maintain employee's loyalty. All the same, employers must remain truthful during evaluations and deal with performance issues in a constructive fashion.

According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, all parts of the federation are required to assess a statutory employee performance at least once a year. Because there is no common model for these appraisals, employees are often asked to evaluate themselves then discuss the self-evaluation with the immediate superior. Written feedback of the meeting provided to the employee once the evaluation is complete. These reviews typically do not determine pay raises or promotions as there is a tendency to blame the process rather than the person when problems arise. Brazilians are also known to bend rules in order to get a job done. Employer versatility and social knowledge are very important in this culture as evaluation rankings can affect an employee's performance in the future. It is for this reason that constructive criticism plays such a huge role in the

evaluation process. Brazilians are immersed in a very understanding and collective society.

Overall Brazil has a very loyal system in place. Though there is no set of objectives or criteria used for measuring outcomes, every individual is afforded the benefit of doubt. When an employee is having trouble, constructive criticism and rationale in Brazil's way of redirecting

#### M. Mexico

Mexico utilises performance appraisals to determine promotions and renew work contracts. Mexico is also one of the few countries that do not use assessment results to decide salary increases or deductions. Frequency of assessment is determined by the previous year evaluation resulting in reviews being held annually or quarterly. Quarterly appraisals are done when an individual is on probation, has been recently promoted, or if an individual is a newly appointed Bureau Chief. In these cases, the individual will undergo frequent evaluations for a period of one year. Performance appraisal measure a range of criteria including: improvement of competencies, values, timeliness, quality of outputs, and number of activities undertaken. Employees are ranked using a four-tier scale: exceptional, successful, requires attention, and not acceptable.

There are several steps to conducting an employee performance appraisal in Mexico. To begin, the evaluation is performed by an employee's immediate supervisor. This supervisor will put together a report known as the Employee Development and Appraisal Plan (EDA). The EDA must identify development goals for the employees that are in accordance with the company's missions and objectives as well as assessment of the previously listed criteria. This EDA will also include an appraisal form and a section specifically focussed on a basic evaluation of the employee which requires both supervisors and employee input. The EDA must be in compliance with Public Regulation Committee policies. A third party, the reviewer is called in to assist in determining the EDA's compliance with policies, regulations, and rules. This reviewer is only required to be part of the evaluation process twice. A first time when the EDA is created, and a second time when the supervisor issues the final ratings. In Mexico, the ranking and final evaluation is agreed upon by both supervisor and reviewer prior to meeting with the employee. Usually the employee already has a basic knowledge of the assigned ranking due to the joint collaboration in creating the EDA.

Individual who have been in a position for fewer than 90 days will not be subject to appraisals. Once this time period has expired, the employee will be evaluated based on the EDA created when upon the initial hire. Timing of evaluations is according to whenever the immediate supervisor deems them appropriate which means employees may undergo evaluation at different times throughout the year.

Employees who receive a rating of Not Acceptable or requires attention on any part of the evaluation will be notified and must create a performance action plan and work improvement plan. Evaluations will then be scheduled several times throughout the year until a 'successful' rating is achieved. If there is continuously no improvement, the employee will be terminated.

#### N. Canada

Canada strives to create an evaluation that not only relates to the employee's specific job description, but also describe the activities that have been accomplished throughout the period. The country relies heavily on consistency across past and current evaluations. At the end of an evaluation the desired developments and activities should be written out and used as objectives in the next evaluation. Expectations should be clearly stated and agreed upon by both employee and manager. Minor and major job components are also rated on different scales as certain job components do not carry the same weight as others. However, because there are different scales, the individual doing the assessment must understand how to analyse the data. Typically, rating ranks will range from a low of 'unacceptable' to a high 'excellent'. These rankings should have specific achievement criteria to that will provide accurate and fair assessments. In order to ensure continuous positive and efficient work environments, employers focus on four core competencies throughout the evaluation:

- Demonstrating integrity and respect;
- Thinking things through;
- Working effectively with others;
- Showing initiative and being action-oriented.

There are three steps that every evaluation follows: 1. setting individual expectations, 2. providing ongoing feedback, and 3. formally reviewing performance. These steps establish a uniform system and enhanced employee participation. The performance evaluation is usually done by the managers /supervisors as well as reviewer who cross-checks all information and rating to make sure nothing was missed or rated incorrectly.

#### O. France

In France has been part of an integrated policy process validated by the immediate supervisor. Final evaluation reports must signed by the employee and the superior performing the evaluation. Appraisals use criteria that assess professionalism, technical skills, organisation, results, personal qualities, and interpersonal skills. This system was modernised and how incorporates work objectives, goals for the year to come, and training or skill development if needed. There is now a five-point system used by several government agencies around the world and France is no exception. This evaluation system incorporates the following:

- Work objective
- Leadership and management section
- Professional qualities and personal attributes
- Overall assessment of employee performance
- Work objectives for the next appraisal period

Each of these sections contains different criteria and is appropriate for each individual's role. An important quality of appraisal is the objectivity which allows evaluations to be directly related to an employee's performance and does not analyse the personal qualities of the individual. These evaluations are ranked by systems established by French law and mandated by the French Supreme Courts. Being under control of the French Supreme Court warrants factual and understandable evaluations. This system does not take away the employer's freedom when creating evaluations; rather it creates a unified way of deciphering evaluations from company to company. Ranking are typically colour coded for

easy placement and analysis. Though the appraisal system in France has been modified a number of times, specific elements of some criteria have continued to be applied for decades. The new system of appraisal in France has proven to be the most effective and accurate.

#### *P. Germany*

In Germany performance appraisal have been analyzed through electronic management system. This system decentralizes and individualizes performance appraisals. Managers or HR organisation's input gathered information into a computer that classifies employees into categories. This system ranks employees based on quality, usability, promptness, team fairness, and conflict management. Because technology is involved, these evaluations are not considered formal. Computer assessments are done annually or semi-annually depending on the company. However, there are some qualifications that require more frequent evaluations. Employees also believe that co-workers should be involved in evaluation in order to provide a well-rounded review. Assessment is mandatory for most, if not all, employees. Sometimes before assessment results are entered into the computer evaluation system, a meeting takes place with the immediate supervisor. These meetings are scheduled every two years, less often than most other countries. During this meeting, the performance evaluation bases its outcomes on work results, expert knowledge, working method, social skill, and leadership.

A rating scale was established by the Federal Ministry of Interiors and is based on a points system. Pay is related to the number of points and employee scores received during the evaluation. Germany relies heavily on these reviews more so than many other countries to determine an appropriate salary or stipend. Because of this expectation, job satisfaction was positively linked to performance appraisals when monetary benefits were stated. The highest amount of pay increase that would be rewarded for a high performance review runs between 10 and 15% of the employee's current salary. Due to this substantial increase possibility, only 15% of employees will be ranked at the highest level of 1. Germany's system for performance evaluations works well and there have been few complaints from employees undergoing reviews.

#### *Q. Italy*

Italians assess employees periodically throughout the year so there is no pile up. Reviews are also conducted frequently to ascertain that performances are in compliance with the company's goals and interests. In recent years, the Italian government has introduced several elements meant to increase motivation and reward employees. In 2011, the transition was implemented and a number of regulations were created. And while the decree states no specific laws on what must be evaluated during performance appraisals, there are a number of steps to be followed when an employer is doing a performance review. The first requirement is that the employer must inform the employee of the upcoming evaluation. Next, the employer must establish the structure of the review, and finally the employer must indicate what qualities will be evaluated during the review. These three steps are known as 'the processes to most employers. Additionally, Italian companies must analyse employees based upon objective measures. Some of include, but are not

limited to; efficiency results, quality of work produced, and customer satisfaction. It is imperative that no employer or supervisor incorporate any information regarding the employee's private life. Political views, religions, and sexual orientation are completely prohibited from assessment during the employee's performance evaluation. Finally, any Italian company that collects data from the performance reviews must only use data that is in compliance with the Italian privacy law.

The most important contribution made during the transition was the instalment of performance related pay systems even though the decree emphasizes that reward based pay systems must be selectively used. An employee is placed into one of three levels during the review. The use of these levels is to eliminate the showering of incentives onto individuals who do not deserve such rewards. If there was no regulation on this matter, most employees would rank highly and the incentive programme would not in the intended manner. Additionally, many evaluations are based on two related elements- reaching objectives and demonstrating organizational competences. The organizational behaviour under assessment include problem solving, leadership ability, and quality of organizational relations. And while objectives vary from company to company, the new evaluation system has been very beneficial to both Italian companies and their employees.

#### *R. Netherlands*

In the Dutch culture, employees are typically evaluated semi-annually. The country tends to use its evaluation analysis to a lesser extent than most other countries. However, these evaluations are still mandatory. Immediate superiors assess subordinates based on activities undertaken, outputs, and improvement of competencies. Employers rely on subjective evaluations to measure employee's performance, though measurements can become complicated if there are several types of work efforts. Teamwork in the Netherlands can increase the probability of a more intense performance appraisal. Performance related pay is used infrequently in this society and promotions require a separate set of evaluations. Some employers apply extrinsic values to reward different types of efforts.

While monetary increases are not used often in this society, it is still important for an employer to remain subjective while doing reviews. When employees trust that employers will provide fair and accurate evaluations, the incentives, such as pay raises, are more effective. There are no specific laws governing the use of monetary systems related to performance how an employer must conduct evaluations. When a review is done objectively there is often no pay relation. Objective measures include sales quantity and produced output and multitasking is often used as a measure of evaluation so that when an employee is able to do several jobs at once the evaluations tend to rank higher.

Unfortunately, there is little evidence illustrating exactly how these reviews are done and what processes are utilized. The research does though; seem to indicate that employee performance reviews are more of a formality than a positive and useful measurement tool.

#### *S. Poland*

Poland, like the Netherlands, does not use performance evaluations across the boards. However evaluations become

highly important in potential contract renewals and of medium importance for determining remuneration and/or career advancement. These assessments are done every two years in the form of a meeting with the immediate supervisor with distribution of written feedback is given at the conclusion of the meeting. Poland incorporated a new system based on universal compensable factors such as performance related pay increases. Employees are ranked on a scale from 1 to 5 and score determines any pay bonus or other extrinsic rewards (Dunn, 2004). While bonuses and remunerations are sometimes used, performance – related pay systems are not which means salaries cannot be increased due to good performance.

Evaluations tend to focus on several aspects of the job for which the employee was hired. And while many categories are used for assessment, the following is a list of objective measures (Dunn, 2004);

- Knowledge of duties;
- Execution of duties (timeliness);
- Initiative and know – how;
- Responsibility, flexibility, and creativity;
- Communication;
- Ability to work with others;
- Customer satisfaction and intrapersonal skills;
- Leadership / management qualities; and
- Training and development of competencies.

Often Polish companies make use of all of these objectives as well as others that directly relate to the goal of the specific company.

#### T. Portugal

Portugal leads the pack as the biggest user of performance evaluations out of all other OECD countries. Assessment is mandatory for all employees, managers or supervisors and company authority figures. However, casual employees such as, temps, are excluded from the evaluation process. In 2004, a new performance appraisal system was introduced in Portugal public administration and is known as the integrated system of performance appraisal – SIADAP. These reviews take place at the beginning of each new year and apply to the information obtained during the previous year, one of the most important aims of the performance appraisal process is to ensure improvement from year to year. Additionally, the Portuguese government use forced distribution to quickly remove widespread leniency. While the initial SIADAP implementation process was very abrupt and difficult due to lack of preparation, it now seems that the process is being used well. SIADAP is based on three components.

- Goal attainment
- Behavioural competency
- Personal attitude

Before feedback is given to the employee, a group known as the coordination council will meet and ensure that designated quotas are respectful to the organization or service. Often evaluation course can determine promotion, opportunities and rewards. Individuals who receive an excellent score can be rewarded with a bonus equivalent to one month salary. Unfortunately, since 2011 bonuses pay scale progression have been frozen. While the SIADAP system is definite improvement over the old evaluation techniques, there are still several problems. Many times individuals feel that the review and the resulting

compensation is unfair. Portugal is still working on the system and is expected to be revised again in the next few years.

#### U. Russia

Before an employee performance appraisal can be done in Russia, all objectives must be approved by order of the company's General Director. There are several pieces of criteria that must be approved and reviewed prior to conducting evaluations. First, the list of positions and individuals who are subject to a performance review must be approved. Some employees are exempt from evaluations and they include individuals who have held the current position for less than one year, interns, pregnant women, and women who have children under three years of age. Every other employee must undergo an annual appraisal. Next, the reviewers who will conduct the performance evaluation are chosen, that is, the quorum committee; 2-3 impartial members who provide rationale and ensure reviews remain unbiased. Once the quorum has been selected, the employee's immediate supervisor will schedule the evaluation, including the date, time, location, duration, and names of committee members, if the company has trade union, a union member must be on the quorum committee. This schedule must be in writing and the employee is notified of the upcoming evaluation at least one month in advance. About two weeks before the scheduled assessment, the supervisor will complete a report outlining the employee's expected performance, qualifications, and business skills expected as well as a detailed account of the employee's actual overall performance. Once all of these objectives have been met and approved by the general director, supervisors can begin with the evaluations.

During these evaluations there are various individuals in the room; the employee undergoing assessment, the employee's immediate supervisors, the quorum committee, and any other individual called into the meeting. The meeting begins with the employee stating his or her thoughts on the year's performance achievements. Next the supervisor states his or her views and describes how or what the employee has achieved throughout the year. Once all statements have been made, the employee is dismissed from the meeting and the quorum takes a vote (typically by a show of hands) determining the adequacy of the employee's performance. In the event of a tie, the employee's performance is deemed adequate. Immediately following the vote and determination of performance, the employee is informed of the outcome and the written report is placed in the employee's personal file. Positive results can lead to salary increases, promotions, and bonuses. However, negative results are subject to salary reduction, demotion, and in extreme cases, dismissal. If an employee does not agree with the findings of the committee, an appeal can be filed with evidence to justify adequate performance.

#### V. Spain

While Spain is known for putting an interesting flair on everything, this unfortunately does not translate into its performance appraisal system. Spain's performance reviews do not carry the same weight as they do in the United States. For example, in Spain, performance assessments are not used to gain promotion, establish contract renewal or confirm termination. In fact, due to such little evidence about reviews done in Spain, it can be assumed that they are done more than a formality rather than necessity. However, when reviews are

conducted, there are three main components: type of measures used to rate performance, persons who conducts the reviews, and frequency of appraisals. And while quantity outputs as well as quality of products are applied as objective measures, there are also many subjective measures such as team work and attitude used to increase flexibility in the appraisal system.

Because there is such discrepancy in the elements used to assess and review employee, there is significant inequality from using systems not based on clearly defined and observable data. Often it is the immediate supervisor who performs the annual review, which can add to the subjectivity, especially if an employer has developed personal feelings towards or against certain employees. This lack of clarity defined and observable data means that employers have the ability to ignore faults in favoured employees and potentially unfairly rank an employee if there are internal conflicts. However, depending on the circumstances, peers, subordinates, and sometimes customers are asked to take part in the evaluation process. These extended reviews are unregulated and leave room for interpretation and untruthfulness. Additionally, Spain uses performance review to determine pay at a greater degree than many other countries, again adding to the scepticism of these annual performance appraisals.

The lack of evidence relating to Spain and its annual performance appraisals suggests that these procedures are not valued as seriously as by other countries. With the narrow range of criteria applied in the review process, Spain does not take advantage of being able to evaluate the full potential and growth of employees. Currently, there is no information regarding any anticipated changes or developments to its system. Perhaps in the future, the annual performance evaluation system in Spain will become modernised.

#### W. Turkey

Performance appraisals in Turkey use a wide range of criteria to fully assess individuals from activities undertaken, timeliness and quality, values, interpersonal skills, and competency improvements. Organisations will add or delete from this list depending on the objectives. Typically, there is a four step process used when conducting performance evaluations in Turkey, and they are:

- Establishing Job criteria and appraisal standards
- Timing of appraisal
- Selection of appraisers
- Providing feedback

The first step, establishing job criteria and appraisal standards, is used to decide what the employee needs to accomplish each term and what is to be measured during the performance review. Timing of performance refers to how often an employee to be evaluated. For example, should an individual receive a lower than expected score on an evaluation or if there are issues to be resolved, the employer may decide to evaluate the employee more frequently until the issues are resolved. When it comes to determining who will conduct the appraisal, several criteria are taken into consideration. Appraisers can include supervisors, subordinates, peers, customers, and sometimes even the employee. This approach allows for multi-source feedback and well-rounded evaluation. Using a 360 degree evaluation helps eliminate biases, though there are some that could pose

a potential threat, such as leniency errors, halo effect, strictness errors, and several others. Turkey finds that the best way to reduce these problems is to provide training on how to assign rating and follow-up training to reviews and appraisers. Training ensures that all individuals are rated in the same manner and that no one receives an unfair evaluation. Finally, feedback is given to the employee. During feedback, the appraiser discuss how an employee scored during the evaluation and if there is anything that needs to be improved upon by the next review.

#### X. United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom several stages are involved in what's considered an employee performance review 'cycle' which includes three meetings typically known as reviewing, planning, and managing. During the review phase, an immediate supervisor analyse the work performance over the year to establish the initial evaluation conducted and feedback is given. Often, supervisors assess the employee's accomplishments and determine if there have been any skill improvements as established in the previous evaluation. Objective measurements are typically used to remain fair during the process.

The next phase is planning, which involves discussion and developing a plan for improving skills should the employer feels it necessary. These improvements may focus on greater efficiency and effective work output or simply learning to create a better customer experience. These expected improvements will be evaluated during the next scheduled evaluation. High emphasis is placed on the development of work objectives and planning achievements. Closing the evaluation cycle is the manager stage, which involves stating future expectations and discussing ways to achieve them. Some refer to this as the 'call to action plan' though it is different from the planning steps as it discusses ways in which to achieve the desired outcomes rather than simply stating them.

The United Kingdom relies on face to face meetings rather technology or other forms of communication creating a more personal evaluation and allowing supervisors to assess employees with a more participative approach. Thus far, this evaluation system works well in the United Kingdom and there have been no reports of expected changes.

#### Y. Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia has been very slow in adopting privatisation. Annual performance appraisals are the most common method used for determining efficiency and effectiveness of an employee. Evaluations are used to uncover employee's strengths and weakness and determine if further training is necessary. This is a formal process, important for both the employee and appraiser, and helps to ensure compatibility between the worker and his or her qualifications, responsibilities, and capabilities. These evaluations can be used to determine promotions, compensation, and remuneration. Saudi Arabia ensures that feedback is provided to all individuals subject to a performance appraisal, which helps to increase employee motivation toward achieving organisational goals. This feedback also gives individuals the opportunity to improve or enhance performance before the next review, further increasing motivation and morale. There are numerous criteria used to evaluate employees in Saudi Arabia and some of the variables include:

- Performance average
- Individual personal characteristics and job related characteristics
- Management by objectives
- General effectiveness

Most companies in Saudi Arabia make use of the three section evaluation form. Section one is completed by the Human Resource Department overseeing the employee's service records and basically states any past promotions, disciplinary actions taken throughout the year, and other necessary job related information about the employee. The next section is filled out by the job holder and describes achievements and prominent progresses as well as any information the employee feels is important for estimating efficiency throughout the period. Finally, the supervisor completes the third section of the evaluation form which contains objective criteria for assessing performance efficiency.

Performance efficiency reports should be easy to analyse and include contain notes about employee weakness, suggestions on how these weakness can be overcome, and any final recommendations in regards to improving overall efficiency. Saudi Arabia's performance appraisal system does have flaws but they are few and far between. Evaluations are formal and there are limited complaints from employees regarding criteria and objectives.

#### Z. Australia

Appraisals from the land down focus on progression and development of the staff as well as stating future objectives. When evaluation performance is below average, Australian employers discuss and analyse with employees to find a way to fix the problem before drastic disciplinary action must be taken. This country remains fair and honest in employee evaluations by using measures and criteria specific to each employee. Employers carefully and accurately distinguish between performance levels such as excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. Additionally, employee performance assessments are directly related to matters that are within the domain of the work capable of being done. They do not state objectives that are too challenging or unreachable, which can help to boost the intrinsic value, loyalty, and morale of employees.

A supervisor's goal when conducting performance evaluation is to keep the balance by not focusing too much on the negatives or the positives while still remaining fair, transparent, and objective. It is important for appraisers avoid bombarding the employee with faults and weakness because it can cause a decrease in motivation. Australians use follow up reviews to ensure employee performance issues are being improved and that skills are developing. Monitoring performance is important to Australian companies not only because it records staff progression and development, but because it also states future objectives and intention. Recording all evaluations and stating all required objectives protects a company when legal action is taken when an employee feels alighted due to a poor performance review. Records help to justify disciplinary action and can decrease arguments amongst employees and supervisors. While many employees feel evaluation have been conducted with subjective measures, most companies create set objectives in order to remain honest and fair to all employees.

These reviews are usually done in the middle of the year and are considered a priority by the human resource department. The evaluation period is often referred to as the 'review season'. Most employees do not object to the Australian ways as long as performance appraisals are not based on biases or subjectivity.

#### AA. Papua New Guinea

Performance appraisal is the most common term which private sector organisations in Papua New Guinea to their performance appraisal system. These systems were designed either primarily by the HR manager in consultation with other managers within the organisation or, by their overseas based parent company which was notable factor among international firms.

The main purposes of performance appraisal systems in Papua New Guinea are to identify training needs of employees and training, evaluating current performance towards meeting organisational goals, and rewarding employees for good performance. Other common objectives in of performance appraisal in Papua New Guinea is to provide feedback, personnel planning, identifying employee potential and counselling were rarely mentioned amongst the main purpose of performance appraisal. Most organizations in Papua New Guinea conduct their formal performance appraisal annually while some conduct theirs more than once a year. The immediate managers are the main source of appraisal rating in most organisation although, there is some input from the appraises themselves.

#### BB. India

Ever since the economic reformation in India, a number of organisations from small, medium and large scale have adopted performance appraisal in developing their human capabilities seeing that, hiring and training employees is costly to them. Companies in India have started to depart from the traditional method of evaluating performance which is "top to down appraisal" normally carried out by the superior (Armstrong, M., & Baron, A.(2000)) to contemporary methods in compliance with the important change in organisation's structure, processes and culture. A study conducted by Rani, L., Kumar, N., & Kumar, S. (2014) for private banks in Rohtak City, India, has indicated that most banks in this province has started to use 360 degree appraisal to appraise their employees. 360 degree appraisal is a method that uses various sources of evaluation such as supervisors, peers, subordinates and the employees themselves and also provides multiple perspective of the individual's performance in order to reduce subjective assessment errors (Sepehrirad, R., Azar, A., & Sadeghi, A. (2012)). The investigation of this study (Rani, L., Kumar, N., & Kumar, S. (2014)) focuses on the practice and application of 360 degree in the selected banks and the effect of this appraisal method on employee satisfaction and motivation level. The result of this research shows that there is a positive correlation between the 360 degree appraisal technique and the other tested variables therefore suggesting, this method is widely accepted by the employees in the region's banking sector. The performance appraisal process itself should be carefully designed by integrating organisations objective and goals since it is as well used as a means of providing feedback to further motivate and maximize the performance of the

employees to achieve the expected results (Boxall, P., Purcell, J., & Wright, P. (2007)).

The employee's motivation and engagement has been a major concern and there are many research carry out on this part (Fletcher, 2001, Sanyal, M. K., & Biswas, S. B. (2014)). Ever since globalization and trade openness, India has encouraged foreign IT firms to venture into Indian economy and at the same time has allow to certain extent host country ( Bhardwaj, A., Dietz, J., & Beamish, P. W. (2007)) cultural influences in Indian economy.

According the studies carried out by Sanyal, M. K., & Biswas, S. B. (2014) for IT field in West Bengal, India, the use of modern performance appraisal methods such as 360 degree and MBO which plays a vital role for the HRD activities. This research implies that the reinforcement of modern performance appraisal methods establishes a causal linkage between the applications of appraisal methods and employees motivation level. Other research includes performance appraisal practices in service and manufacturing sector by Rohan Singh, R., Mohanty, M., & AK, M. (2010) to examine the relationship between performance appraisal and employee's performance in India.

The findings of this research indicate that there is an association exists between these two variables. Excellent performance appraisal practices leads to enhanced employee performance. Furthermore, in today's working environment, the employee themselves wants to have the knowledge on how they fit their organisation. Whether they have met the organisation's goals and target and also aspects of self-improvement for greater performance in future through performance appraisal (Rohan Singh, R., Mohanty, M., & AK, M. (2010)). Since India is a "collectivist" nation (Hofstede, G. (1980)) and "hierarchy and inequality" deeply rooted in Indian traditions (Jain, H. C., & Venkata Ratnam, C. S. (1994)), a research has been carried out by Varma, A., Pichler, S., & Srinivas, E. S. (2005) to assess the behavioural aspects on how "interpersonal" affect the performance appraisal system. "Interpersonal" in this context is defined as a "like-dislike relationship" between supervisor and his or her subordinates (Cardy R.L. and Dobbins, G.H. (1986)). The employees in India are often concerned with their personal relationships with their superior rather than the actual job performance itself (Kanungo R. & Mendonca. M. (1994)). Moreover, they also always rely on the superior to solve their problems (Varma, A., Pichler, S., & Srinivas, E. S. (2005)). Based on this research (Varma, A., Pichler, S., & Srinivas, E. S. (2005)) a sample of 113 supervisors was tested from large manufacturing organisations in India and it is proven that there is a significant correlation between the interpersonal of the subordinate and the performance appraisal rating system. In Indian situation, culturally influence dependence of subordinates on superior gives precedence to favourable or unfavourable performance appraisal evaluation over the actual job performance.

Performance appraisal tool frequently subject to criticism, hence there are research carried out to explore the relationship between perceived fairness of performance appraisal and employees satisfaction. The perceived fairness is an imperative instrument that affects the motivation level of employees (Sudin, S. (2011)). Fairness involves procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informational justice of performance appraisal (Vishal Gupta, Sushil

Kumar, (2013)). J. Sheelam, J. Ravindran (2014) carried out a research for public, private and foreign banks in India aimed at measuring the fairness of performance appraisal rating system, accuracy of performance appraisal and the employees overall satisfaction with current performance appraisal procedures in their organisation. The results of this study indicate that there is a high degree of positive correlation exists between fairness in performance appraisal rating and overall job satisfaction. An appraisal system will be ineffective is employees does not see the performance appraisal as fair, useful, valid and accurate (Levy, P. E. and Williams, J. R. (2004)).

In the fast varying scenario of the Indian economy, performance appraisal has become an essential requirement of every organization to properly evaluate the performance of it employees. In a lot of organizations, rarely is an effort made to discuss with its work force as to whether expected results, as predetermined, were met, exceeded or not. Today's employees want to know not only how they fit in with the targets of the organization for which they work but also what aspects of self-improvement is needed in their performance. Organizations supported through genuine performance appraisal. The existing relationship between performance appraisal and employee performance in service and manufacturing sectors, which was the objective of this study, was met and the variance have been projected. Performance appraisal has an important role to play on employee performance. But there are other factors also. Conducting periodical review of workforce performance by organizations has become a fundamental requirement which will help to shrink the gap between employee performance and successful attainment of its objectives.

### III. CONCLUSION

By doing extensive review, it has been found that performance management system is not having much difference except cultural implication in both Indian and international companies. Performance appraisal has both negative and positive aspects in Indian and international companies. In most of the companies the traditional appraisal system is existing, where appraisal is done once or twice in a year and in some companies, feedback system was very poor or absent. This created bias in employee evaluation because if they have been given poor rating then they will not be in the position to know about their mistakes. If they are given good rating then they will not bother to know their mistakes so that they can improve. Moreover, companies introduced PMS but unable to implement properly which does not fulfil the purpose and some time employee acceptance level is low for the performance appraisal system. Therefore, introduction of performance appraisal system will not serve the purpose; it required effective implementation and well accepted by employees.

### REFERENCES

- [1] A Profile of the Public Service of Malaysia. (2004). London, UK: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- [2] Adekola, A. & Sergi, B. (2007). Global Business Management: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company

- [3] Alqahtani, Faiz, Awad (2010) Evaluating the Performance Appraisal System in Public Universities in Saudi Arabia and its Impact on Human Resource Decisions, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/361/>
- [4] Argentina Brutus, S., Derayeh, M., Fletcher, C., Bailey, C., Velazquez, P., Shi, K., & Labath, V. (2006). Internationalization of multi-source feedback systems: a six-country exploratory analysis of 360-degree feedback. *International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 17(11), pp.1888-1906.
- [5] Baskin, M. (2002, May 1). Legal Guidelines for Associations for Conducting Employee Evaluations and Performance Appraisals. Retrieved from <http://www.asaecenter.org/Resources/whitepaperdetail.cfm?ItemNumber=12208>
- [6] Bol, J. "Subjective Performance Evaluation." 2005.
- [7] Cabrera, Elizabeth, and Jose Carretero. "Human Resource Management in Spain." 2004. Web. 21 Dec. 2015. <http://core.ac.uk/download/files/153/6229845.pdf>
- [8] Chasudhry, S., Reid, G., & Malik, W. (Eds.). (1994) Civil Service Reform in Latin American and the Caribbean: Proceedings of a Conference. Washington, DC: The World Bank
- [9] Cheng, K. & Cascio, W. (2009). Performance-Appraisal Beliefs of Chinese Employees in Hong Kong and the Pearl River Delta. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol.17(3), pp. 329-333.
- [10] Chung, K., Lee, H., & Jung, K. (1997). *Korean Management: Global Strategy and Cultural Transformation*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- [11] Country Case Studies. (2005). In *Performance-Related Pay Policies for Government Employees* (p. 114). OECD.
- [12] Denisenko, S. & Moukhina, A. (2015). Legal Aspects of Staff Evaluation. *Saint Petersburg Business Guide*. Retrieved from <http://petersburgcity.com/business/expert/staff/>
- [13] Dr. Kadam, R. (2012). Performance Appraisal and Human Resource Management: A Challenge Before India. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, Vol. 1(4), pp.91-96
- [14] Dunn, E. (2004). *Privatizing Poland: Baby Food, Big Business, and the Remaking of Labor*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- [15] Gori, E., & Fissi, S. (2014). New Trends in Public Sector Performance Measurement and Evaluation: A Closer Look at the Italian Reform. *Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 32(2), pp.101-122.
- [16] Grobler, P., Wärmich, S., Carrell, M., Elbert, N., & Hatfield, R. (2006). *Human Resource Management in South Africa* (3rd ed.). Belford Row, London: Thomson Learning.
- [17] Gu, F. (2013). *A Comparative Study of Performance Appraisal System in Three Banks in Contemporary China: The Role of Guanxi in Appraisals*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). London School of Economics and Political Science, London.
- [18] Guidelines on How to Conduct a Performance Appraisal." *Australian Business Lawyers and Advisors*. N.p., 2011. Web. 22 Dec. 2015.
- [19] Human Resources Management Country Profiles: Brazil (2012). OECD, HR Management Practice. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/gov/pem/OECD%20HRM%20Profile%20-%20Brazil.pdf>
- [20] Ingui, Sam. "Performance Reviews and Performance Management of Employees - Criteria for Effectiveness." Colin Biggers & Paisley. N.p., 22 Aug. 2012. Web. 22 Dec. 2015. <[http://www.cbp.com.au/publications/performance-reviews-and-performance-management-of?utm\\_source=Mondaq&utm\\_medium=syndication&utm\\_campaign=View-Original](http://www.cbp.com.au/publications/performance-reviews-and-performance-management-of?utm_source=Mondaq&utm_medium=syndication&utm_campaign=View-Original)
- [21] Islam, R., & Rasad, S., (2005). Employee Performance Evaluation by AHP: A Case Study. Honolulu, Hawaii: dISAHP
- [22] Jirjahn, U., & Poutsma, E. (2013). The Use of Performance Appraisal Systems: Evidence from Dutch Establishment Data. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 52(4), pp.801-828.
- [23] Koshi, E. (1998). 'Japanization' of a Performance Appraisal System: A Historical Comparison of the American and Japanese Systems. *Social Sciences Journal*, Vol. 1(2), pp.247-262.
- [24] Morentin, S., Moriones, A., & Sanchez, J., (2011). *Performance Appraisal: Dimensions and Determinants*. Discussion Paper. Universidad Publica de Navarra.
- [25] Performance Appraisals. (2011, November 11). Retrieved November 13, 2015, from [https://www.jobsetc.gc.ca/eng/pieces1.jsp?category\\_id=2904&root\\_id=2902](https://www.jobsetc.gc.ca/eng/pieces1.jsp?category_id=2904&root_id=2902)
- [26] Personnel Policies and Procedures. (2012). *Employee Development and Appraisal Plan (Human Resource Policy No. 2)*. Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico Public Regulation Commission.
- [27] Phin, L. (2015). The Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal in the Private Education Industry of Malaysia. 10(1). Retrieved from: <http://www.knowledgetaiwan.org/ojs/index.php/ijbi/article/viewFile/523/145>
- Shafie, H. B. (1996). Malaysia's experience in implementing the new performance appraisal system. *Public Administration & Development*, Vol. 16(4), pp.341-352.
- [28] Rego, A., Marques, C., Leal, S., Sousa, F., & Cunha, M. e. (2010). Psychological capital and performance of Portuguese civil servants: exploring neutralizers in the context of an appraisal system. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 21 (9), pp.1531-1552.
- [29] Shibata, H. (2000). The transformation of the wage and performance appraisal system in a Japanese firm. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 11 (2), pp.294-313.
- [30] Shibata, H. (2002). Wage and Performance Appraisal Systems in Flux: A Japan-United States Comparison. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 41(4), pp.629.
- [31] Shrivastava, P & Rai, U. (2012). Performance Appraisal Practices in Indian Banks. *A Journal of Management*, Vol. 5(2), pp.46-51
- [32] Snape, Ed, et al. "Performance Appraisal And Culture: Practice And Attitudes In Hong Kong And Great Britain." *International Journal Of Human Resource Management* Vol. 9.5, pp.841-861.

- [33] Sookdew, S. (October 1993). The Performance Appraisal Function in Selected South African Local Authorities. (Unpublished Masters Dissertation). University of Durban-Westville, Westville.
- [34] Turkey Gurbuz, S., & Dikmenli, O. "Performance Appraisal Biases In a Public Organization: An Empirical Study" *Kocaeli Universites Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi* (2007).
- [35] United Kingdom Addison, John T., and Clive R. Belfield. "The Determinants Of Performance Appraisal Systems: A Note (Do Brown And Heywood's Results For Australia Hold Up For Britain?)." *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 46.3, pp.521-531.
- [36] Valeriano, V. Civil Service Commission's Performance Management System. Retrieved from:  
<http://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/20880853.pdf>
- [37] Vallance, S. (1999). Performance Appraisal in Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines: A Cultural Perspective [sup\*]. *Australian Journal Of Public Administration*, Vol. 58(4), pp.78.
- [38] Zhang, Y. & Lovegrove, I. Performance Appraisal for Chinese State-Owned Banking. Liverpool: United Kingdom.

