

## To Investigate the Factors Analysis of Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal and Big Five Personality Trait through Exploratory Factor Analysis

<sup>1</sup>Hafiz Muhammad Ishaq, <sup>2</sup>Nur Naha Abu Mansor, <sup>3</sup>Faisal Khan and <sup>4</sup>Faiz Ahmed

<sup>1</sup>Federal Urdu University of Art, Sciences and Technology Islamabad (FUUAST),

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Management (FM), Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), Johor, Malaysia

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Management (FM), UTM, Malaysia

<sup>4</sup>Comsat Institute of Information Technology (CIIT), Pakistan

**Submitted:** Oct 3, 2013; **Accepted:** Nov 11, 2013; **Published:** Nov 30, 2013

**Abstract:** Main aspect of human development is the career development. The performance appraisals systems constitute the integral part of career development process. But most of the organizations are faced with critical comments regarding performance appraisal systems. Inquiry is the tool to develop and expand the boundaries of science and innovation in knowledge. To enhance the knowledge in research, authorities are conducting and administering the fundamentals research, practical and developmental, for the innovation of knowledge research centers and universities contributing to extend the knowledge and science in all fields and put forward some incorporated solutions for the challenges which are facing humans. Due to unavoidable requirements of research centers periodical study on the research centers performance is required, in order to make out relevant research centers and find out the effective factors of performance appraisal. Precisely, major focus of current research is to examine the determinants of effectiveness of performance appraisal and role of personality traits factors evaluating banking employees' performance. The study adopted a quantitative approach; using self-administered questionnaires, distributed in staffs of all commercial banks. In selection of sample, multistage sampling technique was used in first stage, branches of banks were selected on the basis of cluster sampling technique and in second, a total of 706 participants were selected on the bases of convenience sampling technique. Contemplate factors were analyzed through appropriate statistical analyses like exploratory factor analysis. We used factor analysis to analyze the factor items through exploratory factor analysis.

**Key words:** Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal • Big Five Personality Traits • Factor Analysis  
• Banking Sector

### INTRODUCTION

One way or the other exists to cope with the increase in competition and keep up with the rapid pace of development. For this purpose, most organizations carry out periodic self-assessments in order to gauge their strengths and weaknesses. During such analysis, employees of organizations tend to be under tough scrutiny since they are the most vital part of any organization's assets and can be a significant contributor towards its strength or, in worse scenarios, a major weakness. To make sure employees are following their job descriptions, adhering to organizational code of conduct and showing their motivation and satisfaction, many organizations appraise the performance of their employees

from time to time. So behavior of the employee is considered here as very important because everyone in the organization wants his or her achievements to be recognized. Every organization in this context tries its best in order to influence the behavior of the employees for the achievement of organizational effectiveness.

This study also focuses on the setup of post performance appraisal and its ultimate effect on the effectiveness with the role of big five personality traits. This study is conducted with respect to Pakistan and especially in the banking sector. Over many decades, the Government of Pakistan has continually strived to devise effective rewarding techniques. The assumption underlying is to improve productivity of the employees in all the government financial institutions. The fact that has

been widely noticed and realized is that the banking sector of Pakistan needs tenacious improvements. Pakistan is a rapidly developing country and a sound banking sector is the backbone of any country that is growing and prospering. Therefore this research undertakes to examine the banking sector of Pakistan as this is one sector that has a considerable influence on the overall economy of our country.

### Literature Review

**Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal:** It has been examined by Haslinda [1] that for the effectiveness of performance appraisal systems, HR audit procedures for employees' performance is available to gauge the subordinates' efficiency. Effective performance appraisal can be a tool to keep employees motivated and satisfied. However studies have suggested that employees' satisfaction is closely associated with the fairness of the performance appraisal [2-5]. Smith and Fortunato [6] have found that the supervisors rate subordinate honestly and fairly. They suggest that researches in this area should examine the organizational loyalty, rater accountability, organizational environment, power distance and role of individual traits in the effective performance appraisal system, for instance individual frame of mind, objective oriented and real openness to feedback. Scarceness of research on rater motivation and multisource feedback system is a reason of ineffective performance appraisal system. Another study indicates that direct and frequent communication is the key components to improve effectiveness of performance appraisals [7].

**Perceived Fairness:** Many researchers have identified fairness as the most important element in developing effective performance appraisal scales in most U.S. business organizations [8]. Colquitt [9] introduces the theory of organizational justice while discussing the issues of fairness. It is divided into two categories of procedural and distributive justice which suggest that justice theory relates to the fairness of procedures and determines outcomes and fairness of the outcomes. Cook and Crossman [10] have pointed out that a significant relationship exists between the effectiveness of performance appraisal system and perceived fairness. Nurse [11] adds one more category of interactional, along with the previously held procedural and distributive type of justice. It signifies the aspect of fairness in performance appraisal while studying organizational justice. According to Fedor *et al.* [12] it is clear that "Subordinates should acknowledge the fact of the perceived fairness when the

intention behind a negative review is to identify room for improvement rather point flaws in them i.e. they should feel that it is for their own benefit."

**Performance Feedback:** Dugan [13] endorses this argument that feedback sessions should be regularly held when the managers feel presence of poor performance of subordinates. Becker and Klimoski [14] also concluded that feedback from supervisors eventually becomes a reason of increased performance. Dugan [13] also supports this argument that feedback sessions should work continuously if subordinates are performing poorly. Becker and Klimoski [14] discuss that feedback from supervisors lead to increased performance. The founder and president of the Pittsburgh-based consulting firm, Susan Sujansky, introduces the concept of timely feedback as one of the suggested ways to tackle poor performers. Camachon *et al.* [15] concluded that self-control or regulation is the desired end resulted for all feedback control systems. Rahman [16] supported the idea that proper and timely performance feedback may be effective for improvement of individual's performance. However, the appropriate performance feedback is a guideline to the employees (even then in case of low performance appraisals) for improvement of their performance. It has been explored by Ahmad *et al.* [17] that employees do not get performance feedback according to the work done and consequently do not get fair reward in the absence of fair performance appraisal procedures.

**Appraisal Satisfaction:** An analysis which was performed on 27 different studies by Roberts [18] has strongly indicated the positive results of effective performance appraisals along with manager's participation and desirable appraisal-related outcomes e.g. higher levels of appraisal satisfaction and acceptance. Cook and Crossman [10] maintain that appraisal satisfaction is significant as it is found inter-correlated with perceived fairness. Colquitt, Conlon, Christopher and Ng [19] and Bies [20] have recommended that increase in pay of the employees is more effective for appraisal satisfaction. On the area of performance appraisal, Kuvas [21] performed a cross-sectional survey of 593 employees from 64 Norwegian savings banks. His results reinforce that there is a direct relation between performance appraisal satisfaction and affective commitments along with turnover intentions. Thurston, McNall [22] have found that appraisal satisfaction may not be achieved without organizational justice.

**Elimination of Rating Errors:** Many studies have been conducted to explain rating errors, for instance, Cook [23] includes age biasness and count it as an important factor, Grote [24] concludes attractiveness as an affecting element and Deluca [25] concludes (1993) brings in another important factor of central tendency and range restriction. Many studies substantiate the idea that attractiveness is one of the major elements that enhance the possibility of retiring errors and suggest many measures to reduce its negative effects to consolidate the process of effective performance appraisal [25-30]. Similarly inflationary pressures, in the context of rating errors, has been the focus of Robbins De and Cenzo [28] while Cook [23] talks about ingratiation as an affecting element. Some other major factors have been identified in many studies, for instance, leniency/strictness in studies conducted by Robbins and De Cenzo [28] negative and positive skew and past performance error by Grote [24].

**Big Five Personality Traits:** The “big five personality traits” used as a moderator by [31] it has examined in this study “Agreeableness” and “Conscientiousness” moderated the relationship among perceived fairness and “performance appraisal” system. It has examined by Barrick and Mount [32] at least three traits of “big five personality traits” “Conscientiousness” “Extraversion” “Agreeableness” have significant relationships with “performance appraisal” systems as moderator.

**Extraversion:** It was noted by Barrick and Mount [33] extraversion expresses the gregarious, sociable, talkative, expressive, ambitious and assertive. Many researchers have a tendency to communicate the extraverts’ means: dramatic, impulsive, seek for excitement, expressive and active [34, 35]. It is discussed by researchers like Costa and McCrae [36] the desire of extraverts have for status, power, praise and social recognition. It has been analyzed by Erdheim, Wang and Zoclar [37] there is a positive association between extraverts and affective commitment compare to other five big personality trait. It is discussed by Costa and McCrae [36] the positive emotions are relevant to extraverts and also discussed by Connolly and Viswesvaran [38] the positive emotions guide to appraisal satisfaction.

**Neuroticism:** It is examined by [39, 40] neuroticism equate the emotionally instable individuals are suffered due to differences. It is explained in detail by Judge and Bono [41]. Barrick and Mount [33, 32] the neuroticism describe traits like that moody, tense, angry, depressed, fearful,

anxious, insecure, worried embarrassed and emotional. It is noted that neurotics have lack of trust on others [35] they are socially limited peoples and to avoid situations that required to take the control [42] therefore, [36] due to lack of self-confidence and lack of sense of worth. Affectivity is negatively related with neuroticism [43]. It is explored by Magnus *et al.* [44] in the discussion about neuroticism individuals feel more negatively in life compare than to other individuals. Therefore, it is found that job satisfaction and neurotics are negatively correlated [41, 51] it is examined by Barrick and Mount [33] the negative relationship between job performance and neurotics.

**Conscientiousness:** One of the most important traits is conscientiousness is basically agreed upon the labels proposed for dimension include will to achieve as an alternative prudence [45-48] up till now individuals have conscientious characteristics included: organized, hard working, disciplined, responsible and achievement oriented [35]. Conscientiousness subscales are: order, dutifulness, competence, deliberate, self discipline and achievement striving. The individual personality like conscientiousness includes the following traits: careful, responsible and hardworking, through, persevering and organized [33]. As per Goldberg [35] the high “conscientiousness” includes that dependable, playful, methodical, persistent, achievement oriented, careful and hardworking which are essential characteristics to perform the tasks of works.

**Agreeableness:** The agreeableness is comparable to other domains of personality such as the friendly observance and consistency could not be denied [49]. Agreeableness describe that the flexibility, cooperativeness, tolerance and courteousness accurately present the trait [35]. Agreeableness also includes compliance, straightforwardness, modesty; altruism and tender mindedness are the subscales of agreeableness. As per the Digman [46] agreeableness means caring, altruism, emotional support is the main aspect, indifference to others, self-centeredness, hostility and nurturance.

**Openness to Experience:** It is noted by Digman [46] the complex trait is openness to experience which consider the different features and further discussed “domain of trait characteristics that are more or less related.” This domain includes the features like imagination, sophistication, curiosity, wide interests and intellect [35]. It is expressed by various researchers like,

Table 4.1: Assumptions' Statistic for Factor Analysis

Constructs	DCM <sup>a</sup>	MSA <sup>b</sup>	KMO <sup>c</sup>	BTS <sup>d</sup> x <sup>2</sup>
Perceived Fairness	.000	r > 0.5	0.574	5896.740**
Appraisal Satisfaction	.000	r > 0.5	0.710	6046.076*
Performance Feedback	.066	r > 0.5	0.571	1912.906**
Elimination of Rating Errors	.073	r > 0.5	0.544	1841.829**
Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal	.006	r > 0.5	0.637	9347.782**
Neuroticism	.010	r > 0.5	0.640	3221.081**
Extraversion	.259	r > 0.5	0.749	947.367**
Openness to Experience	.030	r > 0.5	0.671	2472.552**
Agreeableness	.020	r > 0.5	0.444	2726.993**
Conscientiousness	.082	r > 0.5	0.639	1758.158

a. Determinant of Correlation Matrix

b Measure of Sampling Adequacy as per diagonals of Anti-Image Matrices

c Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy

d Bartlett's Test of Sphericity \* p<.001

[50, 51] the divergent thinking, scientific creativity, political liberalism and artistic creativity is related to openness to experience.

**Assumptions of Factor Analysis:** Prior to factor analysis activity, assumptions of the testing were ensured. As sample size ratio to the number of variables should be 5 to 1 or more is required in principal component analysis. A sample size of 100 or greater could be used to perform of principal component analysis [52]. In the current study the sample size is 1892 and the proportion of 1892 cases to 15 variables (126 to 1) were used. This fulfills the presumptive criteria for principal component and factor analyses.

Field [52] recommends an optimal inter-variable correlation must be required for factor analysis. The minimum Correlation of more than 0.3 is required for the purpose of factor analysis. On the other hand highly correlated variables just like (r > 0.8) may cause problem of multi co-linearity. Therefore, the inter-variable correlation matrices are examined and bringing into being rationally correlated variables (r > 0.3). However, any pair of variables which are highly correlated (r > 0.8) were not used in the analysis. For factor analysis, to meet the preliminary criterion, the significance value of any variable should not greater than 0.05 [52].

According to Field [52] the correlation patterns are investigated in depth, the correlation matrix determinants are computed by the researchers which are related to singularity or multi-collinearity problems. The analyses showed no problem in singularity and multi-collinearity of the constructs.

For principal component analysis it is requirement for measuring of sampling adequacy (MSA) for each variable must be greater than 0.50 Field [52]. The researcher computed anti-image correlation matrix for each variables of every construct to test the MSA. Therefore, all correlations were greater than 0.5 (r>0.5) as per the

diagonals of matrices to fulfill the sampling adequacy criterion of all individual variables. The researcher determined the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) for measuring overall sampling adequacy and coefficients of each construct.

In the current research, computed values of all construct are between .5 and .90 are considered satisfactory [53]. According to Kaiser, 1974, KMO measure for all constructs is acceptable as it is greater than benchmark 0.5. Another qualification of principal component analysis to examine the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is done in this study by researcher. As per the Field [52] the resulting probability considered less than 0.05 for the conducting principal component analysis. So, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity significance value in the current study at less than 0.001; which shows highly significant values. For all preconditions table exemplify the statistical values and assumptions satisfy correctness and appropriateness of factor analysis.

**Factor Analysis for Construct Validity:** The purpose of factors analysis using principal component analysis is proposed by Aladwani and Palvia [54] as a varimax rotation method to analyze the appropriateness of dimensions of all constructs. In the previous studies [54-56] the cutoff of 0.5 Eigen values for item loadings is taken as significant loadings. Same is taken therefore used in this study. Furthermore, variables are eliminated by the researcher to show evidence of intricate structures. The single loaded variable on any component also was removed by researcher. The analysis process is continued by using an iterative method by the researcher till the satisfaction of above mentioned criteria. Consequently for final analysis, the researcher obtained the highly loaded factors and dominating items for insertion of final results. Table 4.1 highlights the factor loadings for the respective variables and Table 4.2 depicts the summary of the factor analysis findings.

Table 4.2: Summary of Factor Analysis <sup>a, b</sup>

Constructs	No. of Items	No. of eliminated Items	Iterations	Components Extracted	Variance Explained (%)
PF	11	2	3	1	78.455
AS	16	90	0	1	85.362
PFb	7	0	6	2	79.945
ERE	10	0	0	2	43.772
EPA	34	7	0	2	49.502
Neuroticism	8	1	0	2	53.366
Extraversion	8	2	3	2	44.367
Openness to Experience	10	3	3	1	43.615
Agreeableness	9	1		1	35.058
Conscientiousness	9	0		2	40.574

a Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

b Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Table 4.3: Factor Analysis of Constructs

Factor 1 – Perceived Fairness		
No.	Description	Factor Loadings
1.	My organization makes sure that I am assigned a rater who is qualified to evaluate my work	.631
2.	My organization ensures that I am assigned a rater who knows what I am supposed to be doing	.634
3.	MY organization makes sure that I am assigned a rater who understands the requirements and difficulties of my work	.684
4.	MY organization makes sure that my rater understands the Performance Appraisal process rating procedures and rating format	.633
5.	MY organization makes sure that I am assigned a rater that knows how to evaluate my performance	.683
6.	My rater clearly explains to me what he or she expects for my performance	.643
7.	My rater clearly explains to me the standards that will be used to evaluate my work	.714
8.	My rater explains how I can improve my performance	.714
9.	My rater gives me a chance to question how I should meet my performance expectations for my performance	.698
Factor 2 – Appraisal Satisfaction		
No.	Description	Factor Loadings
1	I am satisfied with the performance appraisal results I received for the most recent rating period.	.608
2	My most recent performance appraisal was fair	.727
3	My performance appraisal results I received was pretty accurate	.622
4	I am satisfied with the way, the performance appraisal process is used to set my performance expectations for each appraisal period	.663
5	I am satisfied with the way the performance appraisal process is used to evaluate and rate my performance	.764
6	I think my department should change the way they evaluate and rate job performance	.833
7	I would want to participate in the performance appraisal process even if it were not required	.649
8	I am satisfied with the amount of support and guidance I receive from my supervisor	.639
9	overall, I am satisfied with the quality of supervision I receive at work from supervisor	.702
10	All in all, I have a good supervisor	.838
11	My supervisors takes the performance appraisal process seriously	.669
Factor 3 – Performance Feedback		
No.	Description	Factor Loadings
1	My supervisor frequently lets me know how I am doing	.771
2	My supervisor routinely gives me information or help that I can use to improve my performance	.754
3	My supervisor reviews my performance expectations from the performance planning session at least every three months in unofficial rating sessions	.681
4	My supervisor lets me know how I can improve my performance	.613
5	My supervisor routinely gives me feedback that is important to the things I do at work	.729
6	My supervisor reviews with me my progress towards my goals	.726
Factor 4 – Elimination of Rating Errors		
No.	Description	Factor Loadings
1	My performance appraisal is based on how well I do my work	.904
2	My performance appraisal reflects how much work I do	.901
3	My performance appraisal is based on the many things I do that help at work	.770
4	My most recent performance appraisal is based on the effort I put into the job	.688
5	My supervisor helps me to understand the process used to evaluate and rate my performance	.623
6	My supervisor takes the time to explain decisions that concern me	.717
7	My supervisor lets me ask him or her questions about my performance rating	.691
8	My supervisor helps me understand what I need to do to improve my performance	.646
Factor 5 – Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal		
No.	Description	Factor Loadings
1	My supervisor utilizes the evaluation system to assess my performance objectivity and without bias.	.585
2	If I have problems with my performance evaluation I can communicate my concerns openly to my supervisor.	.657
3	My supervisor will be ethical in how he/she scores my performance	.687
4	I know the standards used to evaluate my performance	.651
5	My supervisor takes the performance appraisal procedure seriously	.634
6	My supervisor clearly expresses goals and assignments	.722

Table 4.3: Continued

7	The goals developed for my performance period are meaningful measures.	.657
8	I accept the goals I have been assigned	.651
9	I agree that the performance goals set up for me are reasonable	.677
10	I am determined to achieve my performance goals	.702
11	My supervisor allows me to help choose the goals that I am to achieve	.674
12	Goal-setting gives me a broader picture of the work unit and the organizations objectives	.653
13	There is a clear, direct and compelling linkage between performance and pay in the performance appraisal system	.696
14	The forming of a global evaluation is clear and valid	.713
15	There is a clear and reasonable process established for grieving both evaluation and performance-based pay results	.648
16	Performance-based pay based on performance ratings is the most effective method for motivating employees to improve/sustain performance	.689
17	I would be willing to participate in developing a new performance appraisal system	.623
18	Participation of employees in the development of performance standard leads to a better performance appraisal instrument	.626
19	I would prefer my performance to be evaluated by an instrument developed and designed with the help of employees	.694
20	I would prefer my performance to be evaluated additionally by my colleagues because they have relevant performance information and insight	.685
21	Appraising my own performance would enhance my awareness of my performance	.693
22	Being appraised by several sources (supervisor, peers, customers etc) would enhance the accuracy of performance appraisals	.699
23	Being appraised by several sources (supervisor, peers, customers etc) would provide me with valuable information about different important aspects of my performance	.673
24	I need more training in conducting performance appraisal interviews	.690
25	I am sufficiently trained in all skills needed in appraising performance	.632
26	I am able to clearly set goals that are relevant for the employee's position	.661
27	I am able to use the appraisal instrument as intended	.641
Factor 6 - Neuroticism		
No.	Description	Factor Loadings
1	I am depressed, blue	.746
2	I am relaxed and handle stress well	.888
3	I can be tensed	.726
4	I worry a lot	.701
5	I am emotionally stable, not easily upset	.847
6	Can be moody	.796
7	I get nervous easily	.688
Factor 7 – Extraversion		
No.	Description	Factor Loadings
1	I am full of energy	.731
2	I can Generate a lot of enthusiasm	.635
3	I tend to be quiet	.659
4	I have an assertive personality	.807
5	I am sometimes shy, inhibited	.607
6	I am outgoing, sociable	.696
Factor 8 – Openness to Experience		
No.	Description	Factor Loading
1	I am original and comes up with new ideas	.647
2	I am curious about many different things	.731
3	I am ingenious, a deep thinker	.836
4	I have an active imagination	.799
5	I am inventive	.671
6	I values artistic, aesthetic experiences	.439
7	I prefer work that is routine	.345
Factor 9 – Agreeableness		
No.	Description	Factor Loadings
1	I tend to find fault with others	.603
2	I am helpful and unselfish with others	.606
3	I quarrels with others	.663
4	I have a forgiving nature	.749
5	I can be cold and aloof	.648
6	I considerate and kind to almost everyone	.690
7	I am sometimes rude to others	.688
8	I like to cooperate with others	.713
Factor 10 – Conscientiousness		
No.	Description	Factor Loadings
1	I do a thorough job	.792
2	I can be somewhat careless	.744
3	I am a reliable worker	.777
4	I tend to be disorganized	.607
5	I tend to be lazy	.638
6	I persevere (keep trying) until the task is finished	.659
7	I usually Do things efficiently	.657

The researcher varimax rotation method used on survey data and results are found up to the mark and found it to work well. Johnson and Wichern define that, “the varimax procedure finds an orthogonal transformation matrix T that maximizes”.

### CONCLUSION

Results of this study have provided an insight into several factors which have significant effect in clearing up the deviation in effectiveness of performance appraisal. In this study, primary data was collected through convenience sampling technique and 706 questionnaires were distributed to staff of commercial banks. During factor analysis it is noticed that there is no singularity and multi-collinearity issues in the construction of this study. In the current research, computed values of all constructs during factor analysis, like, perceived fairness, performance feedback, appraisal satisfaction, elimination of rating errors and factors of effectiveness of performance appraisal, like, goal settings, employee participation, 360 degree performance appraisal, performance based pay, training and procedural justice, the current results of factor analysis are consistent with the studies of [55-58]. Consequently, after factor analysis the current study found all constructs appropriate for final analysis, the study obtained the highly loaded factors and dominating items for the insertion of final results [59-61].

As per above discussions, commercial banks should confidently appraise employees as per their needs, as per their personality traits and formulate an honest attempt to improve and implementing an open door policy for employees to increase social relations with supervisors for the performance appraisal effectiveness. If commercial bank employees are educated with reference to innovative knowledge and expertise and effectively put this learning into practice for the improvement of organizational performance, subsequently employees should be promoted, rewarded and satisfied with appraisal systems which show the way towards more considerable performance appraisal effectiveness.

### REFERENCES

1. Haslinda, A., 2009. Evolving Terms of Human Resource Management and Development. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 2(9): 180-186.
2. Greenberg, J., 1986. Determinants of Perceived Fairness of Performance Evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 340-342.
3. Greenberg, J. and R. Folger, 1983. *Procedural Justice, Participation and the Fair Process Effect in Groups and Organizations*. Paulus, P.B (Ed.), Basic Group Process, Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
4. Landy, F.J. and J.L. Farr, 1980. Performance Rating. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87(1): 72-107.
5. Lind, E.A. and T.R. Tyler, 1988. *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
6. Smith, A. F.R. and E.V J. Fortunato, 2008. Factors Influencing Employee Intentions to Provide Honest Upward Feedback Ratings. *Journal Business and Psychology*, 22(3): 191-207.
7. Lohrasbi, A., 2006. A Foundation Study for Improving Operations and Productivity in the Service Sector. *Journal of American Academy of Business*. Cambridge, 9: 349-359.
8. Bretz, R.D., J.G.T. Milkovich and W. Read, 1992. The Current State of Performance Appraisal Research and Practice: Concerns, Directions and Implications. *Journal of Management*, 18(2): 321-352.
9. Colquitt, J.A., 2001. On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 386-400.
10. Cook, J. and A. Crossman, 2004. Satisfaction With Performance Appraisal Systems: A Study of Role Perceptions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(5): 526-541.
11. Nurse, L., 2005. Performance Appraisal Employee Development and Organizational Justice: Exploring the Linkages. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(7): 1176-1194.
12. Fedor, D.B., R.W. Eder and M.R. Buckley, 1989. The Contributory Effects of Supervisor Intentions on Subordinate Feedback Responses. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 44(3): 396-414.
13. Dugan, K.W., 1989. Ability and Effort Attributions: Do They Affect How Managers Communicate Performance Feedback Information. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1): 87-114.
14. Becker, T.E. and R.J. Klimoski, 1989. A Field Study of the Relationship between the Organizational Feedback Environment and Performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 42(2): 235-259.
15. Camachon, C., D.M. Jacobs, M. Huet, M. Buekers and G. Montagne, 2007. The Role of Concurrent Feedback on Learning to Walk Through Sliding Doors. *Ecological Psychology*, 19: 367-382.

16. Rahman, S.A., 2006. Attitudes of Malaysian Teachers Toward a Performance-Appraisal System. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(12): 3031-3042.
17. Ahmad, S., I. Ali, K. Rehman, M.A. Khan and Waseemullah, 2010. Insecure Job and Low Pay Leads to Job Dissatisfaction. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary*, 1(11).
18. Roberts, G., 2003. Employee Performance Appraisal System Participation: A Technique Works. *Public Personnel Management*, 32(1): 89-98.
19. Colquitt, Jason, A., D.E. Conlon, M.J. Wesson, C.O.L.H. Porter and K.Y. Ng, 2001. Justice at the Millenium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3): 425-445.
20. Bies, R.J., J. Greenberg and J.A. Colquitt, 2005. *Hand Book of Organizational Justice: Are Procedural Justice and Interactional Justice Conceptually Distinct*, Psychology Press.
21. Kuvas, B., 2006. Performance Appraisal Satisfaction and Employee Outcomes: Mediating and Moderating Roles of Work Motivation. *Human Resource Management*, 17(3): 504-522.
22. Thurston P.W.J. and L. McNall, 2010. Justice Perceptions of Performance Appraisal Practices. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 5(3): 201-228.
23. Cook, M., 1995. Performance Appraisal and True Performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 10(7): 3-7.
24. Grote, D., 2002. Performance Appraisal an Ideal System a Perfect Form. Published in *Executive Excellence Newsletter*, pp: 1-8.
25. DeLuca, J., 1993. Predicting Neurobehavioral Patterns Following Anterior Communicating Artery Aneurysm. *Cortex*, 29: 639-647.
26. Murphy, K. and J. Cleveland, 1995. *Understanding Performance Appraisal*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
27. Werther, William and K. Davis, 1996. *Human Resource and Personnel Management*, (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), Irwin McGraw-Hill.
28. Robbins and De Cenzo, 1996. *Human Resource Management*, Willy, (6<sup>th</sup> ed.).
29. Noe, R., J. Hollenbeck, B. Gerhart and P. Wright, 2003. *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). McGraw Hill Copyright 2011140-147.
30. Bogardus and Anne 2004. *Human Resources Jump Start*. Alameda, CA, USA: Sybex, Incorporated, 2004, 115-117.
31. Skarlicki, D.P., R. Folger and P. Tesluk, 1999. Personality as a Moderator in the Relationship between Fairness and Retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1): 100-108.
32. Barrick, M.R. and M.K. Mount, 1993. Autonomy as a Moderator of the Relationship between the Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1): 111-118.
33. Barrick, M.R. and M.K. Mount, 1991. The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1): 1-26.
34. Watson, D. and E.A. Clark, 1997. Extraversion and its Positive Emotional Core In R Hogan, JA Johnson and SR Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology*, pp: 767-793.
35. Goldberg, L., 1990. An Alternative Description of Personality: The Big Five Factor Structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6): 1216-1229. San Diego: Academic Press.
36. Costa, P.T. and R.R. McCrae, 1992. *Revised NEO Personality Inventory and NP10*
37. Erdheim, J., M. Wang and M.J. Zickar, 2006. Linking the Big Five Personality Constructs to Organizational Commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(5): 959-970.
38. Connolly, J.J. and C. Viswesvaran, 2000. The Role of Affectivity in Job Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29: 265-281.
39. McCrae, R.R. and O.P. John, 1992. An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model and Its Applications. *Journal of Personality*, 2: 175-215.
40. Costa, P.T. and R.R. McCrae, 1988. Personality in Adulthood: A Six-Year Longitudinal Study of Self-Reports and Spouse Ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54: 853-863.
41. Judge, T.A., J.E. Bono and E.A. Locke, 2000. Personality and Job Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Job Characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2): 237-249.
42. Judge, T.A., A.E. Locke and C.C. Durham, 1997. The Dispositional Causes of Job Satisfaction: A Core Evaluations Approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19: 151-188.
43. Watson, D., L.A. Clark and A. Tellegen, 1988. Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6): 1063-1070.

44. Magnus, K., E. Diener, F. Fujita and W. Pavot, 1993. Extraversion and Neuroticism as Predictors of Objective Life Events: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65: 1046-1053.
45. Hogan, R., 1986. *Hogan Personality Inventory Manual*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
46. Digman, J., 1990. Personality Structure: Emergence of the Five-Factor Model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41: 417-440.
47. Peabody, D. and L. Goldberg, 1989. Some Determinants of Factor Structures from Personality-Trait Descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57: 552-567.
48. Fiske, D.W., 1949. Consistency of the Factorial Structures of Personality Ratings from Different Sources. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 44: 329-344.
49. Digman, J. and C.N. Takemoto, 1981. Factors in the Natural Language of Personality: Re-Analysis, Comparison and Interpretation of Six Major Studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 16: 149-170.
50. Feist, G.J., 1998. A Meta-Analysis of Personality in Scientific and Artistic Creativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2: 290-309.
51. Judge, T., J.E. Bono, R. Ilies and M.W. Gerhardt, 2002. Personality and Leadership: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4): 765-780.
52. Field, 2009. *Discovering statistics using SPSS*, London: Sage Publications.
53. Hutcheson, G. and N. Sofroniou, 1999. *The Multivariate Social Scientist: Introductory Statistics using Generalized Linear Models*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
54. Aladwani, A.M. and P.C. Palvia, 2002. Developing and Validating an Instrument For Measuring User-Perceived Web Quality. *Information and Management*, 39: 467-476.
55. Ishaq, H.M., M.Z. Iqbal and A. Zaheer, 2009. Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal: Its Outcomes and Detriments in Pakistani Organizations. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 10: 479-485.
56. Škrinjar, R., V.B. Vukšić and M.I. Štemberger, 2008. The impact of business process orientation on financial and non-financial performance. *Business Process Management Journal*, 14(5): 738-754.
57. Vasset, F., E. Marnburg and T. Furunes, 2011. The Effects of Performance Appraisal in the Norwegian Municipal Health Services: A Case Study. *Human Resources for Health*, <http://www.human-resources-health.com/content/9/1/22>
58. Chin, L., L. Liu and X. Liao, 2012. Factor Analysis-Based Performance Evaluation of Listed Companies in Petroleum Industry of China. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1): 137-142.
59. Muhammad Azam, Sallahuddin Hassan and Khairuzzaman, 2013. Corruption, Workers Remittances, Fdi and Economic Growth in Five South and South East Asian Countries: A Panel Data Approach Middle-East *Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(2): 184-190.
60. Sibghatullah Nasir, 2013. Microfinance in India: Contemporary Issues and Challenges, Middle-East *Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(2): 191-199.
61. Mueen Uddin, Asadullah Shah, Raed Alsaqour and Jamshed Memon, 2013. Measuring Efficiency of Tier Level Data Centers to Implement Green Energy Efficient Data Centers, Middle-East *Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(2): 200-207.