

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter focuses on the results of the study. The results are presented in the order of statistical analysis used. As this being a comparative study, percentage tables for different statements of the P. A. Questionnaire are given. The percentages mentioned in each table are for each private and public organisation (i.e. O1 - O6) and also overall for the private and public organisations. The percentage total does not make 100 per-cent because of unanswered statements and also in many of the statements the respondents were required to respond to more than one alternative.

There is a minimal difference in the column TOTAL of the tables as the mean calculated for the total is from the raw data directly.

With this percentage tables Chi-square tables are also presented for those statements in which the respondents were required to mark for only one of the alternatives given. The Chi-square Test represent a useful method of comparing experimentally obtained results with those to be expected theoretically on some hypothesis. It is to see the agreement between the observed and expected result. Here it was used to see the difference between the organisations.

In the second level of analysis, ANOVA was worked out to see the satisfaction level of the employees for the prevailing appraisal systems. The significant F values were further put to Gap Test to obtain the differences between the organisations.

Correlation was worked out to see the satisfaction level of the respondents for different dimensions and the dimension of overall satisfaction.

Finally the last portion of this chapter (Table 64 to Table 81) shows the ANOVA values worked out to see the relationship of respondents' personality type (extravert - introvert) and his rating for the purpose of P. A. System.

TABLE : 4
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS' REACTION REGARDING
THE BASIC THRUST OF P. A. SYSTEM

Q. 3. What is the basic thrust of the appraisal system currently in vogue ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Performance	95	52	76.7	59.6	83.7	75.0	73.3	72.9
Personality Traits	75	72	66.7	27.7	51.2	47.5	70.7	42.9
Managerial Skills	70	80	83.3	38.3	46.5	55.0	78.7	48.2
Any other	5	-	6.7	8.5	-	-	4.0	4.0

The basic thrust of performance appraisal system currently in vogue in the above organisations, as perceived by the respondents, is on managerial skills in private organisations (78.7%), and on performance in public organisation (72.9%).

TABLE : 5
PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS' REACTIONS ABOUT
PROVISION OF SETTING TARGETS IN P.A. SYSTEM

Q. 4. Does your performance appraisal system provide for clear and agreed targets / objectives for individual managers ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
No prescribed system but known to people	65	20	40.0	59.6	32.6	42.5	41.6	44.9
Fixed targets for production and sales personnel	25	44	43.3	34.0	20.9	32.5	37.4	29.1
Prescribed system for individual targets	10	28	16.7	-	41.9	22.5	18.2	21.4

Generally there is no system of fixing targets in most of the organisations. In certain cases targets are fixed for sales personnel. Since good majority of respondents in O1, O3, O4 and O6 are affirming, it can be assumed that setting target is a system in these organisations, which is well known to the people.

TABLE : 5X
CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONDENTS' REACTIONS ABOUT
PROVISION OF SETTING TARGETS IN P.A. SYSTEM

Responses	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Total
No response	-	02	-	03	02	02	09
No prescribed system but known to people	13	05	12	28	14	34	106
Fixed targets for production and sales personnel	05	11	13	16	09	26	80
Prescribed system for individual targets	02	07	05	-	18	18	50
Total	20	25	30	47	43	80	245

Chi-square analysis was also applied to test the significant difference of responses across all organisations and types of responses. Chi-square value thus obtained was 39.55 which was significant at < 0.001 level at $df = 15$.

TABLE : 5.1
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS' SATISFACTION
FOR P. A. SYSTEM

Q. 4 A. *Does your performance appraisal system provide for clear and agreed targets / objectives for individual managers ? Are you satisfied with it ?*
Yes No

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	60	64	40	44.7	48.8	43	53.3	45.3
No	35	28	40	51.1	37.2	45	34.7	44.7

53.3% and 45.3% in private and public organisation, respectively, seems to be satisfied with the prevailing practices (mentioned in Table - 5) of setting targets in performance appraisal system.

TABLE : 6
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING PROVISION FOR
SETTING INDIVIDUAL KEY PERFORMANCE AREAS

Q. 5. *Does the performance appraisal system require every employee to undertake an exercise of identifying key performance areas or key result areas or any other form of setting targets or objectives ?*
Yes No

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	55	68	43.3	53.2	60.5	61.3	54.7	58.8
No	45	24	50.0	44.7	37.2	38.8	40.0	40.0

58.8% and 54.7% in public and private organisation, respectively, accept that they have a provision for setting the key performance areas for individuals on their own. Highest percentage of 68% of the respondents in O2 followed by O6 and O5 (61.3% & 60.5% respectively) agree that their organisations have provision for setting key performance areas for individual members in their organisations. It appears that though organisations may have a system operating, yet everybody may not be able to see it.

TABLE : 7

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING PROVISION FOR SETTING
DEPARTMENTAL TARGETS**

<p>Q. 6. <i>Does the performance appraisal system require or have provision for the department to set their objectives / targets ?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes No</p>
--

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	70	48	46.7	42.6	58.1	65	53.3	57.1
No	25	44	46.7	55.3	39.5	35	40.0	41.8

57.1% & 53.3% of the respondents in public and private organisations, respectively, have the provision of setting departmental targets. In O1 70% of the respondents report of the provision of departmental targets. Whereas in O6 65% of the respondents report the same.

TABLE : 8

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE SYSTEM OF DETERMINING
TARGETS / OBJECTIVES FOR INDIVIDUAL MANAGERS**

Q. 7. How are the targets / objectives for individual managers determined ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
The superior determines & communicates	50	12	50.0	55.0	20.9	43.8	37.3	41.2
The superior determines and obtains agreement of subordinates	35	08	26.7	08.5	07.0	12.5	22.7	10.0
Some discussion takes place between superior and subordinates	45	56	33.3	10.6	25.6	25.0	44.0	21.2
Objectives are determined jointly between superior and subordinates	15	12	-	14.9	14.0	13.8	08.0	14.1
Subordinate set their own targets and seek approval of superiors	25	44	30.0	12.8	32.6	12.5	33.3	17.6

The above table shows how the targets / objectives are determined for individual managers. The results showed that, targets are determined after some discussion between the superior and the subordinate in private organisations, O2 is the example. But in O1 and O3 the superiors determine the targets / objectives and are passed on to the subordinates. In public sector the results indicate that it is determined by the superiors and communicated downward, i.e. 41.2%. O4 and O6 support the same, the percentages shown for O5 are very low.

TABLE : 8.1

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING SATISFACTION LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENTS IN DETERMINING TARGETS/OBJECTIVES FOR INDIVIDUAL MANAGERS

Q. 7 A. How are the targets / objectives for individual managers determined ? Are you satisfied with the way targets are fixed ?
Yes No

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	73.3	62.5	40.0	55.6	65.1	51.9	56.3	56.4
No	26.7	37.5	60.0	44.4	30.2	48.1	43.7	42.4

The way targets / objectives are determined and the level of satisfaction shown by the respondents for the same is quite good.

TABLE : 9
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SHOWING
SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED BY THE APPRAISERS FOR P. A.

Q. 8. What sources of information are used by appraisers to judge the performance of a subordinate ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Periodic reports	25	24	40	19.1	18.6	28.8	30.7	23.5
Superior's memory	50	28	50	42.6	46.5	35.0	42.7	40.0
Discussion with subordinate and other managers	55	56	13.3	25.5	46.5	11.3	38.7	24.1
Self	10	60	10	53.2	30.2	55.0	26.7	48.2

The sources of information for appraisal by the appraisers as pointed out in the result is self-appraisal (48.2%) in public organisation and on supervisors' memory (42.7%) in private organisation. Followed by discussion with subordinate and other managers (38.7%) and superiors' (40%) in private organisation and public organisation, respectively. In brief, the results across all four items are evenly distributed.

TABLE : 9.1
PERCENTAGE OF SATISFIED RESPONDENTS WITH SOURCES OF
INFORMATION FOR JUDGING PERSONALITY

Q. 8 A. What sources of information are used by appraisers to judge the performance of a subordinate ?
Do you feel satisfied with the sources of information ?
Yes No

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	60	72	56.7	55.3	53.5	37.5	62.7	46.5
No	30	28	30.0	40.4	41.9	56.3	29.3	48.2

Whatever method used to judge the personality traits and managerial skills of the appraisee, the respondents seemed to be satisfied with it in private organisation. Whereas the respondents in public organisation were not satisfied. The distribution of percentages in public organisation between satisfaction and not satisfaction is more or less equal.

TABLE : 10

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING WHETHER PERSONALITY TRAITS
AND MANAGERIAL SKILLS ARE DEFINED**

Q. 9. *Are the personality traits and managerial skills defined in the system to ensure that all appraisers understand and interpret the factors in the same manner ?*

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	55	52	30	48.9	65.1	35.0	44.0	49.6
No	45	40	70	46.8	32.6	63.8	53.3	47.7

The above table 10 shows that by and large respondents are evenly divided around 50 per-cent in each organisation showing whether personality traits and managerial skills are defined or not in the appraisal system. As shown by the figures in the table above 49.6% in public organisation and 44% in private organisation say that they are defined whereas 53.3% and 47.7% in private and public organisation respectively say that they are not defined. A very clear cut disparity in responses are found in O3 and O6.

TABLE : 11

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING RELEVANCE OF
TRAITS AND SKILLS FOR MANAGERIAL PERFORMANCE**

Q. 10. Do you think that the personality traits and the managerial skills included in the system are relevant to managerial performance ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
All are relevant	40	59	13.3	36.2	56.0	35.0	37.4	42.4
Some are relevant	55	35	63.3	44.7	32.8	46.3	51.1	41.3
Quit a few are not relevant	0	03	10.0	06.4	02.2	08.8	04.3	05.8
Not sure	05	03	12.8	04.7	09.0	02.7	06.9	05.5

In the above table it can be seen that the traits and skills included in performance appraisal system seem as relevant to managerial performance in both the private organisations (51.1%) and public organisations (41.3%) although there is a difference of 1.1% between the first two responses.

TABLE : 11X

**CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES SHOWING RELEVANCE OF
TRAITS AND SKILLS FOR MANAGERIAL PERFORMANCE**

Responses	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Total
No response	-	-	03	-	-	-	03
All are relevant	08	15	04	17	25	29	97
Some are relevant	11	09	19	21	15	37	112
Quit a few are not relevant	-	01	03	03	01	07	15
Not sure	01	-	01	06	02	08	18
Total	20	25	30	47	43	80	245

Chi-square analysis was also applied to test the significant difference of responses across all organisations and types of responses. Chi-square value thus obtained was 47.48 which was significant at < 0.001 level at $df = 20$.

TABLE : 12

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING HOW THE JUDGEMENT
OF PERSONALITY TRAITS AND MANAGERIAL SKILLS IS DONE**

Q. 11. How are personality traits and managerial skill judged ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Superior's judgement depending on his memory	70	28	56.7	63.8	58.1	76.3	50.7	68.2
Superior maintains record of critical incidents	30	12	20.0	08.5	34.9	18.8	20.0	20.0
Superior discusses with peers	05	36	23.3	08.5	18.6	05.0	22.7	09.4
Superior discusses with his superior	10	24	26.7	23.4	30.0	02.5	21.3	18.6
Superior discusses with concerned subordinates	45	60	26.7	10.6	20.9	07.5	42.7	11.8

The above table shows the way personality traits and managerial skills are judged by the superiors. Majority of the respondents feel that it depends on the memory of the superior in both the type of organisations i.e. 50.7% and 68.2% in private and public, respectively. 42.7% of the sample in the private organisation conveys that the superior discusses the same with the concerned subordinates.

TABLE : 12.1

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING OF RESPONDENTS IN JUDGING
PERSONALITY TRAITS AND MANAGERIAL SKILLS**

Q. 11 A Are you satisfied with the method of judging personality traits and managerial skills ?
Yes No

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	60	72	56	55.3	53.5	37.5	62.7	46.5
No	30	28	30	40.4	41.9	56.3	29.3	48.2

The respondents in private organisations seem to be satisfied with the method of judging personality traits and managerial skills (62.7 per-cent), whereas the respondents in public organisation show more or less an equal response for satisfaction and unsatisfaction for the same.

TABLE : 13
PERCENTAGE SHOWING FACTORS ACCOUNTED
FOR OVERALL RATING BY RESPONDENTS

Q. 12. What factors are taken into account for arriving at the overall rating ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Targets / objectives / tasks accomplished	60	72	56.7	48.9	72.1	68.8	62.7	64.1
Personality traits and managerial skills	75	68	76.0	31.9	51.2	43.8	73.3	42.4
Extraneous factors	15	24	26.7	14.9	44.2	31.3	22.7	30.0

The above table shows the factors accounted for arriving at overall ratings of the appraisals. 73.3% of the respondents stated personality traits and managerial skills as the prime factor, and targets / objectives / tasks accomplished as the next important factor (62.7%) for overall rating in private organisations whereas 64.1% said targets / objectives / tasks accomplished are the prime factors and personality traits and managerial skills came out as the next important factor for accounting of overall ratings in public organisations.

TABLE : 13.1
PERCENTAGE SHOWING WEIGHTAGE ASSIGNED BY RESPONDENTS
TO THE FACTORS ACCOUNTED FOR OVERALL RATING

Q. 12 A. Is any weightage assigned to the above (as given in question no. 12) ?

Yes No

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	65	64	56.7	46.8	83.7	73.8	61.3	68.8
No	30	28	36.7	44.7	16.3	25.0	32.0	28.2

The above table explains the respondents' acceptance of the weightage assigned to each i.e. achieving targets, determining personality traits. Both the type of organisations seems to be accepting the way it is being done.

TABLE : 14

**PERCENTAGE SHOWING MEASURES TAKEN BY RESPONDENTS FOR
APPLICATION OF UNIFORM STANDARDS**

Q. 13. What measures are taken to ensure application of reasonably uniform standards of rating in different departments ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
System of moderation by a committee	10	32	20.0	17.0	27.9	12.5	21.3	17.6
Training of appraisers	10	16	43.3	8.50	23.3	20.0	25.0	17.6
Detailed instructions on the subject	15	8	50.0	31.9	20.9	40.0	26.7	32.9
Scrutiny by Personnel / HRD department	50	20	30.0	19.1	07.0	10.0	32.0	11.8
Forced distribution (i.e. appraisers are required to give different gradings to stipulated percentages of employees	5	8	10.0	12.8	39.5	10.0	08.0	21.0
Use of statistical device for adjustment of consistent tendencies to overvalue or undervalue the appraisee	5	4	0.00	0.00	02.3	05.0	2.70	02.9

Whatever measure of evaluation is used by the organisation, it should follow a uniform standards of rating. The above table shows that the scrutiny done by Personnel / HRD department helps in attaining the uniformity in the standard of evaluations in private organisations. The respondents in public organisations feel that detailed instruction on the subject, helps in maintaining the uniformity in appraisal.

TABLE : 15

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING METHOD OF JOINT APPRAISAL

Q. 14. In case of joint responsibility (e.g. services like finance, maintenance, personnel etc.) how is joint appraisal done ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
First by reporting officer and then by supervisor	20	20	20.0	46.8	27.9	21.3	20.0	30.0
First by functional manager and then by the heads of department	20	32	60.0	23.4	30.2	35.0	41.3	30.6
Jointly by both supervisor and reporting officers	0	12	06.7	12.8	14.0	12.5	06.7	12.9
Separately by the two and coordinated by reviewing officer	5	8	06.7	04.3	11.6	18.8	06.7	12.9

The above table shows how the responsibility in joint appraisal is dealt with in various organisations. 41.3% of respondents in private organisations and 30.6% of respondents in public organisation report that, first appraisal are done by functional manager and then the head of department. That is in majority cases, appraisal is done in succession viz. first by immediate supervisor and then by reporting and / or reviewing officers.

TABLE : 15X

CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES SHOWING METHOD OF JOINT APPRAISAL

Responses	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Total
No response	10	07	02	06	07	10	42
First by reporting officer and then by supervisor	04	05	06	22	12	17	66
First by functional manager and then by the heads of department	05	08	18	11	13	28	83
Jointly by both supervisors and reporting officers	-	03	02	06	06	10	27
Separately by the two and coordinated by reviewing officer	01	02	02	02	05	15	27
Total	20	25	30	47	43	80	245

Chi-square analysis was also applied to test the significant difference of responses across all organisations and types of responses. Chi-square value thus obtained was 46.29 which was significant at < 0.001 level at $df = 20$.

TABLE : 15.1

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SATISFIED WITH THE SYSTEM OF JOINT RESPONSIBILITY

Q 14 A Do you feel satisfied with this type (as in question no. 14) of system ?

Yes No

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	45	68	70.0	51.1	46.5	60.0	62.7	54.1
No	5	8	23.3	38.3	39.5	28.8	13.3	34.1

The above table shows that in Private organisations 62.7% of the employees are satisfied with the system, whereas 13.3 % are not satisfied with it. In case of Public organisations 54.1% of the employees are satisfied with the system whereas 34.1% of the people are dissatisfied with it.

TABLE : 16

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING KNOWLEDGE OF PREVIOUS RATINGS WHILE APPRAISING CURRENT PERFORMANCE

Q. 15. When you appraise your subordinate(s) are you aware about his ratings / appraisals in the last performance appraisal ?								
Yes			No					

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	40	52	86.7	46.8	27.9	40.0	59.0	38.8
No	50	16	13.3	36.2	27.9	53.8	24.0	39.3

On inquiring whether the appraisers were aware of the previous ratings while rating their raters in private organisations 59.0% of the respondents felt that they were aware of the previous (appraisal) ratings while respondents in public organisations were almost evenly divided in their opinion i.e. 38.8% saying 'yes' and 39.3 saying 'no' to the query.

TABLE : 17

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TAKING INTO ACCOUNT PREVIOUS RATING WHILE MAKING CURRENT RATINGS

Q. 16. When you are appraising your subordinate, do you take into account the ratings that he received last time ?								
Yes			No					

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	35	44	80	34.0	23.3	26.3	56.0	27.8
No	55	24	20	46.8	23.3	65.0	30.7	49.4

In private organisations 56% of the employees take into account the previous ratings while appraising present performance and only 30.7% do not bother about it. Almost reverse situation is there in the public organisations. In general there are people in both organisations who do take into account and do not take into account this previous ratings.

TABLE : 18

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SHOWING WHETHER SENIORS CONSIDER
PREVIOUS RATINGS WHILE APPRAISING CURRENT PERFORMANCE**

Q. 17. When you are appraised, does your superior take into account the ratings you received during your last appraisal ?								
Yes				No				

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	20	32	76.7	29.8	30.2	21.3	42.9	25.9
No	50	36	10.0	31.9	25.6	62.5	29.3	40.0

42.9% of the respondents agree that, their previous ratings are taken into consideration for current appraisals whereas 40% of the respondents do not think so.

TABLE : 19

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING WHETHER PREVIOUS RATING
AFFECTED THE CURRENT RATINGS OF THE RESPONDENTS**

Q. 18. If your answer to question no. 17 is 'yes', please tell us whether that affected your current rating ?								
Yes				No				

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	10	20	43.3	19.1	37.2	17.5	26.7	22.9
No	15	20	23.3	14.9	34.9	15.0	20.0	20.0

The effect of the previous ratings on the current appraisal is shown in table - 19. The figures show that 26.7% of respondents in private organisations and 22.9% in public organisation agree to the previous responses indicating that rating do effect the current appraisals if considered. That is only a small percent of people believed that previous ratings effect the ratings of their current performance.

TABLE : 20

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING BUILT IN SAFEGUARDS
AGAINST ERRORS IN INDIVIDUAL JUDGEMENT**

Q. 20. What safeguards are built into the system against aberrations / errors of individual appraiser's judgement ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Review by appraiser's superior	50	76	83.3	63.8	74.4	67.5	72.0	68.2
Detailed scrutiny by personnel / HRD department	40	24	56.7	06.4	04.7	03.8	41.3	04.7
Appeal	05	00	00.0	06.4	07.0	23.8	01.3	14.7
Appraiser to provide tangible evidence	45	24	10.0	21.3	41.9	30.0	24.0	30.6

Review by the appraiser's's superior is the most common method to check appraisers' errors in judgement. This is a built in safeguard in most of public and private organisations under review as projected clearly in the table above.

TABLE : 21

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING FREQUENCY OF APPRAISAL

Q. 21. At what frequency is the appraisal done ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Annually	90	96	96.7	89.3	93.0	85.0	94.7	88.2
Six monthly	5	4	03.3	04.3	02.3	05.0	04.0	04.1
Quarterly	0	0	00.0	02.1	0.00	02.5	0.00	01.8
As & when required	0	0	00.0	04.3	0.00	01.3	0.00	01.8

The above table clearly depicts the frequency (in a year) of appraisals conducted in organisations. All the organisations show a high percentage for yearly appraisal i.e. 94.7% and 88.2% in private and public organisations respectively.

TABLE : 22

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SHOWING WHETHER THERE IS A SEPARATE COMPONENT TO DETERMINE POTENTIAL OF THE APPRAISEE

Q. 22. Is there a separate component to determine the potential of the appraisee ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	50	64	50.0	46.8	55.8	41.3	54.7	46.5
No	50	12	33.3	36.2	39.5	52.5	30.7	44.7

'Yes' there is a separate component which determines the potential of the appraisee in the appraisal system. 54.7% in private organisations and 46.5% in public organisations state this.

TABLE : 23

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING FACTORS ACCOUNTED FOR
DETERMINING POTENTIAL APPRAISAL**

Q. 23. What separate components are taken into account to determine potential appraisal ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Performance on present assignment	65	68	60.0	29.8	48.8	42.5	64.0	40.6
Personality traits and managerial skills	60	60	50.0	12.8	46.5	31.3	56.0	30.0
Qualifications	40	32	36.7	17.0	39.9	10.0	36.0	18.2
Unused knowledge / skills	20	20	43.3	08.5	16.3	10.0	29.3	11.2
Past experiences	55	44	43.3	17.0	34.9	10.0	46.7	18.2
Age	05	12	20.0	06.4	14.0	00.0	13.3	05.3

The table shows different factors accounted for determining potential appraisal. The highest percentage is 64% in private organisations and 40.6% in public organisations for the performance on present assignment. The next factor given importance is personality traits and managerial skills for both public and private organisations i.e. 30% and 56% respectively. The factor considered to be least important is age in both the type of organisation. Though, public and private organisations' respondents vary a good deal for each to the components individually there is a striking similarity in their perception as far as the trend across factors are concerned.

TABLE : 24

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING WHETHER THERE IS A PROVISION
FOR DETERMINATION OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS**

Q. 24. Does the system provide for determination of training and developmental needs ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	80	96	93.3	48.9	90.7	72.5	90.7	70.6
No	20	04	0.00	34.0	09.3	25.0	06.7	23.5

90.7% of the respondents in private organisation and 70.6% of the respondents in public organisation accept that their appraisal system determines the training and developmental needs. All the organisations show a clear acceptance except O4.

TABLE : 25

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING PROCESS OF
DETERMINING TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS**

Q. 25. How are the training and developmental needs determined in your organisation ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Superior's judgement	40	28	66.7	51.1	39.5	35.0	46.7	40.6
Based on demonstrated strengths and weaknesses	35	36	36.7	14.9	25.6	11.3	36.0	15.9
Discussed with reviewing authority	30	16	43.3	08.5	07.0	07.5	30.7	07.6
Discussed with appraisee	35	60	16.7	04.3	60.5	08.8	36.0	24.5
No systematic method	15	12	20.0	34.0	16.3	32.5	16.0	28.8

46.7% of the private organisations respondents and 40.6% of the public organisation respondents opine for superior's judgement as the factor of determining training and developmental needs. It is very surprising that only about 16% of the respondents believed that demonstrated strengths and weaknesses could be a basis for determining training and developmental needs in private organisations.

TABLE : 25.1

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING SATISFACTION LEVEL FOR THE
PROCESS OF DETERMINING TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT NEEDS**

Q. 25 A. Are you satisfied with the procedure of determining training and developmental needs in your organisation ?

Yes No

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	50	68	40.0	38.3	60.5	33.8	52	41.8
No	25	20	26.7	48.9	30.2	48.8	24	44.1

Above table shows the satisfaction level of the respondents for the process of determining training and developmental needs. 52% of the respondents in private organisations and 41.8% of the respondents in public organisation were satisfied with the method. At the same time 44.1% of the respondents showed dissatisfaction for the same.

TABLE : 26

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE KIND OF TRAINING
AND DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS USUALLY RECOMMENDED**

Q. 26. What kind of training and development efforts are usually recommended ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Training course	75	80	80.0	59.6	88.4	61.3	78.7	67.6
Job rotation	25	44	40.0	40.4	60.5	22.5	37.3	37.1
Job enlargement	25	24	06.7	08.5	14.0	10.0	17.3	10.6
Special assignment	30	16	13.3	06.4	16.3	13.8	18.7	12.4
Attachment to superiors	0	08	30.0	12.8	04.7	18.8	14.7	13.5
On the job coaching by superior	25	12	53.3	17.0	07.0	15.0	32.6	13.5
Counselling	15	16	16.7	04.3	14.0	06.3	16.0	07.6
Guidance for self development	25	28	60.0	19.1	11.6	26.3	40.0	20.0

The most usually recommended training and developmental effort in both types of organisations are various training courses. Followed by job rotation. However, there is a wide gap between the two kind of efforts made for training and development (almost by 50%). There is also a wide gap between the second most preferred (job rotation) and the third most preferred training and developmental effort (job enlargement) - again a gap of about 50%. Guidance for self development has also emerged as another important training and developmental effort.

TABLE : 27

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING EXTENT TO WHICH APPRAISAL REPORTS ARE USED FOR TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND DECISIONS

Q. 27. To what extent, in actual practice, are appraisal reports used for training and developmental plans ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Almost always	10	56	16.7	14.9	27.9	11.3	28.0	16.5
Occasionally	75	32	76.6	51.1	53.5	46.3	61.3	49.4
Never	10	04	06.7	31.9	14.0	35.0	06.7	28.8

Generally it is the appraisal reports which are used for identifying training and developmental needs of the employees. From above table it can be concluded that this practice is only occasionally used for identifying training and developmental needs. (61.3% in private and 49.4% in public organisation) Only in O2, the practice is used more frequently.

TABLE : 27X

CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES SHOWING EXTENT TO WHICH APPRAISAL REPORTS ARE USED FOR TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND DECISIONS

Responses	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Total
No response	01	02	-	01	02	06	12
Almost always	02	14	05	07	12	09	49
Occasionally	15	08	23	24	23	37	130
Never	02	01	02	15	06	28	54
Total	20	25	30	47	43	80	245

Chi-square analysis was also applied to test the significant difference of responses across all organisations and types of responses. Chi-square value thus obtained was 51.66 which was significant at < 0.001 level at $df = 15$.

TABLE : 28

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING AMOUNT OF
WEIGHTAGE GIVEN TO P. A. SYSTEM FOR PROMOTIONS**

Q. 28. What weightage is given to performance appraisal in deciding on promotions ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Promotions decided on performance appraisal reports	20	08	23.3	06.4	41.9	36.3	17.3	29.4
Considerable weightage is given	25	20	30.0	10.6	39.5	26.3	25.3	26.5
As one of the relevant factor	40	48	33.3	48.9	18.5	21.3	40.0	28.2
Hardly any weightage is given	10	28	23.3	38.3	02.3	07.5	21.3	14.7

Table 28 shows that appraisals are counted as one of the relevant factor for considering individuals promotions in private organisation, 40% of the respondents report this. 29.4% of the respondents report that promotions are decided entirely on performance appraisal reports. At the same time 28.2% of the respondent in public organisation report that it is counted as only one of the relevant factor for promotions.

TABLE : 28.1

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING SATISFACTION OF THE RESPONDENTS
FOR THE WEIGHTAGE GIVEN TO P. A. SYSTEM FOR PROMOTIONS**

Q. 28 A. Are you satisfied with the weightage given to performance appraisal in deciding on promotions ?

Yes No

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	50	52	70.0	48.9	51.2	38.8	58.7	44.7
No	25	32	13.3	36.2	39.5	46.3	22.7	41.8

In the table 28.1 respondents seem to be by and large satisfied with whatever weightage given to performance appraisal system for considering promotions in both types of organisation.

TABLE : 29

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING AS TO WHO DOES THE APPRAISAL

Q. 29. Who does the appraisal ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Immediate supervisor	80	80	86.7	61.7	90.7	85.0	82.3	79.3
Supervisor's superior	20	40	63.3	27.7	20.9	12.5	44.0	18.8
A committee of superiors	5	8	13.3	02.1	09.3	06.3	09.3	05.9
Self-appraisal	10	40	06.7	57.4	02.3	41.3	18.7	35.9
Subordinates	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

79.3% of the respondents in public organisations and 82.3% in private organisations report that their appraisal is done by the immediate supervisors. No organisation report of appraisals done by subordinates. This is shown in the above table.

TABLE : 30
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING
WHO REVIEWS APPRAISALS

Q. 30. Who normally reviews the appraisal ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
None, the appraiser's report is final	-	-	03.3	04.3	04.7	05.0	01.3	04.7
Immediate superior of the appraiser	50	56	83.3	66.0	27.9	57.5	65.3	52.4
A committee of the superiors	05	32	43.3	06.4	09.3	06.3	29.3	07.1
Top management group	25	08	46.7	12.8	60.5	06.3	28.0	26.5
The chief executive	35	-	10.0	02.1	20.9	26.3	13.3	18.2

Table 30 shows the practice of reviewing. In majority of cases, it seems that the immediate supervisor of the appraiser are generally the people who review the appraisal reports (65.3% in private and 52.4% in public organisations).

TABLE : 31
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING
THE METHODS USED BY REVIEWING AUTHORITIES

Q. 31. What methods do the reviewing authorities use ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Review is a formality	10	28	-	19.1	09.3	28.8	12.0	21.2
Reviewing authorities enter their comments and make changes on their own	25	08	36.7	48.9	44.2	55.0	24.0	50.6
Reviewing authorities discuss doubtful/ controversial entries	50	16	56.7	23.4	34.9	10.0	41.3	20.0
Reviewing authorities discuss final results	10	12	-	-	07.0	01.3	06.7	02.4

Different methods are used by the reviewing authorities for reviewing the appraisal reports. In the table 31, 50.6% of the respondents in public organisations believed that reviewing authorities enter their comments and make changes on their own whereas in private organisations 41.3% of the respondents believed that reviewing authorities discuss doubtful / controversial entries with the appraiser.

TABLE : 31.1
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE SATISFACTION OF THE
RESPONDENTS FOR THE METHODS USED BY REVIEWING AUTHORITIES

Q. 31 A Are you satisfied with the methods used by the reviewing authorities ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	35	40	60.0	51.1	58.1	53.8	46.7	54.1
No	60	32	26.7	42.6	41.9	38.8	37.3	40.6

The sample used for study seems to be satisfied with the reviewing practices 46.7% of the respondents in private organisations and 54.1% of the respondents in public organisations support this . However in O1 reverse seems to be the case.

TABLE : 32

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE
PROVISION OF REVIEW DISCUSSION IN P. A. SYSTEM**

Q. 32. Does the performance appraisal system provide for a performance review discussion ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	60	40	10	40.4	30.2	25.0	33.3	30.6
No	30	36	80	51.1	69.8	68.8	48.6	64.1

Inquiring whether there is a provision of review discussion in their performance appraisal system, the responses did not yield a satisfying picture. It seems that there is no provision for review discussion in their performance appraisal system in as many as six organisations. In general 48.6% and 64.1% of total respondents say 'No'.

TABLE : 33

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE PEOPLE WHO PARTICIPATE
IN THE REVIEW DISCUSSION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL**

Q. 33. Who participates in the performance review discussion ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Appraisee and the reporting officer	50	52	10.0	25.5	46.5	17.5	34.7	27.1
Appraisee, reviewing officer and HRD manager	25	20	46.7	12.8	11.6	21.3	32.0	16.5

The table above shows the people involved in review discussion of appraisal. Both type of organisations report that it is the appraisee and the reporting officer who are involved in discussion. Many respondents preferred not to reply to the present statement.

TABLE : 34

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE EXTENT TO WHICH
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IS DISCUSSED WITH APPRAISEE**

Q. 34. In what manner are the appraisal reports communicated to or discussed with the appraisees, if at all, in your organisation ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Appraisal report is confidential, no communication	20	80	-	63.8	65.1	18.8	33.3	49.2
Only adverse comments are communicated	10	-	90.0	25.5	16.3	75.0	33.3	46.5
Superiors discuss the reports with subordinates sometimes	-	36	06.7	04.3	09.3	02.5	16.3	04.7
Superiors always discuss the report at the end of the appraisal	60	44	03.3	02.1	04.7	01.3	35.7	02.4

49.2% of the respondents in public organisations reviewed appraisal report as confidential. 46.5% of the respondents in the public organisations say that only adverse comments are communicated to the appraisee. This is how performance appraisal is discussed with appraisee. Private organisations report that superiors always discusses the report at the end of the appraisal. (35.7%).

TABLE : 34X

**CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE EXTENT TO WHICH
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IS DISCUSSED WITH APPRAISEE**

Responses	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Total
No response	02	03	-	02	02	02	11
Appraisal report is confidential, no communication	04	02	27	30	28	15	106
Only adverse comments are communicated	02	-	02	12	07	60	83
Superiors discuss the reports with subordinates sometimes	-	09	01	02	04	02	18
Superiors always discuss the report at the end of the appraisal	12	11	-	01	02	01	27
Total	20	25	30	47	43	80	245

Chi-square analysis was also applied to test the significant difference of responses across all organisations and types of responses. Chi-square value thus obtained was 231.92 which was significant at < 0.001 level at $df = 20$.

TABLE : 34.1

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE EXTENT TO WHICH
RESPONDENTS WERE SATISFIED WITH THE DISCUSSION OF APPRAISAL**

Q. 34 A. Are you satisfied with the method of communication of reports ?

Yes No

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	51.0	46.5	60.0	50.0	45.6	59.0	54.0	53.6
No	38.9	38.0	37.5	40.2	37.7	36.9	36.0	40.8

Table 34.1 shows that respondents are satisfied with the method of communication of appraisal reports in both the types of organisations (54.0% and 53.6% in private and public organisations respectively).

TABLE : 35

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING WHETHER COUNSELLING
IS AN ESSENTIAL PART OF APPRAISAL PROCESS**

Q. 35. Is counselling an essential part of the appraisal process in your organisation ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	30	36	33.3	38.3	30.2	28.8	33.7	32.42
No	25	44	50.0	44.7	51.2	62.5	39.6	52.8

The above table shows that counselling does not form an essential part of the appraisal process in their organisations figures 39.6% and 52.8% of the sample in each group support this view.

TABLE : 36

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE INDIVIDUALS
WHO GIVE PERFORMANCE COUNSELLING**

Q. 36 Who gives performance counselling to the employees ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Immediate superior	50	48	16.7	34.0	41.9	36.3	36.0	37.1
Superior of the superior	05	-	13.3	10.6	07.0	03.8	06.7	06.5
HRD / Personnel specialist	10	-	03.3	06.4	-	02.5	04.0	02.9
Committee of superiors	-	-	-	02.1	-	03.8	-	02.4
External expert	-	-	10.0	-	-	01.3	04.0	00.6
Not practised in the company	25	28	43.3	36.2	30.2	42.5	33.3	37.6

Inquiring as to who gives performance counselling, the results showed that 37.6% of the sample in public organisations and 33.3% of the sample in the private organisations are of the view that counselling is not practised. And 36% of the sample in private organisations and 37.1% in public organisations feel it is done by immediate superior. This view seems contradictory. This might be because, respondents did not know exactly what is the meaning of counselling in organisational setup (i.e. the organisations under study).

TABLE : 36X

**CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE EXTENT TO WHICH
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IS DISCUSSED WITH APPRAISEE**

Responses	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Total
No response	02	06	04	05	09	08	34
Immediate superior	10	12	05	16	18	29	90
Superior of the superior	01	-	04	05	03	03	16
HRD / Personnel specialist	02	-	01	03	-	02	08
Committee of superiors	-	-	-	01	-	03	04
External expert	-	-	03	-	-	01	04
Not practised in the company	05	07	13	17	13	34	89
Total	20	25	30	47	43	80	245

Chi-square analysis was also applied to test the significant difference of responses across all organisations and types of responses. Chi-square value thus obtained was 26.93 which was significant at $< 0.005 / 0.001$ level at $df = 20$.

TABLE : 37

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING
PRACTICE OF MBO IN THE ORGANISATION**

Q. 37. Do you practice M.B.O. (Management by objectives) in your organisation ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	15	16	06.7	10.6	14.0	18.8	12.0	15.3
Not practised as a formal discipline but it is used	45	56	30.0	34.0	51.2	38.8	42.7	40.6
No	20	12	40.0	23.4	20.9	26.3	25.3	24.1
Not applicable	10	04	23.3	21.3	09.3	12.5	13.3	14.1

The above table shows that MBO is not practised as a formal discipline in any type of organisations. 42.7% respondents in private organisations and 40.6% in public organisations feel that such management practice is being followed in the organisations informally. O3 seem to deny the practice of MBO in their organisation.

TABLE : 38
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING
LINKAGES OF P. A. SYSTEM TO MBO

Q. 38. *What the are linkages of appraisal system with Management By Objectives in your organisation ?*

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Directly and intimately linked	05	16	-	08.5	14.0	18.8	06.7	13.7
The focus of appraisal is not MBO	10	08	06.7	25.5	07.0	16.3	08.0	16.5
MBO data is indirectly used for appraisal	10	08	03.3	04.3	14.0	10.0	06.7	09.4
Avoid MBO influencing appraisal	10	04	06.7	02.1	04.7	02.5	06.7	02.9

The above table shows the linkage of performance appraisal system to management by objectives. The scores yielded are very low on all the alternatives. 16.5% of respondents in public organisations feel that even if MBO is practised in their organisation the focus of MBO is not the appraisal. As mentioned earlier, since most of the respondents did not believe that MBO is practised in their organisations while appraising, the above finding seem to be expected. Similar response is seen in private organisations.

TABLE : 38X

**CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES SHOWING
LINKAGES OF P. A. SYSTEM TO MBO**

Responses	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Total
No response	13	16	25	28	26	42	150
Directly and intimately linked	01	04	-	04	06	15	30
The focus of appraisal is not MBO	02	02	02	12	03	13	34
MBO data is indirectly used for appraisal	02	02	01	02	06	08	21
Avoid MBO influencing appraisal	02	01	02	01	02	02	10
Total	20	25	30	47	43	80	245

Chi-square analysis was also applied to test the significant difference of responses across all organisations and types of responses. Chi-square value thus obtained was 26.93 which was significant at $< 0.005 / 0.001$ level at $df = 20$.

TABLE : 39

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING ROLE
OF HRD / PERSONNEL IN P. A. SYSTEM**

Q. 39. What role do the Personnel / HRD functionaries play in the operation of the appraisal system in the organisation of the appraisal system in your organisation ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Have no role to play	15	12	06.7	10.6	23.3	36.3	10.7	25.9
Maintain records	70	36	56.7	63.8	67.4	43.8	53.3	55.3
Coordinate the system	50	56	73.3	29.8	58.1	32.5	61.3	38.2
Scrutinize all appraisals	30	24	36.7	19.1	20.9	13.8	30.7	17.1
Advise operating managers on appraisals	10	24	16.7	04.3	16.3	02.5	17.3	06.5
Review working of the system	10	24	16.7	08.5	18.6	08.8	17.3	11.2
Assist in training appraisers	20	40	16.7	10.6	20.9	10.0	25.3	12.9

The above table shows the role of personnel / HRD functionaries in performance appraisal system. The respondents feel that HRD / Personnel functionaries should coordinate the performance appraisal system. And 53.3% of the respondents feel that they maintain the records in the same type of organisation i.e. private organisation. Whereas in public organisations 55.3% of the respondents feel that they maintain records and 38.2% feel that they coordinate the system.

TABLE : 40

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING TO WHAT EXTENT RESPONDENTS WOULD
LIKE HRD / PERSONNEL FUNCTIONARIES TO CONTINUE TO PLAY THEIR ROLE**

Q. 40. Would you like the Personnel / HRD functionaries to continue to play their roles as at present ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	65	64	73.3	51.1	53.5	47.5	68.0	50.0
No	20	28	26.7	34.0	37.2	48.8	25.3	41.8

In both the organisations, the respondents feel that HRD / Personnel functionaries should continue to play their role (as presently done) in the appraisals (68% in private and 50% in public organisations). We can say that this is a healthy sign.

TABLE : 41

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE EXTENT TO WHICH RESPONDENTS
WOULD LIKE THE HRD/PERSONNEL FUNCTIONARIES TO BE INVOLVED IN P. A. SYSTEM**

Q. 41. Would you like the Personnel / HRD functionaries to be involved in any aspect of the development or operation of the system, in which they are not involved at the moment ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	35	72	66.7	70.2	58.1	68.8	60.0	66.5
No	50	16	20.0	17.0	39.5	26.3	26.7	27.1

The respondents feel that HRD / Personnel functionaries should involve themselves in other aspects of development of performance appraisal system as well. Besides what they are doing at present 60% in private organisations and 66.5% in public organisations approve of such involvement.

TABLE : 41.1

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING AREAS IN WHICH
HRD / PERSONNEL FUNCTIONARIES SHOULD BE INVOLVED**

Q. 41 A. What other areas in which you would like the Personnel / HRD functionaries to be involved (in any aspect of the development or operation of the system) in which they are not involved at the moment ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Have no role to play	-	-	-	02.1	04.7	01.3	-	02.4
Maintain records	30	12	36.7	23.4	32.6	13.8	26.7	21.2
Coordinate the system	35	24	43.3	29.8	32.6	23.8	34.7	27.6
Scrutinize all appraisals	45	60	63.3	44.7	30.2	37.5	57.3	37.6
Advise operating managers on appraisal	40	32	66.7	23.4	25.6	13.8	48.0	19.4
Review the working of the system	50	48	60.0	34.0	37.2	42.5	53.3	38.8
Assist in training of appraisers	40	28	63.3	38.3	37.2	25.0	45.3	31.8

The above table shows that the areas in which Personnel / HRD people should be involved. 57.3% of the respondents want them to scrutinize all appraisals. 53.3% want them to review the working of the system. And 48% want them to advise operating managers on appraisals in private organisations. 38.8% of respondents want them to review the working of the system. 37.6% want them to scrutinize all appraisals and 31.8% want them to assist in training of appraisers in public organisations. That means there are more variety of areas in which the respondents want the HRD / Personnel to get involved. This is good sign. Will HRD and Personnel functionaries welcome such a situation ?

TABLE : 42

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING WHETHER THE ORGANISATIONS
USE EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS FOR P. A. SYSTEM**

Q. 42. Has your organisation ever used external consultants for developing / improving and implementing an appraisal system ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	20	52	63.3	36.2	32.6	16.3	48	25.9
No	30	08	33.3	38.3	55.8	73.8	24	55.9

Inquiring into whether the organisations used external consultants for performance appraisal system. 55.9% of the respondents deny the use of external consultants either for developing / improving and implementing an appraisal system in public organisations whereas 48% of the respondents agree to the use of external consultants in private organisations.

TABLE : 42.1

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING AREAS IN WHICH
HELP OF EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS WAS TAKEN**

Q. 42 A. The areas in which your organisation used external consultants for developing / improving and implementing an appraisal system ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
In developing the system	-	40	40.0	36.0	20.9	05.0	29.3	17.6
In revising the system	10	16	33.3	06.4	02.3	02.5	21.3	03.5
In training of appraiser	05	04	-	08.5	04.7	06.3	02.7	06.5
In developing counselling skills	-	16	06.7	-	02.3	03.8	08.0	02.4

Private organisations report that external consultants were used for developing and revising the system. Figures 29.3% and 21.3% of above table. In public organisations very few respondents agree that external consultants were used in developing the system (17.6%). This supports the results of table 42.

TABLE : 43

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING WHETHER THE ORGANISATION
TRAIN THEIR APPRAISERS BEFORE THE ACTUAL APPRAISAL IS DONE**

Q. 43. Does your organisation train the appraisers before the actual appraisal is done ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes	25	12	23.3	21.3	39.5	12.5	20.0	21.8
No	60	76	76.7	57.4	25.6	82.5	72.0	55.1

When asked if the appraisers were trained before the appraisal began. The responses showed that appraisers are not trained before appraisals in private organisations (72%) and same prevails in public organisations (55.1%).

TABLE : 44
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING OVERALL
EVALUATION OF PRESENT P. A. SYSTEM

Q. 44. *What do you think are the problems with the present system and the current practices in your organisation ?*

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
No serious problem	25	52	20.0	34.0	32.6	18.8	32.0	26.5
Appraisals have lost meaning	35	12	50.0	55.3	18.6	45.0	33.3	41.2
System is unsatisfactory	20	12	36.7	10.6	30.2	21.3	24.0	20.6
Wide variation in agreed standards of performance	20	12	10.0	04.3	09.3	12.5	13.3	09.4
Wide variation in standards of evaluation	20	08	53.3	12.8	09.3	30.0	29.3	20.0
Appraisers lack ability to obtain relevant information	20	04	13.3	04.3	18.6	22.5	12.0	16.5
Appraisers lack to clearly narrate facts and describe in qualitative terms	25	04	33.3	02.1	07.0	16.3	21.3	10.0
Appraisers have ulterior motives, aims and prejudices	15	12	06.7	08.5	16.3	22.5	10.7	17.1

33.3% of the respondents feel that appraisals have lost meaning. 29.3% of the respondents feel that there is a wide variation in standards of evaluation. Whereas 32% of the respondents feel that there is no serious problem with their appraisal in private organisations. 41.2% of the respondents in public organisations feel that appraisals have lost meaning and 26.5% of the respondents feel that there is no serious problem with their appraisal system in public organisations.

TABLE : 45

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING SATISFACTION OF
THE RESPONDENTS WITH THE PRESENT P. A. SYSTEM**

Q. 45. Are you satisfied with the present appraisal system and practices in your organisation ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes, entirely	-	08.0	03.3	19.1	04.7	05.0	04.0	08.8
Yes, reasonably	25	32.0	23.3	17.0	14.0	13.8	26.7	14.7
Yes, but there is scope for improvement	40	32.0	36.7	12.0	41.9	26.3	36.0	26.5
System is OK., but implementation needs change	15	12.0	10.0	19.1	18.6	13.8	12.0	16.5
System needs thorough review	05	08.0	26.7	27.7	20.9	37.5	14.7	30.6

36% of the respondents feel that they are satisfied, but there is a scope for improvement in their appraisal system in private organisations. Similarly 26.5% of the respondents in public organisations feel that they need to improve.

TABLE : 46

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING SATISFACTION OF THE MANAGERS
WITH THE PRESENT P. A. SYSTEM AS PERCEIVED BY THE RESPONDENTS**

Q. 46. Do you think that the managers at different levels in your organisation are, by and large, satisfied with the present system and practices.

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Yes, by and large	15	32	10.0	25.5	34.8	20.0	18.7	26.7
No, there is much dissatisfaction	15	16	53.3	21.3	23.3	23.8	30.7	22.9
There is considerable dissatisfaction	20	08	16.7	14.9	32.6	27.5	14.7	25.3
No formal appraisals	10	16	-	17.0	04.6	08.8	08.0	10.0
Not quite sure	25	20	20	17.0	04.7	15.0	21.3	12.9

When asked whether managers were satisfied with their prevailing appraisal system the respondents felt, that there is much dissatisfaction in managers with their performance appraisal system i.e. 30.7% in private organisations. In public organisations 26.7% of the respondents felt satisfied by and large. At the same time considerable dissatisfaction (25.3% and 22.9%) was shown.

TABLE : 47

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING IMPORTANCE OF
P. A. SYSTEM AS PERCEIVED BY THE RESPONDENTS**

Q. 47. How important do you think is a sound appraisal system from the point of view of effective management development at this stage in your organisation ?

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Extremely important	35	48	33.3	42.6	60.5	43.8	38.7	47.6
Very important	25	24	53.3	38.3	25.6	25.0	36.0	28.8
Quite important	25	08	10.0	-	11.6	13.8	13.3	09.4
Not so important	25	04	03.3	08.5	-	13.8	02.7	08.8

Table 47 shows the level of importance of the performance appraisal system as perceived by the respondents is 38.7% of the respondents in private organisations and 47.6% of the respondents in public organisations feel that performance appraisal system is extremely important. 36% respondents in private organisations and 28.8% in public organisation feel it is very important for the organisation. Respondents in O3 show that P. A. is very important.

TABLE : 47X

**CHI-SQUARES OF RESPONSES SHOWING IMPORTANCE OF
P. A. SYSTEM AS PERCEIVED BY THE RESPONDENTS**

Responses	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Total
No response	03	04	-	05	01	03	16
Extremely important	07	12	10	20	26	35	110
Very important	05	06	16	18	11	20	76
Quite important	05	02	03	-	05	11	26
Not so important	-	01	01	04	-	11	17
Total	20	25	30	47	43	80	245

Chi-square analysis was also applied to test the significant difference of responses across all organisations and types of responses. Chi-square value thus obtained was 231.92 which was significant at < 0.001 level at $df = 20$.

TABLE : 48

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING THE VARIOUS PURPOSES
OF P. A. SYSTEM USED BY THE ORGANISATIONS**

Responses	Private Organisations			Public Organisations			Total	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Private	Public
Salary progression	60	12	86.7	25.5	04.7	03.8	54.7	10.0
Special rewards	15	-	26.7	-	-	06.3	14.7	02.9
Promotions	75	32	76.7	48.9	93.0	68.8	61.3	69.4
Placement and transfer	15	24	03.3	02.1	41.9	06.3	13.3	14.1
Training and development	55	28	60.0	57.4	20.9	11.3	48.0	26.5
Managerial manpower planning	-	-	-	-	-	08.8	-	04.1
Demotion, early retirement or termination	30	48	06.7	12.8	23.3	25.0	26.7	21.2
Review of effectiveness of selection method	55	96	56.7	21.3	41.9	17.5	69.3	24.7
Review of effectiveness of training and development	05	04	06.7	06.4	02.3	12.5	05.3	08.2

Table 48 shows that review of effectiveness of selection method is the prime purpose of appraisal in private organisations, where as in public organisations the appraisals are used for promotions.

TABLE : 49

**COMPANYWISE AVERAGE RANKS OF THE DIFFERENT PURPOSES
FOR WHICH THE APPRAISAL REPORTS ARE USED**

Purposes	Private			Public			Totals		
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	Pvt.	Pub.	Total
Salary progression	2.30	6.20	1.75	4.15	6.00	6.28	2.98	5.63	4.62
Special rewards	3.07	6.00	4.00	5.45	6.92	5.48	4.31	5.87	5.32
Promotions	3.05	3.74	2.38	1.80	1.10	1.61	2.96	1.51	1.96
Placement and transfer	4.44	3.67	6.42	4.29	2.79	4.51	4.96	3.91	4.22
Training and development	4.00	1.88	3.83	3.37	3.24	4.12	3.14	3.68	3.50
Managerial manpower planning	4.40	2.48	4.57	4.12	4.14	3.64	3.72	3.90	3.84
Demotion, early retirement or termination	8.30	8.79	8.56	7.14	7.22	6.35	8.57	6.78	7.28
Review of effectiveness of selection method	6.20	6.06	6.00	5.50	5.55	4.80	6.06	5.17	5.46
Review of effectiveness of training and development	5.40	5.28	6.39	5.07	5.93	6.10	5.80	5.79	5.79

TABLE : 50**ANOVA VALUES FOR THE PURPOSE OF SALARY PROGRESSION**

SOURCE	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F ratio
Between Groups	5	562.215	112.443	23.297
Within Groups	150	762.583	4.8265	
Total	163	1324.798		

$p = < 0.001$

ANOVA table 50 yielded significant F value. ($F = 23.29$, $df = 161$, $p = < 0.001$). Therefore further analysis was done using gap test [table 50G].

TABLE : 50G**MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS FOR SALARY PROGRESSION AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE**

ORGANISATIONS	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
MEAN VALUE	2.30	6.20	1.75	4.14	6.00	6.28
O1	—					
O2	3.90*	—				
O3	0.55	4.45*	—			
O4	1.84*	2.06*	2.39*	—		
O5	3.70*	0.20	4.25*	1.86*	—	
O6	3.98*	0.08	4.53*	2.14*	0.28	—

Table 50G shows the results obtained from Gap Test. Altogether eleven mean differences are significant. Highest mean was obtained by organisation six (O6) followed by O1, O2, O5, O4 and O3. O1 significantly differed from all the organisations except O3. O2 significantly differed from O3 & O4. Whereas O3 differed from O4, O5 and O6. O4 differed from O5 & O6.

TABLE : 51
ANOVA VALUES FOR THE PURPOSE OF SPECIAL REWARDS

SOURCE	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F ratio
Between Groups	5	189.79	37.95	8.86
Within Groups	140	599.71	4.28	
Total	145	789.50		

$p = < 0.001$

In the table 51 ANOVA values are shown. The F value obtained is significant ($F = 8.86$, $d f = 143$, $p = < 0.001$)

TABLE : 51G
MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS FOR THE USE OF SPECIAL REWARDS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

ORGANISATIONS	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
MEAN VALUE	3.06	6.00	4.00	5.45	6.92	5.47
O1	—					
O2	2.94 *	—				
O3	0.94	2.00 *	—			
O4	2.39 *	0.55	1.45 *	—		
O5	2.86 *	0.92	2.92 *	1.47 *	—	
O6	2.41 *	0.53	1.47 *	0.02	1.45 *	—

Table 51G shows the results of the Gap Test done after obtaining significant F value. Ten significant values were obtained. Highest mean was obtained by O5 followed by O2, O6, O4, O3 & O1. O1 significantly differed from all the organisations except O3. O2 differed from O3 only. Whereas again O3 differed from all the organisations except O1. And O4 and O5 differed from O5 and O6 respectively.

TABLE : 52
ANOVA VALUES FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROMOTIONS

SOURCE	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F ratio
Between Groups	5	129.91	25.98	11.42
Within Groups	211	479.79	2.27	
Total	216	609.70		

$p = <0.001$

Table no. 52 depicts the ANOVA values for the purpose of promotions in the organisations. The F value shown in the table is significant at 0.001 level. ($F = 11.42$, $df = 214$)

Table : 52G
MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS
FOR PROMOTION AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

ORGANISATIONS	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
MEAN VALUE	3.05	3.73	2.37	1.80	1.09	1.61
O1	—					
O2	0.68	—				
O3	0.68	1.36*	—			
O4	1.25*	1.93*	0.57	—		
O5	1.96*	2.64*	1.28*	0.71*	—	
O6	1.44*	2.12*	0.76*	0.19*	0.52	—

After obtaining significant F value, further analysis were done by using a gap test. The highest mean value as seen from the table is 3.73 (O2). Followed by O1, O3, O4, O6 & O5 Gap Test yielded ten significant values. O1 significantly differed from O4, O5, O6. Whereas O2 significantly differed from all the organisations except O2. O3 significantly differed from O5 & O6, leaving O4. And O4 differed from O5.

TABLE : 53**ANOVA VALUES FOR THE PURPOSE OF PLACEMENT AND TRANSFER**

SOURCE	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F ratio
Between Groups	5	181.31	36.26	11.58
Within Groups	166	519.72	3.13	
Total	171	701.04		

$p = < 0.001$

ANOVA table 53 yielded significant F value. ($F = 11.58$, $df = 169$, $p = < 0.001$). So further analysis was done using Gap Test. The results are presented in table 53G.

TABLE : 53G**MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS FOR PLACEMENT AND TRANSFER AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE**

ORGANISATIONS	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
MEAN VALUE	4.43	3.66	6.42	4.28	2.79	4.50
O1	—					
O2	0.77	—				
O3	1.99*	2.76*	—			
O4	0.15	0.62	2.14*	—		
O5	1.64*	0.87	3.63*	1.49*	—	
O6	0.07	0.84	1.92*	0.22	1.71*	—

Altogether eight mean differences are significant highest mean was obtained by O3, followed by O6, O1, O4, O2, and O5. O1 significantly differed from O3 & O5. Similarly O2 significantly differed from O3 only. Whereas O3 significantly differed from all the organisations. O4 and O5 differed from O5 and O6 respectively.

TABLE : 54

ANOVA VALUES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

SOURCE	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F ratio
Between Groups	5	95.78	19.15	6.32
Within Groups	185	559.96	3.02	
Total	190	655.74		

$p = <0.001$

In the table 54 ANOVA values are shown. The F value is significant at < 0.001 level. ($F = 6.32$, $df = 188$).

TABLE : 54G

MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS FOR TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

ORGANISATIONS	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
MEAN VALUE	4.00	1.87	3.83	3.36	3.23	4.11
O1	—					
O2	2.13*	—				
O3	0.17	1.96*	—			
O4	0.64	1.49*	0.47	—		
O5	0.77	1.36*	0.60	0.13	—	
O6	0.11	2.24*	0.28	0.75	0.88*	—

Table 54G shows the results of the Gap Test done further to see the least significant difference between the groups. Here only six significant values were obtained. The highest mean value, that can be seen from the table 54G is of O6 i.e. 4.11. Next highest is of O1 then O3, O4, O5 and O2. O2 is significantly different from all the organisations. And that O5 is different from O6.

TABLE : 55

**ANOVA VALUES FOR THE PURPOSE OF MANPOWER PLANNING,
SUCCESSION PLANNING AND CAREER PLANNING**

SOURCE	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F ratio
Between Groups	5	61.64	12.33	3.07
Within Groups	165	661.08	4.00	
Total	170	722.73		

$p = <0.001$

ANOVA table 55 shows the ANOVA values for the managerial manpower planning as a purpose of appraisal used by the organisations. The F value obtained is 3.07. With df = 168, which is significant at 0.001 level.

TABLE : 55G

**MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS FOR MANPOWER PLANNING,
SUCCESSION PLANNING AND CAREER PLANNING AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE**

ORGANISATIONS	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
MEAN VALUE	4.40	2.47	4.56	4.11	4.14	3.64
O1	—					
O2	2.47*	—				
O3	0.16	2.08*	—			
O4	0.28	1.63*	0.458	—		
O5	0.25	1.66*	0.42	0.02	—	
O6	0.75	1.16*	0.92	0.47	0.50	—

Table 55G shows the Gap Test conducted after obtaining significant 'F'. The lowest mean value obtained is 2.47 (O2). Next is O6, O4, O5, O1 & O3 is ascending order. O2 is significantly different all the organisations.

TABLE : 56

**ANOVA VALUES FOR THE PURPOSE OF DEMOTION
AND EARLY RETIREMENT AND TERMINATION**

SOURCE	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F ratio
Between Groups	5	117.39	23.47	4.93
Within Groups	143	600.76	4.76	
Total	148	798.16		

$p = < 0.001$

ANOVA table 56 yielded significant F value. ($F = 4.93$, $df = 147$, $p = < 0.001$). Therefore further analysis was done using Gap Test. The results of which are presented in table 56G

TABLE : 56G

**MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS FOR DEMOTION AND
EARLY RETIREMENT AND TERMINATION AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE**

ORGANISATIONS	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
MEAN VALUE	8.30	8.78	8.55	7.14	7.22	6.34
O1	—					
O2	0.48	—				
O3	0.25	0.23	—			
O4	1.15	1.64*	1.41*	—		
O5	1.07	1.56*	1.33*	0.08	—	
O6	1.95*	2.43*	2.21*	0.80	0.88	—

Total seven mean differences are significant. The means obtained can be arranged in an ascending order organisationwise O2, O3, O1, O5, O4 and O6. O6 is significantly different from O1, O2 and O3. Whereas O5 is significantly different from O2 and O3 and same is O4 which also differs from O2 & O3.

TABLE : 57

ANOVA VALUES FOR THE PURPOSE OF REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTION

SOURCE	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F ratio
Between Groups	5	40.04	8.00	1.69
Within Groups	146	689.71	4.72	
Total	151	729.76		

$p = <0.001$

In the table 57 above ANOVA values are shown. The F value obtained is significant though comparatively lower than the values obtained previously. ($F = 1.69$, $df = 149$, $<p = 0.001$)

TABLE : 57G

MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS FOR REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTION AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

ORGANISATIONS	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
MEAN VALUE	6.20	6.05	6.00	5.50	5.55	4.80
O1	—					
O2	0.15	—				
O3	0.20	0.05	—			
O4	0.70	0.55	0.50	—		
O5	0.65	0.65	0.45	0.05	—	
O6	1.40	1.25*	1.20	0.71	0.75	—

Table 57 shows the result of the Gap Test. Only two significant values are obtained. Highest mean was seen for O1; followed by O2, O3, O5, O4 and O6. It was observed that O6 was significantly different from O2 & O3.

TABLE : 58**ANOVA VALUES FOR THE PURPOSE OF REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING**

SOURCE	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F ratio
Between Groups	5	34.39	6.87	1.49
Within Groups	152	699.70	4.60	
Total	157	734.10		

$p = < 0.001$

Table 58 shows ANOVA values. F value obtained is 1.49, which is significant at < 0.001 level.

TABLE : 58G**MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS FOR REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE**

ORGANISATIONS	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
MEAN VALUE	5.40	5.27	6.39	5.07	5.93	6.10
O1	—					
O2	0.13	—				
O3	0.99	1.12	—			
O4	0.33	0.20	1.32*	—		
O5	0.53	0.66	0.46	0.86	—	
O6	0.70	0.83	0.29	1.03*	0.07	—

Table 58G shows the results obtained from the Gap Test administered. Again only two significant values were obtained. The highest mean obtained was 6.39 of O3; followed by O6, O5, O1, O2 & O4. O4 significantly differed from O3 & O6.

TABLE : 59

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS' SATISFACTION WITH
DIFFERENT DIMENSIONS OF P. A. SYSTEM**

Sr. No.	Dimensions	Satisfied		Not satisfied	
		Private	Public	Private	Public
1	Provision of clear and agreed objectives in P. A. System	53.3	45.3	34.7	44.7
2	Method of determining individual targets	56.3	56.4	43.7	42.4
3	Sources of information used	62.7*	46.5	29.3	48.2
4	Method of rating in joint responsibilities	62.7	54.1	13.3	34.1
5	Method of determining training needs	52.0	41.8	24.0	44.1
6	Method of determining personality traits	62.7	46.5	29.3	48.2
7	Weightage given to P. A. for promotions	58.7	44.7	22.7	41.8
8	Method used by reviewing authorities	46.7*	54.1	37.3	40.6
9	Method of communicating P. A. reports	54.0	53.6	36.0	40.8

* Total count of percentage do not come to 100 because of unanswered statements.

Table 59 shows that private organisations seem to be satisfied with their appraisal system compared to public organisation. The scores on satisfaction obtained in private organisation are more than 50%, whereas the satisfaction scores of public organisations below 50% with exceptions in four dimensions. Overall it seem that the scores in public organisations are more or less equally divided.

Correlation of effectiveness of P. A. system between all the dimensions of P. A. and Question 46 is - 0.2000 (0.01 level)

Correlation of effectiveness of P. A. system between all the dimensions of P. A. and Question no. 47 is - 0.1418

TABLE : 60

ANOVA FOR OVERALL SATISFACTION BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS

Source	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F
Between groups	5	13.47	2.69	1.49
Within groups	239	431.32	1.8047	
Total	244	444.80		

p = nonsignificant

ANOVA worked out for the dimension of overall satisfaction for all the types of organisations yielded an insignificant F value (Table 60).

TABLE : 61

ANOVA FOR MANAGER'S SATISFACTION BETWEEN THE ORGANISATIONS

Source	df	sum of squares	mean squares	F
Between groups	5	30.65	6.13	2.78*
Within groups	239	525.44	2.19	
Total	244	556.09		

$p = < 0.05$

ANOVA worked out for the dimension of managers' satisfaction for all the types of organisations yielded a significant F value = 2.78 significant at 0.05 level (Table 61).

TABLE : 61G

MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SATISFACTION OF MANAGERS AND ORGANISATIONS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
O1						
O2	0.60					
O3	0.93*	0.33				
O4	0.68	0.08	0.25			
O5	1.39*	0.79*	0.46	0.71*		
O6	0.70	0.10	0.23	0.02	0.69*	

Gap Test yielded five significant differences (Table 61G).

TABLE : 62

**ANOVA FOR OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH
DIFFERENT TYPES OF ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	sig. of F
Main effects	0.786	2	0.393	0.206	0.814
Organisation type	0.391	1	0.391	0.205	0.652
2-way interactions	1.59	1	1.593	0.834	0.363

p = nonsignificant

Analysis of variance was calculated to see the difference in satisfaction level of the respondents in respect to the type of organisation. The (F) value obtained is nonsignificant.

TABLE : 63

**ANOVA FOR MANAGERS' SATISFACTION FOR
DIFFERENT TYPES OF ORGANISATION**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	sig. of F
Main effects	29.33	2	14.66	6.32	0.002
Organisation type	16.38	1	16.38	7.07	0.009
2-way interactions	0.083	1	00.08	0.036	0.850

p = nonsignificant

In the table analysis of variance is calculated to see the significant difference between managers' satisfaction and type of organisation. The (F) values obtained were nonsignificant.



TABLE : 64

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF SALARY PROGRESSION AS
SEEN BY EXTRAVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	569.12	6	94.85	19.25	0.001
Organisation	560.21	5	112.04	22.74	0.001
Group Extroversion	006.91	1	006.906	1.40	NS

p = nonsignificant

Table 64 shows the ANOVA values for extraversion type of personality and the purpose of salary progression. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of extraversion.

TABLE : 65

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF SPECIAL REWARDS AS SEEN
BY EXTRAVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	190.89	6	31.81	7.42	0.001
Organisation	189.11	5	37.82	8.82	0.001
Group Extroversion	1.09	1	1.09	0.25	0.613

p = nonsignificant

Table 65 shows the ANOVA values for extraversion type of personality and the purpose of special rewards. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of extraversion.

TABLE : 66

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF PROMOTIONS AS SEEN BY
EXTRAVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	130.06	6	21.677	9.44	0.001
Organisation	129.76	5	25.95	11.30	0.001
Group Extroversion	0.15	1	0.15	0.06	0.79

p = nonsignificant

Table 66 shows the ANOVA values for extraversion type of personality and the purpose of promotions. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of extraversion.

TABLE : 67

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF PLACEMENT AND TRANSFER
AS SEEN BY EXTRAVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	181.38	6	30.23	9.68	0.001
Organisation	177.55	5	35.51	11.37	0.001
Group Extroversion	0.06	1	0.06	0.02	0.887

p = nonsignificant

Table 67 shows the ANOVA values for extraversion type of personality and the purpose of placement and transfer. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of extraversion.

TABLE : 68

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT
AS SEEN BY EXTRAVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	95.80	6	15.96	5.17	0.001
Organisation	95.22	5	19.04	6.17	0.001
Group Extroversion	0.02	1	0.02	0.006	0.940

p = nonsignificant

Table 68 shows the ANOVA values for extraversion type of personality and the purpose of training and development. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of extraversion.

TABLE : 69

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF MANAGERIAL MANPOWER PLANNING
AND SUCCESSION / CAREER PLANNING AS SEEN BY EXTRAVERTS
IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	72.92	6	12.15	3.04	0.01
Organisation	63.31	5	12.66	3.17	0.01
Group Extroversion	11.27	1	11.27	2.82	0.095

p = nonsignificant

Table 69 shows the ANOVA values for extraversion type of personality and the purpose of managerial manpower planning and succession planning / career planning. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of extraversion.

TABLE : 70

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF DEMOTION / EARLY RETIREMENT / TERMINATION
AS SEEN BY EXTRAVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	131.61	6	21.93	4.68	0.001
Organisation	118.71	5	23.74	5.06	0.001
Group Extroversion	14.21	1	14.21	3.03	0.084

p = nonsignificant

Table 70 shows the ANOVA values for extraversion type of personality and the purpose of demotions / early retirement / termination. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of extraversion.

TABLE : 71

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTION
METHOD AS SEEN BY EXTRAVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	41.54	6	6.92	1.48	0.186
Organisation	38.35	5	7.67	1.65	0.151
Group Extroversion	1.49	1	1.49	0.32	0.572

p = nonsignificant

Table 71 shows the ANOVA values for extraversion type of personality and the purpose of review of effectiveness of selection method. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for all the variables.

TABLE : 72

ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT AS SEEN BY EXTRAVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	39.01	6	6.50	1.40	0.217
Organisation	37.87	5	7.57	1.63	0.154
Group Extroversion	4.61	1	4.61	0.99	0.320

p = nonsignificant

Table 72 shows the ANOVA values for extraversion type of personality and the purpose of review of effectiveness of training and development. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for all the variables.

TABLE : 73

ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF SALARY PROGRESSION AS SEEN BY INTROVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	567.97	6	94.66	19.56	0.001
Organisation	482.33	5	96.46	19.93	0.001
Group Introversion	5.75	1	5.75	1.18	0.277

p = nonsignificant

Table 73 shows the ANOVA values for introversion type of personality and the purpose of salary progression. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of introversion.

TABLE : 74

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF SPECIAL REWARDS AS
SEEN BY INTROVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	189.92	6	31.65	7.52	0.001
Organisation	186.45	5	37.29	8.86	0.001
Group Introversion	0.12	1	0.12	0.03	0.861

p = nonsignificant

Table 74 shows the ANOVA values for introversion type of personality and the purpose of special rewards. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of introversion.

TABLE : 75

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF PROMOTION AS SEEN
BY INTROVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	131.45	6	21.91	9.57	0.001
Organisation	127.65	5	25.53	11.15	0.001
Group Introversion	1.54	1	1.54	0.67	0.412

p = nonsignificant

Table 75 shows the ANOVA values for introversion type of personality and the purpose of promotion. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of introversion

TABLE : 76

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF PLACEMENT AND TRANSFER
AS SEEN BY INTROVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	185.25	6	30.87	9.77	0.001
Organisation	183.19	5	36.63	11.59	0.001
Group Introversion	3.93	1	3.93	1.24	0.266

p = nonsignificant

Table 76 shows the ANOVA values for introversion type of personality and the purpose of placement and transfer. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of introversion.

TABLE : 77

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT AS
SEEN BY INTROVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	98.36	6	16.39	5.51	0 001
Organisation	98.36	5	19.67	6.61	0 001
Group Introversion	2.58	1	2.58	0.86	0 353

p = nonsignificant

Table 77 shows the ANOVA values for introversion type of personality and the purpose of training and development. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of introversion.

TABLE : 78

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF MANAGERIAL MANPOWER
PLANNING AND SUCCESSION / CAREER PLANNING AS
SEEN BY INTROVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	61.72	6	10.28	2.53	0.023
Organisation	59.87	5	11.97	2.94	0.014
Group Introversion	0.07	1	0.07	0.01	0.893

p = nonsignificant

Table 78 shows the ANOVA values for introversion type of personality and the purpose of managerial manpower planning / succession planning / career planning. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for all the variables.

TABLE : 79

**ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF DEMOTION / EARLY RETIREMENT / TERMINATION
AS SEEN BY INTROVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS**

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	117.59	6	19.59	3.97	0.001
Organisation	105.47	5	21.09	4.27	0.001
Group Introversion	0.19	1	0.19	0.04	0.842

p = nonsignificant

Table 79 shows the ANOVA values for introversion type of personality and the purpose of demotion / early retirement / termination. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of introversion.

TABLE : 80

ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTION METHOD AS SEEN BY INTROVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	43.29	6	7.21	1.59	0.154
Organisation	28.29	5	5.65	1.24	0.291
Group Introversion	3.24	1	3.24	0.71	0.399

p = nonsignificant

Table 80 shows the ANOVA values for introversion type of personality and the purpose of review of effectiveness of selection method. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for all the variables.

TABLE : 81

ANOVA FOR PURPOSE OF REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT AS SEEN BY INTROVERTS IN DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS

Source of variation	sum of squares	df	mean squares	F	p
Main effects	36.27	6	6.04	1.31	0.256
Organisation	35.53	5	7.10	1.54	0.181
Group Introversion	1.87	1	1.87	0.40	0.524

p = nonsignificant

Table 81 shows the ANOVA values for introversion type of personality and the purpose of effectiveness of training and development. The result indicated nonsignificant F value for the variable of introversion.