



## Studying the current status of employee performance evaluation of Jihad Organization University of North Khorasan

Alireza Shakeri<sup>1</sup>, Mahboubeh SoleimanpourOmran<sup>2\*</sup> and Behrang Esmaeili Shad<sup>3</sup>

\* Graduated M.A. student in Educational Management, Department of Educational Management, Bojnourd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bojnourd, Iran. . E mail : [alireza.shakeri\\_1357@yahoo.com](mailto:alireza.shakeri_1357@yahoo.com)

<sup>2</sup>Department of Educational Management, Bojnourd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bojnourd, Iran. E mail : [m.pouromran@gmail.com](mailto:m.pouromran@gmail.com) (corresponding author)

<sup>3</sup>Department of Educational Management, Bojnourd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bojnourd, Iran.

### ABSTRACT

### Original Article:

This study aims to investigate the present situation of performance of Jihad's University employees of North Khorasan and providing ultimate model. This study is descriptive\_ applied, the statistical population was 80 people whom all of them were chosen due to small number of people. In order to collect the data, the librarian and internet sources such as books were used. Information and data collection needed to assess the research hypothesis, the researcher made questionnaire which has 71 items is used that the experts' opinions have been applied for reliability and the Cronbach's coefficient test was used to confirm the validity of the questionnaire and the value was 0.90. SPSS software was used to analyze the information. The single sample t-test and factorial analysis and the Freedman test were used in inferential statistics. The results showed that the present situation of Jihad's University has significant difference in regarding employees' ultimate performance and based on the results of the Freedman test and factorial analysis, in employees' opinions, the assessment indicators, use of assessment results, assessment goals, and performance standard are the best components and the assessment period has the least rate.

Received 10 Mar. 2015

Accepted 22 June. 2015

Published 30 July. 2015

**Keywords:** the present situation of performance assessment, the desirable model, the employees of Jihad University

### 1. Introduction

Human resources is the most original and greatest asset of an organization and is mentioned as a strategic factor. Optimizing human resources implies the existence of a system to evaluate the performance of employees. Evaluating the performance is the functions of human resource management which is done with time and cost in organizations and its results are used in other human resource management functions, including payroll, educational needs and the promotion (Yazdanshenas, 1980: 4). Therefore, the establishment of a sound management system in any organization and creating basic facilities of logical tools for managers to monitor the quantity and quality of work in various areas are critical issues that are discussed in managing an organization as the foundation and infrastructure of each work (SeyedJavadein, 2002: 125). Performance evaluation, the process of measuring the current situation and determine how to achieve the desired status with specified criteria in a given period is with the aim of continuous improvement of organization's performance (Sharie, 2011: 2). Element of change and instability and simultaneous expansion of the scope and diversity of communities has increased the scope of complexity and diversity of organizations as well as their environmental Interactions. The number and diversity of the organizations caused their survival has become a major challenge in today's changing world which higher education

system in the country with regard to the extent of impact on different social processes and functions have not been excluded from this provision.

In the current era that witnessed the expansion of the community expectations from universities and increasing environmental changes caused by the complexity and dynamics of our environment, universities require the establishment of monitoring and evaluation system because the lack of evaluation at the university means the lack of communication with internal and external environment of university. Therefore, institutionalizing continuous improvement thinking at the university through the use of continuous assessment, comparing their performance with others and emulating the successful experiences of universities are the main purpose of university from the establishment of the Monitoring and Evaluation system (Zare and Bakhtiari, 2012: 16). In the past 20 years, two issues have been proposed in the top responsive higher education: the first issue is attention to increase in academic and other services and the other is responding, planning and appropriate performance evaluation (Frank, 2008: 499). Without performance evaluation based on the components and key indicators, continuous improvement in the development and improving the quality of universities will not be realized (Hakan et al., 2006: 357). If the evaluation system is well designed and properly applied, it can be a suitable means to encourage, educate, reform and improve the performance of the staff (Tavalaee, 2013: 5).

There has been much research in this field, including Mahmoudi et al. (2012) in a research entitled "a model to identify key performance indicators using the Balanced Scorecard and the dynamics of the system", concluded that to identify indicators of performance evaluation, the strategic foundation of the organization should be fully understood. The main objective of any system of performance evaluation is evaluation of compliance of the current results with pre-determined goals. In organizations, goals are determined based on the organization's policy and strategy. So without understanding the strategic foundations of the organization, organization's needs was not well understood and may go wrong in the choice of performance indicators. In a study entitled providing a good model for evaluating the performance of the defense research centers, Hosseinpour (2012) concluded that to determine the appropriate method for evaluating the performance of any organization, the features and goals of the organization should be considered. According to the conditions and characteristics of their organization to carry out its duties, Defense Research Centers need to have a performance evaluation system and methods for evaluation and accordingly the Balanced Scorecard as a template and an appropriate method for defensive centers are selected.

In a study entitled staff performance evaluation system from the perspective of managers and staff: requirements of change, the level of satisfaction, injuries, Ahanchian (2011) concluded that from the perspective of the subjects, changing in the evaluation criteria, implementation process, providing feedback and using the results are required, the consent of the directors and staff of the current system of performance appraisal is low and as a result there are some defects and anomalies in the evaluation of staff performance, personal growth and organizational development is delayed. These issues can be detected as the most important damages of the staff performance appraisal system.

In a study entitled satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the directors and staff performance appraisal system, Klaterback (2007) also showed that staff and managers have a negative attitude toward the performance appraisal system and are not happy with it because of a poor and inefficient performance evaluation program.

In a study entitled frustration of staff from evaluation system in universities affiliated to the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology, Sporen (2007) showed that human resources of the university have not a positive view of employee performance evaluation and it is not satisfactory.

In a study entitled satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the directors and staff of performance appraisal system, Walery (2006) also showed that staff and managers have a negative attitude toward the performance appraisal system and are not happy with it and the reasons is the incomplete and poor communications between the evaluator and appraisee.

In a study entitled effectiveness of the performance appraisal system, Lucas (2004) showed that factors have been effective in decreasing the effectiveness of this system of assessment were the absence of joint meetings between

managers and staff to review the results and analyzing the data resulted from assessment.

In a study entitled effectiveness of the performance appraisal system, Samerick (2004) showed that the factors have been effective in reducing the effectiveness of this system of assessment are lack of feedback from the results of the those being evaluated.

In a study entitled effectiveness of the performance appraisal system, Smith (2003) showed that factors reduce the effectiveness of this appraisal systems include the implementation of the assessment by assessors who have not previously been trained before the start of the evaluation. Like all organizations and educational centers, Jihad's University need to have a suitable evaluation system to improve the performance of their employees that is commensurate with the objectives of the Jihad's University. Evaluating the performance is a strategic action at the universities (Simmons, 2002). Sensitivity of training activities and complexity of the missions that are defined by the local community, institutions and community for the colleges increases the expectations to meet the responsiveness of these institutions and confirms two important conclusions: 1) evaluating the performance of employees at universities is a reasonable tool to ensure the preservation and promotion of human capital that the university is primarily able to meet and providing the requirements of stakeholders by relying on it, and 2) formal, written and documented assessment at the University cannot replace regular feedback on job performance. So it can be identified as an important reason that shows the need to design and build a system of performance evaluation for higher education institutions (Ahanchian, 2010: 1).

Performance evaluation is closely associated with the improvement of human resources and philosophy of this relationship is that it makes improvement targeted and purposeful. Therefore, it is important that organizations have a suitable evaluation system and make it work properly to obtain good results from.

With all the importance that can be made for personnel evaluation scientifically and rationally, according to the indifferent attitude of the management measures in most organizations and institutions, not only evaluations are failed, but created some problems. So, it is necessary to solve these problems and take measures for a suitable evaluation system to evaluate the performance of employees to improve staff performance (Alhaviredi Habibpour, 3: 1989). Therefore, with respect to these issues, the current research seeks to answer the question of whether the status quo of Jihad's University staff of North Khorasan has a significant difference with optimal situation. Hence, the present study aims to achieve the following objectives:

Recognizing the status quo of employee performance of Jihad's University of North Khorasan and presenting a desirable performance pattern.

#### **Secondary Objectives:**

1. Recognizing the status quo of Jihad's University staffs' performance at North Khorasan in terms of evaluation purposes;
2. Recognizing the status quo of Jihad's University staffs' performance at North Khorasan in terms of performance standard;

3. Recognizing the status quo of Jihad's University staffs' performance at North Khorasan in terms of appraisal periods;
4. Recognizing the status quo of Jihad's University staffs' performance at North Khorasan in terms of evaluation indicators;
5. Recognizing the status quo of Jihad's University staffs' performance at North Khorasan in terms of using the results of appraisal;
6. Identifying the components of the desired pattern
7. Determining the priority of components of desired pattern

assessment indicators and using the results of the assessment

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation
	Evaluation purposes	98.26
performance Standard evaluation periods	75.211	51.6
	17.54	5.58
Evaluation criteria Using the results of evaluation	67.58	11.58
	27	8.08

### 3.2 Research Method

This research is an applied, descriptive- survey research. The statistical population consisted of all employees of Jihad's University of North Khorasan, the number was 80 and because of the limited number of population, sampling method was census. Data collection tool was the library and field method. In the survey, data collection tool of researcher-made questionnaire of 71 questions was used that measures the status quo of performance that includes five components: standard performance, use of the results of the evaluation, performance indicators, periodic and objective and evaluation that is in four option response package based on Likert scale. In order to confirm the validity, the experts' opinions in the field were used and to determine its reliability, Cronbach's test was used that its value was estimated as 0.90 that shows appropriate reliability of the tool. To analyze the data, descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage and mean) and inferential statistics, one-sample T-test and factor analysis and Friedman test, using SPSS 16 software was used.

#### Findings:

Table 1. Descriptive indicators of variable of evaluation goals, performance standards, evaluation periods,

Table 2. Results of difference or no difference in the average and variable of evaluation purposes

Variable	t	Degree of freedom	Significance level	Mean
Evaluation purposes	29.62	68	0.00	26.98

According to Table 2, it can be seen that t value obtained is equal to 29.62 which statistically significant at less than 0.05. Therefore, in terms of employees, there is a significant

Table 3. The results of difference or no difference in average of performance standard variable

Variable	t	Degree of freedom	Significance level	Mean
Performance standard	27.95	69	0.00	21.78

According to Table 3, it can be seen that t value obtained is equal to 27.95 which statistically significant at less than 0.05. Therefore, in terms of employees, there is a significant

Table 4. The results of difference or no difference in average of performance evaluation period

Variable	t	Degree of freedom	Significance level	Mean
evaluation period	25.52	69	0.00	17.04

According to Table 4, it can be seen that t value obtained is equal to 25.52 which statistically significant at less than 0.05. Therefore, in terms of employees, there is a significant

Table 5. The results of difference or no difference in average of performance evaluation dictators

Variable	t	Degree of freedom	Significance level	Mean
evaluation dictators	42.36	69	0.00	27

As Table 1 shows, the average and standard deviation and variable of evaluation purposes are 26.98 and 7.56, respectively and the mean and standard deviation of performance standard variable is 21.75 and 6.51, respectively and the mean and standard deviation of the variable of evaluation period is 17.54 and 5.58, respectively and the mean and standard deviation of the variable of evaluation indicators are 58.67 and 11.58, respectively, and the mean and standard deviation of the variable of the results of evaluation are 27.00 and 8.08, respectively.

After describing the research variables, the data on these variables are inferred. Given that in the present study, an independent group in terms of the variable of evaluation objectives, performance standard, evaluation periods, evaluation indicators and using the results of evaluation are compared, first, the one-sample t-test was used and then to determine the components of optimal evaluation model as well as determining the priority of optimal model components, factor analysis was used which the results are presented in the following table:

**Hypothesis 1:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of performance evaluation purposes and desired situation.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of performance in terms of performance standard and an ideal situation.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of performance standard and the ideal situation.

**Hypothesis 4:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of performance evaluation period and the ideal situation.

**Hypothesis 5:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of performance evaluation dictators and the ideal situation.

**Hypothesis 6:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of performance evaluation dictators and the ideal situation.

**Hypothesis 7:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of performance evaluation dictators and the ideal situation.

**Hypothesis 8:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of performance evaluation dictators and the ideal situation.

**Hypothesis 9:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of performance evaluation dictators and the ideal situation.

**Hypothesis 10:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of performance evaluation dictators and the ideal situation.



*University College of Takestan*

According to Table 4, it can be seen that t value obtained is equal to 42.36 which statistically significant at less than 0.05. Therefore, in terms of employees, there is a significant

difference between the status quo of performance in terms of performance indicators and an ideal situation.

**Hypothesis 5:** There is a significant difference between the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of results of performance evaluation and the ideal situation.

Table 6. The results of difference or no difference in average of results of performance evaluation

Variable	t	Degree of freedom	Significance level	Mean
results of performance evaluation	27.94	69	0.00	27

According to Table 6, it can be seen that t value obtained is equal to 27.94 which is statistically significant at less than 0.05. Therefore, in terms of employees, there is a significant

difference between the status quo of performance in terms of results of performance evaluation and an ideal situation.

**Hypothesis 6:** determining the desired components in terms of employees using factor analysis test

Table 7. Results surveying variance of ideal evaluation pattern components

Dimensions	Components
	1
Evaluation criteria	0.921
Evaluation period	0.868
performance Standard	0.975
Using assessment results	0.965
Evaluation purposes	0.959

According to the results of findings in Table 7, the variance of all performance components obtained showed that of all the components, component of evaluation indices was chosen as the best components that has the highest

correlation with standard components and the amount of variance components performance standard is 0.97 that has the highest variance among all components and factors.

**Hypothesis 7:** determining the priority of desirable evaluation model components

Table 8. The results of the variance rating of evaluation pattern components

Dimensions	Components
	1
Performance Standard	0.221
Using assessment results	0.219
Evaluation purposes	0.218
Evaluation criteria	0.209
Evaluation period	0.197

According to the findings in (Table 8), coefficient variance of all components of the performance evaluation obtained show that of all the components, variance rating coefficient of components performance standard is 0.22 which has the highest coefficient of variance among all components.

Therefore, it is the best component of evaluating the performance in terms of employees.

Table 9: mean of rates of each variable

	Mean of ratings
Evaluation criteria	5.00
Evaluation period	1.14
performance Standard	1.92
Using assessment results	3.53
Evaluation purposes	3.41

Table 11: main results of test

Number	69
Chi-2	260.352
Degree of freedom	4
Significance level	.000

According to the results of Tables 10 and 11, the average rating of all components of optimal performance obtained show that of all components, rating average of evaluation indicators component equals 0.05 which has the highest rate in terms of average among all components. Then, using evaluation results and dimensions of purposes and performance standard have the highest rates and have a low rate in performance evaluation period. Since significance level is less than 0.05; therefore, in terms of employees, status quo of performance has a significant difference with the ideal situation.

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

According to the results of the one-sample t-test, the hypothesis of the study showed that the current situation of the employees of the Jihad's University of North Khorasan has a significant difference with the desirable situation. It is therefore essential that the organization has an appropriate evaluation system and make it work properly to obtain good results from. According to the indifferent attitude of the management measures in most organizations and institutions, not only evaluations are failed, it has created some problems. Therefore, it is necessary to solve these problems and a suitable evaluation system to evaluate the performance of employees are created to improve performance. According to the first hypothesis, it can be concluded that in terms of staff, the status quo of performance are significant in terms of assessment objectives. The results of the study hypothesis is consistent with Azargar research (2002). He reached the conclusion in his research that the current system of evaluation cannot meet the assessment objectives of staff. According to the second hypothesis, the status quo of staffs' performance in terms of performance standard has a significant difference with desirable situation from the view of staff. So it can be concluded that in terms of staff, the status quo has a significant difference with performance standard. The results of the study hypothesis correspond with the study of Alvaredi Habibpour (1989). He has been concluded in his research that the lack of standards in employee performance in evaluation caused the level of human resource improvement has been decreased. Therefore, after explaining the objectives, standards of staff performance based on job descriptions and duties should be determined. According to the third hypothesis, status quo of performance in terms of evaluating assessment period of performance has a significant difference with a desirable situation in terms of staff. The results of this hypothesis is consistent with the research results obtained by Yazdanshenas (1980). He showed in his study that there is a significant difference between assessment periods in the status quo with the desirable condition. In the current assessment system, since assessment is done just once, it cannot influence the staffs' performance improvement. According to the results of the fourth hypothesis, it can be concluded that status quo of performance in terms of performance assessment indicators has a significant difference with a desirable situation in terms of staff. So, it can be concluded that status quo of performance in terms of performance assessment indicators has a significant difference. The results of the study hypothesis correspond with the results of Mahmoudi et al (2012). They concluded

that to identify indicators of performance evaluation, the strategic foundations of organization should be fully understood. The main objective of any system of performance evaluation is evaluation of compliance of the current results with pre-determined goals. In organizations, goals are determined based on the organization's policy and strategy. So without understanding the strategic foundations of the organization, organization's needs was not well understood and may go wrong in the choice of performance indicators. According to fifth hypothesis, staffs' performance in terms of using the results of performance evaluation has a significant difference with desirable situation in terms of staff. The results of the study hypothesis correspond with Tabarsa and Ghafuri (2007). They concluded in their research that new performance evaluation system of government personnel in connection with the use of the results of the assessment, which determining the payment system of staff is done based on it, is efficient and has paid a special attention to the rewards payment, salaries payment as well as benefits given the results of performance evaluation.

Also, the current system of evaluating the performance is more effective than the previous system in terms of identifying employees whose place in the organization should be discounted, and using the results of the performance evaluation to system of punishment and rewards and ultimately identifying qualified individuals in the organization has been considered in an acceptable level. Sixth hypothesis indicates that variance of components performance standard is equal to 97% in terms of staff. Therefore, it has the highest amount of variance among all the components of performance. In determining priority of components of desired pattern, the best component for evaluating the performance in terms of the staff was Jihad's University of North Khorasan. According to the research findings, it is concluded that the status quo of Jihad's University in terms of staffs' performance components has a significant difference with desired situation. Thus, to increase efficiency and provide better service to employees, the authorities of Jihad's University should use the results of evaluation to give promotions and bonuses for staff and officials of Jihad's University assess their employees at the right time to improve the performance of employees. On the other hand, the proper performance evaluation system can increase the trust and confidence of employees regarding the accuracy of personnel decisions and will cause working motivations. Therefore, As Davis and Newstrom (1989) emphasize, the modern philosophy of performance evaluation is that its orientation is towards performance, insists on goals and objectives and determining objectives or targeting is done with bilateral consultation between leaders and employees. Optimal performance evaluation is very different from previous evaluation system in many aspects. Universities and higher education institutions play a main role as the highest center of thinking and the scientific community and with the presence of thoughtful thinkers, researchers, scholars and students in scientific advancement and to accelerate the movement of thought, belief, cultural and political community. Evaluation and performance measurement leads to system intelligence and motivate people towards an optimal behavior which is the main part

of formulation and implementation of organizational policies. Evaluation and performance measurement provides the feedback necessary in the following cases:

- By keeping track of progress towards targets, it is clear whether the policies developed are to be successfully implemented?

- By measuring the organizational expected results, as well as measuring employee satisfaction and customers, it is specified whether policies have been formulated correctly. In addition, the performance and management support systems provide to performance management incentive mechanism that enhance learning and organizational knowledge in the following ways: Providing organizational growth indicators, identifying points of improvement, staff development talents.

An administration system requires performance measurement and learning to could contribute organizational advancement and identify organizational growth indicators, improving effectiveness and continuous improvements.

Normally on the importance and impact of performance evaluation, the following cases can be mentioned: manpower planning, recruitment and selection, training and development of human resources, designing compensation system, determining the career path, recognizing the potential and manpower capabilities, motivation system design, determining the validity of employment examinations and creating an atmosphere of trust (Mayer Davis, 1997; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995; Murphy, 2008). Such cases somehow show the expected results of performance evaluation of human resources. The performance evaluation thus requires effectiveness system to be able to design, direct and promotes appropriate designs of performance evaluation of human resources.

#### **References:**

1. IbnRasoul, Asghar& Mehdi Ghazanfari (2011), designing a Balanced Scorecard performance measurement framework. Case Study: Ministry of Commerce. Management improvement. Fifth year. (11).
2. Azarehgar, Hamid, 2002, studying the status of the fishery's central office performance evaluations and providing an appropriate model. Tehran University master's thesis.
3. Armstrong. Michael. 2006. Performance Management. Translated by Saeed Safari and Amir Wahhabian. Tehran, Jihad's University Publication Organization
4. Ahanchian, Mohammad Reza. 2010. University staff performance evaluation system from the perspective of managers and employees. Changing requirements. Satisfaction level. Damages.
5. Ahanchian, Mohammadreza, 2010, performance evaluation system of university staff from the perspective of managers and employees. Changing requirements. Satisfaction level. Damage.
6. Alhaviredi, Habibpour, 1989, Study of performance evaluation of railway employees and to provide suitable development of human resources. Tehran University master's thesis.
7. Toulai, Rohollah, 2013: New approaches to evaluating the performance of organizations. Database of scientific management articles, <http://system.parsiblog.Com/Posts/66>
8. Khoshvaghti, Armin, 2005, evaluating employee performance. Management solutionsite.
9. Doaie, Habibollah, 1985, human resource management, Mashhad. Ferdowsi University Press
10. Shimon L. Dolan, Schuler, Randolph S. 1987. Management of personnel issues and human resources. Tehran: Public Administration Training Centre.
11. Rahimi, Ghafour, 2006: Performance evaluation and continuous improvement of the organization. TadbirJournal. 173. P: 36.
12. Zare. Zainab. 2012. Analysis of the performance evaluation of Al-Zahra University. Azal Press. First Edition.
13. State official and employment status, designing state personnel appraisal. 1984. Publisher: certain administrations, Fourth Edition
14. Saadat, Esfandiar, 1986: human resource management, Tehran, SAMT Publications, first edition
15. Saadat, Esfandiar. 2004. Human Resource Management. Pages 231 to 238. Eighth Edition. SAMT Publications
16. Syed Javadein. Reza. 2007. Evaluation of the performance evaluation of staff on improving performance at Imam Sadeq University. Management thought. Second year. Second issue.
17. Shafya. Mohammed Ali. 2001. Appropriate indicators to assess the quality of higher education in Iran. Ministry of Science, Research and Technology research project. No. (40).
18. Tabarsa. Gholamreza. 1989. Reviewing and explaining the role of the strategic requirements in the selection of evaluation system of government agencies. Proceedings of the Second Festival of martyr Rajai, evaluating the performance of the state executive organizations. Tehran: The state of employment office.
19. Alizadeh. Abraham. 2009. Factors affecting the willingness of employee turnover. Police Human Development Magazine.
20. Moshabaki, Isfahani. Asghar. et.al. 2010. Studying the effect of performance evaluation on improving human resources in the police headquarters. Police Management Studies. Issue IV.
21. Mir Sepasi. Naser. 2007. Strategic Human Resource Management and Labor Relations. Second edition. Tehran, Mir Publishing. PP. 237- 240
22. Najmi. 2003, Excellence model from idea to practice, Tehran, Rounas Publications
23. HedayatTabatabai. Amir. 1989. Measuring efficiency with technical-engineering approach, Tehran, Training and Research Institute of Defense
24. Bernardin, H.J. 2003. Human Resource Management: an experiential approach. 3 th Edition. New York: McGrawHill.
25. Foot. M and Hook. C .1999. Introducing Human Resource Management. Longman.
26. Ivancevich, J. M. 2007. Human Resource Management. New York: McGrawHill.
27. Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. 1992. "The Balanced scorecard: Measures that Drive performance", Harvard Business Review, January-February, pp. 9-11
28. Lucas, R. W. 1994. Performance coaching: Now and for the future. HR Focus, 71 (1), pp.16-28.

29. Mayer, R. C. & Davis, J. H. (1997). the effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of applied psychology*, 84 (1), pp. 123-136.
30. Murphy, K. R. & Cleveland, J. 1995. *Understanding Performance Appraisal: Social, Organizational, and Goal-based Perspectives*, NJ: SAGE
31. Murphy, K. R. 2008. Explaining the weak relationship between job performance and ratings of the job performance. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1 (2), pp. 148-160.
32. Noe, R.A, Hollenbeck, J. R, Gerhurt, B & Wright, P.M. 2008. *Human Resource Management: gaining Competitive advantage*. New York: McGrawHill.
33. Simmons, J. 2002. An "expert witness" perspective on performance appraisal in universities and colleges. *Employee Relations*, 24(1), 86-100.
34. Simmons, J. 2002. An "expert witness" perspective on performance appraisal in universities and colleges. *Employee Relations*, 24(1), 86-100.
35. Valerie, F. 1996. Older workers fend for themselves. *Personnel Journal*, 75 (5), pp. 23-34.