

<u>s.no</u>	approaches	percentage respondents	of	MD	Effectiveness
1)	ABSOLUTE STANDARDS	Org-1	Orga2		
	a) Performance expectation forecast				
	Superiors analyses plans carefully	58.61	62.75	4.14	Org-2
	Performance appraisal system measure relative worth of job	60.28	65.13	4.85	Org-2
	Performance appraisal system useful to estimate SWOT analysis of employees	53.89	60.63	6.74	Org-2
	Mean value percentage	57.59	62.83		
	b) About performance rater				
	Qualified evaluator is appointed for you	62.5	73.13	10.63	Org-2
	Qualified evaluator has sufficient knowledge	58.75	60.38	1.63	Org-2
	Evaluator understand practical requirement and problems	64.72	71.13	6.41	Org-2
	Evaluator knows to evaluate performance as per format	63.06	65	1.94	Org-2
	Evaluator knows procedures and rating formats	62.36	62.38	0.02	Org-2
	Mean value percentage	62.27	66.4		
	c) Appealing for justice				
	I have opportunity to appeal	61.39	69.63	8.24	Org-2
	I have confident about my review	62.92	60.63	2.29	Org-1
	I can object if appraisal is unbiased	61.39	62.63	1.24	Org-2
	My appraisal report revaluated if I apply	62.5	63.25	0.75	Org-2
	I have no stress to appeal	66.94	62.69	4.25	Org-1
	I have opportunity to communicate my feelings	61.49	68.63	7.14	Org-2
	Mean value percentage	62.77	64.57		
2)	CONFIGURABLE JUSTICE				
	D) Accuracy of performance ratings				
	Performance appraisal Represent how well work has performed	58	68.63	10.63	Org-2
	Performance appraisal exactly reflecting what the work I did in the organization	61	65	4	Org-2
	Performance rating involves my overall effort that I give	62.06	64.31	1.036	Org-2
	My current performance ratings was based on my effort that i put in the work	61.14	68.01	6.87	Org-2
	Mean value percentage	60.55	66.47		
	E) Concern over all performance rating				
	Actual performance rating given even if it might upset me	63.19	69.25	6.06	Org-2
	Performance rating is the result of application of performance standards	62	71.94	9.94	Org-2
	Performance rating does not reflect raters personal likes and dislikes	61.69	66.37	4.68	Org-2
	Mean value percentage	62.29	69.18		
3)	INFORMATIONAL JUSTICE				

	F) Understanding performance expectations				
	Performance Targets are clearly mentioned	61	66.13	5.13	Org-2
	Standards used while evaluating performance	58.21	67.23	9.02	Org-2
	Mean value percentage	59.6	66.68		
	G) In process performance feedback				
	Performance improvement changes are explained	61.89	66.75	4.86	Org-2
	Regular feedback is given by the superior	55.64	65	9.36	Org-2
	Supervisors giving suggestions to increase performance	62.21	74.79	12.58	Org-2
	Performance evaluator gives progress about your work	50.83	70.13	19.3	Org-2
	Evaluator suggest changes to improve my performance	61.67	70.38	8.71	Org-2
	Mean value percentage	55.44	69.41		
4)	INTERPERSONAL JUSTICE				
	H) Rater's behavior				
	Supervisor plans carefully	62.31	67.7	5.39	Org-2
	Superior is polite and kind towards me	61	77.63	16.63	Org-2
	Superior treat me with dignity and respect	60.97	67.1	6.13	Org-2
	Superior always gives guidance and rectify my mistakes	63.86	66.88	3.02	Org-2
	Mean value percentage	62.02	69.82		

Table1.1 :Comparative analysis by frequency distribution