

Table 14.4: Forced Choice Block

Regularity on the Job	Most	Least
(a) Always regular	✓	
(b) Informs in advance for absence/delay	✓	
(c) Never regular		✓
(d) Remains absent		✓
(e) Neither regular nor irregular		

Table 14.5: Weighted Checklist

Traits	Weights	Performance Ratings (Scale 1 to 5)
1. Attendance	0.5	
2. Knowledge of the job	1.0	
3. Quantity of work	1.0	
4. Quality of work	1.5	
5. Dependability	1.5	
6. Interpersonal relations	2.0	
7. Organisational loyalty	1.5	
8. Leadership potential	1.5	

Checklist method is a descriptive technique and it provides concrete examples of evaluation. But it is a time-consuming and expensive method as a different checklist must be developed for each job category. *Secondly*, it is difficult to assemble, analyse and weight several statements that properly describe job related behaviour and performance. The statements may be interpreted differently by different rates. The rater may not know which statement contributes most to successful performance. Trained raters are required.

8. Critical Incidents Method. In this method, the supervisor keeps a written record of critical events and how different employees behaved during such events. The rating of an employee depends on his positive/negative behaviours during these events. These critical incidents are identified after thorough study of the job and discussion with the staff. For example, a fire, a sudden breakdown of machinery, a serious accident, etc. may be identified as critical incidents for the working of a factory. Table 14.6 illustrates the behaviour of five workers during machine breakdown.

Table 14.6: Critical Incident Score

Worker	Reaction	Score
A	Informed the supervisor immediately	5
B	Became anxious of loss of output	4
C	Tried to repair the machine	3
D	Complained of poor maintenance	2
E	Was happy to get forced rest	1

Critical incidents method helps to avoid vague impressions and general remarks as the rating is based on actual records of behaviour/performance. The feedback from actual events can be discussed with the employee to allow improvements. The

rater can fully defend his ratings on the basis of his record. But this method suffers from several problems. *First*, it is very time consuming and cumbersome for the superior to maintain a written record for each employee during every major event. *Secondly*, quoting incidents after considerable time lapse may evoke negative emotions from employees. *Thirdly*, subjective judgement of supervisor is involved in deciding critical incidents and 'desirable' response to an event. *Fourthly*, the supervisor may commit errors in recording behaviours of different employees during a short duration event. *Fifthly*, critical incidents occur infrequently and therefore, a continuous record of performance might not be available. *Lastly*, the employees are likely to become concerned with what the supervisor records rather than with daily job routine.

9. Group Appraisal Method. Under this method, a group of evaluators assesses employees. This group consists of the immediate supervisor of the employee, other supervisors having close contact with the employee's work, head of the department and a personnel expert. The group determines the standards of performance for the job, measures actual performance of an employee, analyses the causes of poor performance and offer suggestions for improvements in future. The advantage of this method is that it is simple yet more thorough. Due to multiple evaluators personal bias is minimised. But it is a very time-consuming process.

10. Field Review Method. In this method, a training officer from the human resource department interviews line supervisors to evaluate their respective subordinates. The interviewer prepares in advance the questions to be asked. By answering these questions a supervisor gives his opinions about the level of performance of his subordinate, the subordinate's work progress, his strengths and weaknesses, promotion potential, etc. The evaluator takes detailed notes of the answer which are then approved by the concerned supervisor. These are then placed in the employee's personal service file.

This system relieves the supervisor of the need for filling in appraisal forms. The supervisor's personal bias is reduced due to the active involvement of the human resource officer. The ratings are usually classified into three categories, *i.e.*, outstanding, satisfactory and unsatisfactory. This is, however, a time-consuming method. The success of this method depends upon the competence and sincerity of the interviewer.

The traditional methods given above all focus more on the traits of an employee than on his job performance. In the absence of predecided performance criteria or standards, the personal bias or subjectivity of the evaluator affects the ratings.¹

One study² of appraisal in General Electric Co., USA revealed that the traditional approach to performance appraisal caused the following responses:

- (a) The very nature of the appraisal system led to criticism.
- (b) Criticism exercised a negative impact on goal attainment.