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Abstract
To evaluate an expanded version of Ilgen, Fisher, and Taylor's (1979) model of feedback effectiveness, measures of organizational characteristics, ratee perceptions of the appraisal process, and ratee intentions to change were collected from paying and receiving tellers (n=163) in three banking institutions. Regression analysis indicated that four organizational characteristics: a) openness surrounding the appraisal process, b) frequency of evaluation, c) participation in the performance feedback session, and d) quality of the rater-ratee relationship were significantly related to ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process which, in turn, influenced a) ratee intentions to turnover and b) ratee intentions to file a formal grievance. Overall, the results partially support Ilgen et al.'s model, emphasize the importance of ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process in performance appraisal implementation, and demonstrate the need to include variables such as organizational characteristics, ratee perceptions of the appraisal process, and ratee intentions to change in models of performance appraisal effectiveness.
Organizational Characteristics Affecting Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process and Ratee Intentions to Change

Introduction

In their review article on performance appraisals, Landy and Farr (1980) proposed a model which describes the factors that influence the task of judging performance (see Figure 1). According to this model,

characteristics of the rater and ratee, characteristics of the particular position under consideration, the selection and development of the rating instrument, the rating process, the cognitive operations of the rater, and the characteristics specific to the given organization all combine to influence the accuracy of ratings.

In most instances, the relationships between each of the components of this rating process and performance evaluations have been extensively researched. Yet, as Landy and Farr (1980) note, there is a lack of needed research addressing the impact of organizational characteristics on performance appraisal effectiveness. In response to this call for research as well as others (Dunnette & Borman, 1979; Kane & Lawler, 1979), many recent studies (e.g., Bernardin & Walter, 1977; Ivancevich, 1979; Warmke & Billings, 1979; Bernardin, Orban, & Carlyle, 1981; Zedeck & Cascio, 1982; Liden & Mitchell, 1983; McIntrye, Smith, & Hassett, 1984) have investigated the effects of organizational characteristics on the psychometric characteristics of performance ratings (i.e., halo, leniency, restriction of range, etc.). With three exceptions, research
has tended to neglect the relationship between organizational characteristics and employee perceptions of the appraisal process.

Landy, Barnes, and Murphy (1978) demonstrated that five organizational characteristics: a) the existence of a formal evaluation program; b) performance evaluations at least once per year; c) supervisor's knowledge of evaluatee's performance level; d) evaluatee opportunity to express feelings when evaluated; and e) development of action plans in relation to performance weaknesses were responsible for 29% of the variance in perceptions of performance evaluations. Barr, Brief, and Fulk (1981) cross-validated Landy et al.'s five variable model and found a trimmed three variable model consisting of two of Landy et al.'s variables (supervisor's knowledge of evaluatee's performance level and development of action plans in relation to performance weaknesses) and a measure of trust in the supervisor accounted for 42% of the variance in employees' perceptions of the appraisal process. Similarly, Dipboye and dePontbriand (1981) found that employee perceptions of the appraisal process were a function of the extent to which: a) they were allowed to participate in the feedback session; b) plans and objectives were discussed; and c) they were evaluated on factors relevant to their work.

To summarize, these findings provide preliminary evidence that organizational characteristics affect employee perceptions of the appraisal process. It is surprising that such little effort has been devoted to understanding this relationship. When determining performance appraisal effectiveness, employee perceptions of the appraisal process should be just as important as the accuracy of
ratings. This may be especially true when performance ratings are used for feedback and development. Employees who do not accept their evaluations as fair and are not satisfied with the appraisal process may view their performance evaluations as meaningless and may not use this information to improve upon performance weaknesses.

The notion that acceptance of the performance rating influences a ratee's willingness to improve upon performance weaknesses is central to Ilgen, Fisher and Taylor's (1979) model of feedback effectiveness (see Figure 2). According to Ilgen et al., a recipient's reaction to feedback involves a four-stage process leading to the recipient's actual behavioral response. The first stage, perceptions of the feedback, is concerned with how accurately the recipient perceives the feedback. The second stage, acceptance of the feedback, refers to the recipient's belief that the feedback is an accurate account of his/her performance. It should be noted that in this stage, the true accuracy of the feedback may have no bearing on whether the recipient believes the feedback is accurate. The third stage, desire to respond to the feedback, refers to the recipient's willingness to improve performance in the areas where negative feedback was received and maintain performance in areas where positive feedback was received. The final stage, intended response, refers to the goals or targets set by the recipient to improve performance weaknesses and maintain performance strengths. The outcome of this four-stage process is a behavioral response by the recipient,
which leads to future increases or decreases in performance.

Thus, according to Ilgen et al. (1979), the ratee must accurately perceive his/her performance rating, accept his/her rating as accurate, be willing to improve performance in areas rated unfavorably and maintain performance in areas rated favorably, and set goals to improve performance weaknesses and maintain performance strengths if the appraisal process is to have a positive effect on a ratee's future work behavior.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of the present study was to expand and test Ilgen et al.'s (1979) feedback model. Part 1 of this research delineated a framework of organizational characteristics which may affect employee perceptions of the appraisal system. This framework expanded Ilgen et al.'s (1979) model to include the influence that organizational characteristics have on feedback acceptance. The proposed framework was empirically examined and revised based on the findings. Part 2 of this research investigated how ratee perceptions of the appraisal process influence their intentions to change. This portion of the research provided a direct test of the link between feedback acceptance and the desire to respond to feedback in Ilgen et al.'s (1979) feedback model. Once again, a set of hypotheses were proposed, tested, and revised based on the evidence.

Figure 3 presents the expanded version of Ilgen et al.'s (1979) feedback effectiveness model tested in the present study.
Part 1: A Framework of Organizational Characteristics Affecting Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process

Figure 4 presents the proposed organizational characteristics which are hypothesized to influence ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. This framework was developed based upon an extensive review of the performance appraisal literature. Yet, it should be emphasized that the framework presented here is not inclusive. It was an initial attempt to view the performance appraisal area in systematic terms, with an emphasis on revising the framework based on the empirical evidence.

Definitions of Categories

The organizational characteristics were grouped into four main categories: Structural Characteristics, Policy and Procedural Characteristics, Task Characteristics, and Social Characteristics. The present study defined these four categories as follows:

1. **Structural Characteristics**: "Structure is concerned with the ways in which the tasks of an organization are divided (differentiation) and with the coordination of these activities (integration)" (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1979, p. 20).

2. **Policy and Procedural Characteristics**: [Policies and procedures are] "the planned and formalized policies, procedures, and controls that guide the activities and relationships of people in the organization (administrative system)" (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1979, p. 198).
3. **Task Characteristics:** "... organizational technologies and tasks . . refer to what is done on the object transformed" (Miles, 1980, p. 51-52). In other words, task characteristics are properties of the work itself.

4. **Social Characteristics:** [Social characteristics are]" ... composed of individuals and groups in interaction. It consists of individual behavior and motivation, status, and role relationships, group dynamics, and influence systems. It is also affected by sentiments, values, attitudes, expectations, and aspirations of the people in the organization" (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1979, p. 110).

The present study identified ten organizational characteristics that would appear to be related to ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. Each of these organizational characteristics was defined in terms of its placement under one of the four categories.

**Structural Characteristics**

This category includes two organizational characteristics: span of control and role ambiguity and role conflict.

1. **Span of Control.** According to Miles (1980), configuration is one of the most frequently cited structural dimensions. By definition, configuration " ... refers to the shape of the organization structure caused by the location of formal roles and units in organizational space" (Miles, 1980, p. 24). One typical configuration measure is span of control or the number of subordinates reporting to a superior (Miles, 1980).

2. **Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict.** Another frequently cited structural dimension is formalization (Miles, 1980).
Formalization is defined as "... the extent to which expectations regarding work means and ends are explicit. The clearer, more detailed, and more unequivocal the specifications are for the performance of individual roles and unit tasks, the greater the formality of structure" (Miles, 1980, p. 23). Therefore, high formalization decreases the chance that the role incumbent will experience role ambiguity and role conflict. Role ambiguity is an individual's lack of understanding about the rights, privileges, and obligations of a job while role conflict refers to the simultaneous occurrence of two or more role requirements for which the performance of one precludes the performance of the other (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1982).

Policy and Procedural Characteristics

This category includes four organizational characteristics: rater training, secrecy surrounding the appraisal process, frequency of evaluation, and participation in the performance feedback session.

1. **Rater Training.** Because of its relationship to the reward system, the performance appraisal process is typically a clearly defined and well-specified organizational practice (Miles, 1980). Often, upper-level management mandates a policy of rater training. Rater training is a program whereby the individuals who evaluate other employees learn how to appraise these employees' performance more accurately.

2. **Secrecy Surrounding the Appraisal Process.** When an organization has a policy of secrecy about pay rates, the performance appraisal process is typically kept concealed. Employees are unaware of how their organization conducts performance appraisals. For example, employees might not know there exists a procedure for contesting an "unfair
evaluation". In contrast, when there is a policy of openness about the appraisal process, employees are knowledgeable about the entire system. Each employee is knowledgeable about who will conduct the evaluation, the purpose of the appraisal, the type of rating scale that will be used, and the performance dimensions he/she will be evaluated on (Lawler, 1981).

3. **Frequency of Evaluation.** Organizations often differ in their policies of how often evaluations are conducted. Some organizations evaluate employees after completion of a project while others evaluate employees at a specific time each year. According to Bernardin and Beatty (1984), most organizations have a policy of evaluating employees every 6 to 12 months.

4. **Participation in the Performance Feedback Session.** Organizations also differ in the degree to which ratees are given an opportunity to participate in the feedback session. When employee participation is an integral part of the appraisal process policy, ratees are given an opportunity to express their "side" and are asked for their input into setting plans, objectives, and goals. On the other hand, in some organizations, participation is not considered an essential feature of the appraisal process and employees are not given an opportunity to participate in the feedback session. In essence, the rater provides all of the feedback.

**Task Characteristics**

This category includes two organizational characteristics: task identity and task interdependence.
1. **Task Identity.** An individual's job or task can vary along a number of dimensions. One dimension that seems especially relevant to the appraisal process is task identity. Task identity is the degree to which a job requires completion of a "whole" and identifiable piece of work (Hackman & Oldham, 1980).

2. **Task Interdependence.** An individual's job or task can also vary along the dimension of task interdependence. Task interdependence is the degree to which an individual is dependent on other employees to complete his/her job (Liden & Mitchell, 1983).

**Social Characteristics**

This category includes two organizational characteristics: the organizational climate dimension of trust in the appraisal system and quality of the rater-ratee relationship.

1. **Organizational Climate-An Individual's Trust in the Appraisal System.** Organizational climate is defined as a set of properties of the internal work environment, perceived by employees who work in this environment, and is assumed to be a major force in influencing their behavior on the job (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1973). One important feature of an organization's climate is the degree to which there is trust in the appraisal process. Trust in the appraisal system can be defined as the probability that the appraisal system will produce appropriate outcomes for an individual even if no influence is exerted on the system (Driscoll, 1978).

2. **Quality of the Rater-Ratee Relationship.** Relationships are clearly another aspect of the social structure of an organization. One particular relationship, that of the rater and ratee, is of specific interest when conducting performance appraisals since the quality of
this relationship is hypothesized to be an important determinant of an effective appraisal system.

Hypotheses

Structural Characteristics

Span of Control

Span of control refers to the number of subordinates who report to a single supervisor. When a supervisor (rater) has a narrow span of control, he/she has more time to devote to the evaluation process and more opportunities to observe each subordinate's performance. This situation should increase the supervisor's knowledge of the ratee's level of performance. Thus, ratees should feel that their supervisors have sufficient information to make fair ratings.

When a supervisor manages a large number of subordinates, on the other hand, he/she is unable to spend the needed time observing each subordinate, which should limit the rater's knowledge of the subordinate's work performance. Ratees in this situation probably feel that the ratings made by their supervisors are based on inadequate data.

Based upon the above rationale, ratees who work under a supervisor with a narrow span of control should have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who work under a supervisor with a large span of control.

Hypothesis 1: Ratees who work under a narrow span of control will have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who work under a supervisor with a large span of control.

Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict

The degree of role ambiguity and role conflict experienced by the
ratee may also affect ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. Role ambiguity is "uncertainty about what the occupant of a particular role is supposed to do" while role conflict is the "simultaneous occurrence of two or more role expectations such that compliance with one makes compliance with the other more difficult" (Cascio, 1982, p. 366).

According to role theory (Katz & Kahn, 1966), role ambiguity and role conflict increase the probability that the role incumbent will be dissatisfied with his/her role, perform less effectively, experience anxiety, and have a high propensity to leave the organization (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970). These predictions have been strongly supported by House and Rizzo (1972).

Both role ambiguity and role conflict may also adversely affect ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. When ratees experience role ambiguity, they lack essential information about their job requirements and the extent to which they are met. In this situation, ratees should experience negative feelings about the appraisal process since they are unaware of the important job-relevant behaviors to perform. Likewise, when individuals experience role conflict, they must decide which of the conflicting directives to act upon, disregarding the other. Ratees in this situation should also experience unfavorable perceptions of the appraisal process since they will likely receive lower ratings than they actually deserve if the rater feels they have chosen the "wrong" directive.

When individuals experience low role ambiguity and low role conflict on the other hand, they are certain of their job requirements and have few conflicting expectations. This situation is hypothesized to produce favorable perceptions of the appraisal process since ratees
should know the important job dimensions they will be evaluated on.

Hypothesis 2: Ratees who experience low role ambiguity and/or low role conflict will have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who experience high role ambiguity and/or high role conflict.

**Policy and Procedural Characteristics**

**Rater Training**

The preponderance of research concerning rater training has examined the effects of training on rating quality. While rater training does not appear to increase the accuracy and validity of ratings (Bernardin & Walter, 1977; Ivancevich, 1979; Warmke & Billings, 1979), it may have a positive effect on ratee reactions to the evaluation process. Although there is no research to support this hypothesis, ratees who perceive management as committed to making the entire appraisal process as fair and accurate as possible should indicate favorable perceptions regarding the appraisal process. Management may be able to accomplish this goal by implementing a rater training program. Thus, ratees who are evaluated by raters who complete rater training should have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who are evaluated by raters who do not complete rater training.

Hypothesis 3: Ratees who are evaluated by raters who complete rater training will have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who are evaluated by raters who do not complete rater training.

**Secrecy Surrounding the Appraisal Process**

The effects of secrecy on ratee perceptions regarding the appraisal
process are not known. Yet, it has been suggested that the quality of working life, organizational effectiveness, and employee satisfaction would increase if organizations developed a policy of openness about the appraisal process (Steele, 1975).

When there is a policy of openness regarding the appraisal process, employees are knowledgeable about how their organization conducts performance appraisals. Each individual is aware of the type of rating scale that will be used, the performance dimensions he/she will be evaluated on, how frequently he/she will be evaluated, who will conduct the evaluation, the purpose of the appraisal, the procedure for contesting an "unfair" evaluation, and the format of his/her performance feedback session. This type of performance appraisal information eliminates surprises, misunderstandings, and misconceptions concerning the appraisal process. Therefore, ratee perceptions regarding the appraisal process should be more favorable when a policy of openness regarding the appraisal process exists.

Hypothesis 4: Ratees who are in organizations where there is a policy of openness regarding the appraisal process will have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who are in organizations where there is a policy of secrecy regarding the appraisal process.

Frequency of Evaluation

Researchers have repeatedly alluded to the importance of frequent evaluations. Bernardin and Beatty (1984) state:

The consensus seems to be that feedback interviews [or evaluations] should be held more frequently than is typically done (which is every 6 or 12 months). As we have already noted, the latter procedure is certainly contrary to the principles of good feedback. (p. 278).
Yet, there has been little empirical investigation of employee reactions to frequency of evaluations. Frequent evaluations should benefit the ratee in a number of ways. First, the ratee is provided constant feedback about his/her performance. Second, the ratee knows where he/she stands with the rater at all times. Third, the ratee and rater are able to circumvent possible misunderstandings and misconceptions about the appraisal process. Due to these factors, ratees who are frequently evaluated should have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who are evaluated infrequently.

Hypothesis 5: Ratees who are frequently evaluated will have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who are evaluated infrequently.

Participation in the Performance Feedback Session

Participation in the performance feedback session is another organizational characteristic which appears to affect ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. Nemeroff and Wexley (1979) found an invitation to participate in the feedback session was a major correlate of how satisfied subordinates were with the feedback session. In addition, Landy et al. (1978) found two variables, evaluatee opportunity to express feelings when evaluated and development of action plans in relation to performance weaknesses, to be important correlates of favorable perceptions of performance evaluations. Moreover, as cited earlier, Dipboye and dePontbriand (1981) found that the extent to which ratees were allowed to participate in the feedback session and the degree to which plans and objectives were discussed were important correlates of positive reactions to the appraisal process. Together,
these findings suggest that ratees who have an opportunity to participate in the feedback session should have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who do not have an opportunity to participate in the feedback session.

Hypothesis 6: Ratees who have an opportunity to participate in the feedback session will have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who do not have an opportunity to participate in the feedback session.

Task Characteristics

Task Identity

According to Hackman and Oldham's (1980) Job Characteristics Model, jobs possessing the five job characteristics of skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback increase intrinsic work motivation. These five characteristics should also affect ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. One of these characteristics, task identity, should make rating easier for the evaluator since employees in high task identity jobs are responsible for a whole piece of work. When a ratee possesses a job high in task identity, he/she is completing a job from beginning to end, with a visible outcome. This job characteristic makes the ratee's performance easily identifiable and should increase the chances that his/her work performance will be accurately assessed. Thus, ratees possessing jobs high in task identity should have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees occupying jobs low in task identity. Consistent with this prediction, Mohrman & Lawler (as cited in Lawler, 1981) found that reactions to the performance appraisal process were positive in high task identity jobs.
Hypothesis 7: Ratees occupying jobs high in task identity will have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees occupying jobs low in task identity.

Task Interdependence

Task interdependence or the extent to which group members work together appears to influence performance evaluations. Liden and Mitchell (1983) found that in high interdependent groups, poor performers were rated higher and good performers were rated lower than in low interdependent groups. This finding suggests that raters view all members of an interdependent group responsible for the group outcome. Moreover, it suggests that rater evaluations are not made in isolation but are often influenced by work group characteristics.

Although the relationship between task interdependence and ratee perceptions of the appraisal process has not been examined, most individuals would probably not have favorable perceptions of the appraisal process if their evaluations were based on the performance of the entire group instead of their own performance. Therefore, ratees in jobs characterized by low task interdependence should have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees in jobs which are characterized by high task interdependence.

Hypothesis 8: Ratees in jobs which are characterized by low task interdependence will have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees in jobs which are characterized by high task interdependence.
Social Characteristics
Organizational Climate-An Individual's Trust in the Appraisal System

Taguiri (1968) defines organizational climate as a "relatively enduring quality of the internal work environment of the organization: that a) is experienced by its members; b) influences their behavior; and c) can be described in terms of values of a particular set of characteristics (p. 27). This definition implies that climate is a set of properties of the work environment that employees react to on the job. It is a major force in influencing job behavior.

One important aspect of organizational climate is trust. Trust, in this instance, refers to the "probability that the decision-making system will produce preferred outcomes for an individual or group, even if no influence is exerted on the system" (Driscoll, 1978, p. 44). Thus, trust is viewed as an organizational variable reflecting a member's assessment of a particular decision-making system rather than a personality trait of trusting other people in general (Driscoll, 1978).

In a study of organizational decision-making, Driscoll (1978) found individuals with high trust were more satisfied with the organization than low trust individuals. Moreover, trust was the only significantly useful predictor of overall satisfaction.

Trust in the appraisal process is one organizational climate variable that may be related to appraisal process ratings. Consistent with this hypothesis, Bernardin, Orban, and Carlyle (1981) found trust in the appraisal process influenced raters' evaluations of their subordinates. Raters who indicated a low level of trust in the appraisal process rated subordinates more leniently than raters who indicated a high level of trust in the appraisal system.
While there has been no empirical research looking at the effect of trust in the appraisal process on ratee perceptions of the appraisal process, it would appear that ratees who have high trust in the appraisal process should have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who have low trust in the appraisal process.

Hypothesis 9: Ratees who have high trust in the appraisal process will have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees who have low trust in the appraisal process.

Quality of the Rater-Ratee Relationship

Several beneficial outcomes typically result when ratees have a supportive working relationship with their supervisor/rater. First, ratees probably feel their supervisor understands their problems and needs and recognizes their potential. Second, ratees probably know where they stand with their supervisor. Third, ratees can usually count on their supervisor to help solve work problems. These outcomes should contribute to favorable perceptions of the appraisal process. Therefore, ratees who are involved in a supportive rater-ratee relationship should have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal system than ratees involved in a non-supportive rater-ratee relationship. This prediction is substantiated by Nemeroff and Wexley's (1979) finding that subordinates were more satisfied with the appraisal process when their manager was helpful and supportive than when their manager lacked these qualities. Moreover, as previously mentioned, Barr et al. (1981) found that a measure of the quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship explained a large proportion of the variance in employee perceptions of the appraisal process.
Hypothesis 10: Ratees who are involved in a supportive rater-ratee relationship will have more favorable perceptions of the appraisal process than ratees involved in a non-supportive rater-ratee relationship.

Part 2: The Relationship Between Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process and Ratee Intentions to Change

Although performance appraisal research has yet to determine the importance of ratee perceptions (ratee acceptance of feedback) in the feedback process, problem-solving research has produced results which emphasize its importance. These studies (e.g., Gorman & Tweney, 1984; Kern, 1982) have repeatedly found that when subjects are aware that the feedback they receive contains errors (i.e., subjects were told that in 20% of the trials, there might be instrument malfunction), they are extremely hesitant to revise their initial hypotheses about the given task. In essence, these subjects maintained their initial hypotheses by totally ignoring feedback which they thought might contain inaccuracies.

Ilgen et al.'s (1979) feedback effectiveness model makes similar predictions about individuals' responses to feedback. As previously noted, Ilgen et al. predict that feedback acceptance leads to a willingness to respond to feedback in a manner congruent with the feedback. In other words, in a performance appraisal feedback session, Ilgen et al. suggest that most individuals are willing to try to improve in areas rated negatively if they perceive the feedback as accurate. On the other hand, most individuals are not willing to try to improve performance in areas rated negatively if they think their evaluation is an inaccurate account of their performance. In such a situation, most individuals would probably totally disregard or discount their evalua-
tion. Therefore, ratees who have favorable perceptions of the appraisal process should be more willing to improve upon performance weaknesses than ratees who have unfavorable perceptions of the appraisal process. This prediction is stated below.

Hypothesis 11: Ratees who have favorable perceptions of the appraisal process will have higher intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses than ratees who have unfavorable perceptions of the appraisal process.

Ratee Intentions to Turnover

According to Fishbein and Ajzen's theory of reasoned action (1975), the best predictor of an individual's overt behavior is his/her intentions to perform (or not to perform) the behavior. Behavioral intentions have been used to predict and understand a variety of behaviors. For example, an employee's intention to stay or leave is considered the most direct and immediate precursor to actually quitting the job in several theoretical turnover models (March & Simon, 1958; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Price & Mueller, 1981; Steers & Mowday, 1981) which have received considerable support (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978; Miller, Katerberg, & Hulin, 1979; Price & Mueller, 1981; Youngblood, Mobley & Meglino, 1983). Moreover, behavioral intentions were found to be more predictive of turnover than overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with the work itself, or organizational commitment in a meta-analysis of the intention-turnover research (Steel & Ovalle, 1984).

Ratee turnover intentions may also be influenced by ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. When a ratee has favorable
perceptions of the appraisal process, he/she feels that high performers receive high ratings and low performers receive low ratings. This situation should give the ratee a sense of control over his/her evaluation and a sense of control over possible rewards (e.g., pay, promotions, benefits, etc.). When a ratee has unfavorable perceptions of the appraisal process, on the other hand, he/she feels that there is not a positive relationship between performance and ratings. This situation should decrease the ratee's sense of control over possible rewards and may even result in the ratee searching for another job setting which gives him/her a sense of control over these important factors. Therefore, ratees who have favorable perceptions of the appraisal process (perceive appraisals as fair and accurate) should be less willing to quit their jobs than ratees who have unfavorable perceptions of the appraisal process (perceive appraisals as unfair and inaccurate).

Hypothesis 12: Ratees who have favorable perceptions of the appraisal process will have lower intentions to quit their jobs than ratees who have unfavorable perceptions of the appraisal process.

Ratee Intentions to File a Formal Grievance

There has not been any research addressing the relationship between ratee perceptions of the appraisal process and ratee intentions to file a formal grievance. It would appear, however, that individuals who perceive their evaluations as unfair and inaccurate should be more willing to file a formal grievance than ratees who perceive their evaluations as fair and accurate. This prediction is stated below.
Hypothesis 13: Ratees who have favorable perceptions of the appraisal process will have lower intentions to file a formal grievance than ratees who have unfavorable perceptions of the appraisal process.

Summary

In summary, the primary objective of this study was to extend and evaluate Ilgen et al.'s (1979) feedback model. Part 1 of this research tested the influence that organizational characteristics have on ratee perceptions of the appraisal process while Part 2 of this research investigated the link between ratee perceptions of the appraisal process and ratee responses to feedback. Figure 5 presents the expanded model of feedback effectiveness which will be evaluated in the study.
Method

Subjects

The sample consisted of 163 paying and receiving tellers from three banking institutions located in the southeast (n=96, n=48, n=19, respectively). Included in the sample were 145 females and 17 males. Of the tellers, 62% were married, 6% were divorced, 5% were separated, 1% were widowed, and 26% were single, never married. The average age of the tellers was 29 years and the average length of employment as a bank teller was four years. The educational level of the bank tellers ranged from "completed some high school" to completed some graduate school. Of the tellers, 4% completed some high school, 37% completed high school, 53% completed some college, 4% completed college and 2% completed some graduate school. Their last appraisal was on the average three months ago. These sample characteristics are presented in Table 1, broken down by bank.

Procedure

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from each bank's Vice-President of Human Resources. Data were collected on company time, with the questionnaires distributed to the tellers by branch managers. Each branch manager was briefed by the author about the purpose of the study.

The questionnaire was identified as part of a university research project concerning employee perceptions of the appraisal process. Confidentiality was assured by asking the participants to refrain from putting their names on the survey and returning their questionnaires directly to the investigator.
Of the 238 questionnaires distributed, 179 were returned, which represents a 75.2% response rate. Thirteen questionnaires were eliminated from the sample because of missing data and three questionnaires were eliminated because the respondents had yet to be evaluated as tellers. This resulted in a final sample of 163.

**Instrument**

The instrument consisted of five sections: the cover letter, demographic information, measures of organizational characteristics, a measure of ratee perceptions of the appraisal process, and measures of ratee intentions to change.

**Cover Letter**

The cover letter explained the purpose of the study, assured anonymity, and asked that the questionnaire be mailed directly to the researchers at the university (see Appendix A).

**Demographic Information**

Demographic information included questions concerning the respondent's sex, age, marital status, length of employment in current occupation, length of service with company, educational level, and the date of last appraisal (see Appendix B).

**Perceptual Measures of Organizational Characteristics** (see Appendix C).

**Span of Control.** This characteristic was assessed using Kerr and Jermier's (1978) 3-item Spatial Distance Between Superior and Subordinates Subscale of the Substitutes for Leadership Questionnaire. Kerr and Jermier report reliability coefficients (coefficient alpha) of .85 and .82 in samples of university police and city police, respectively. In addition, one item which taps ratee perceptions of their supervisors's span of control ("My immediate supervisor/rater
supervises a large number of employees") was added.

Role ambiguity and role conflict. Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman's (1970) 6-item Role Ambiguity Scale and 8-item Role Conflict Scale were used to measure these two organizational characteristics. Both scales have shown acceptable levels of internal reliability. For example, Szilagyi, Sims, and Keller (1976) present Spearman-Brown internal reliability coefficients of .76 and .90 for Role Ambiguity and .90 and .94 for Role Conflict in two different samples.

Secrecy surrounding the appraisal process. Eight items were used to measure the extent to which ratees are aware of how their organization conducts performance appraisals. Items asked, for example, if the respondent is aware of when he/she will be evaluated and the type of rating scale that will be used.

Participation in the performance feedback session. Seven items were used to measure the extent to which employees participate in the feedback session. This measure was composite of items from Landy et al. (1978) and Dipboye and dePontbriand (1981).

Task identity. The 3-item Task Identity Subscale of the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) was used to measure this organizational characteristic. The internal reliability of this scale has been confirmed as acceptable in a number of studies. Dunham (1976) reports an alpha coefficient of .72 for Task Identity.

Task interdependence. The 2-item Task Interdependence Subscale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979) was used to tap this organizational characteristic. To date, no reliability values have been published.
Organizational climate—An individual's trust in the appraisal system. This organizational characteristic was assessed using Bernardin's (1978) fifteen-item Trust in the Appraisal Process Survey (TAPS). TAPS is an organizational climate measure which assesses the level of trust individuals have in their organizations' appraisal process. In addition, eight items which assess other aspects of climate not included in TAPS were used. Reliability data has yet to be reported on the TAPS.

Quality of the rater-ratee relationship. Dansereau, Graen and Haga's (1975) 7-item Leader-Member Exchange Scale was used to measure the quality of the superior-subordinate relationship. This scale measures such things as subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which their superior understands their problems and recognizes their potential. Dansereau et al. report a coefficient alpha of .65 for this scale in a sample of computer processors.

Objective Measures of Organizational Characteristics (see Appendix D).

Span of control. An objective measure of span of control was obtained with one item which asks for the actual number of subordinates the ratee's supervisor managers. Since this item was highly correlated with the perceptual measure of span of control, all items were summed to form a single measure.

Rater training. One item which asks if the respondent's supervisor/rater completes a rater training course was used to assess this organizational characteristic.

Frequency of evaluation. This organizational characteristic was measured using one item which asks for the actual number of times the ratee's performance is evaluated.
Measure of Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process (see Appendix E).

Twelve items were used to measure ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. These items were similar to those used by Landy et al. (1978) and Dipboye and dePontbriand (1981).

Measures of Ratee Intentions to Change (see Appendix F).

Ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses. A procedure similar to Fishbein and Ajzen's (1981) was used to obtain a measure of ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses. First, each of the bank's performance appraisals was reviewed to find out the performance criteria used to evaluate tellers. This review revealed that all three banks evaluated their tellers using similar global performance criteria (e.g., job knowledge and skills, judgment and decision-making, quality and quantity of work, human relations, communication skills, and availability of work). Second, several bank personnel were interviewed to determine how these global job dimensions were specifically defined. A content analysis of these responses led to the identification of fourteen items which assessed ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses. Items asked, for example, if the respondent intends to be more courteous to bank customers or intends to improve his/her working rapport with bank employees during the next six months.

Ratee intentions to turnover. The two-item Intention to Turnover Subscale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979) and four items which measured the degree to which the ratee felt like coming to work after his/her evaluation were used to assess intention to turnover. Cammann et al. cite an alpha coefficient of .83 for the turnover intention subscale.
Ratee intentions to file a formal grievance. This intention was assessed with one item asking "After my evaluation, I feel like filing a formal grievance with my company".

**Design**

Part 1 of the present study examined the relationship between organizational characteristics and ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. Part 2 of this research investigated the relationship between ratee perceptions of the appraisal process and ratee intentions to change. For Part 1, the independent variables were the organizational characteristics and the dependent variable was ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. For Part 2, ratee perceptions of the appraisal process were used to predict ratee intentions to change (i.e., ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses; ratee intentions to turnover; and ratee intentions to file a formal grievance).
Results

Reliability of the Measures

The internal consistency of the organizational characteristics measures, ratee perceptions of the appraisal process measure, and ratee intentions to change measures were determined using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. These reliabilities are presented in Table 2 along with the mean and standard deviation of each measure. With the exception of the task identity subscale of the JDS and the task interdependence subscale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire, all measures exhibited acceptable reliabilities. The relatively low reliabilities of these measures will attenuate their relationship with the dependent measures.

Interrelationships Between Classes of Variables

To determine if there were significant interrelationships between classes of variables or a problem with multi-collinearity, correlations among organizational characteristics and among ratee intentions to change were calculated. These correlations are reported in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. Disregarding the sign of each correlation, the average correlation in Table 3 was .21 and the highest intercorrelation was .58. For Table 4, the average correlation was .28 and the highest intercorrelation was also .58. Since the average intercorrelation among the variables was relatively low and two variables shared no more than 34% of the variance, it was concluded that each of the measures has a substantial portion of unshared variance, and thus, multi-collinearity is not a problem (Lewis-Beck, 1980).
Test of the Relationship Between Organizational Characteristics and Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test hypotheses predicting a relationship between organizational characteristics and ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. In this analysis, ratee perceptions of the appraisal process were regressed upon vectors representing the organizational characteristics. The $b$-weight of each predictor was then tested with a $t$-test.

The results of the multiple regression analysis appear in Table 5. As can be seen, the quality of the rater-ratee relationship, the degree of participation in the feedback session, the secrecy surrounding the appraisal process, and the frequency of evaluations were all significantly related to ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. Specifically, as predicted in hypothesis 4, ratees who perceived their organization to have a policy of openness regarding the appraisal process were more satisfied with the appraisal process than ratees who perceived their organization to have a policy of secrecy regarding the appraisal process. In addition, consistent with hypothesis 5, ratees who were frequently evaluated were more satisfied with the appraisal process than ratees who were evaluated infrequently. Furthermore, as predicted in hypothesis 6, ratees who felt that they had an opportunity to participate in the feedback session were more satisfied with the appraisal process than were ratees who felt that they did not have an opportunity to participate in the feedback session. Finally, consistent with hypothesis 10, ratees who perceived themselves to be involved in a supportive rater-ratee relationship were more satisfied with the appraisal process than ratees who perceived themselves to be involved.
in a non-supportive rater-ratee relationship.

A step-wise multiple regression analysis was then conducted to determine the relative importance of the different organizational characteristics in the regression equation. The results of this analysis appear in Table 6. As can be seen, the best one variable model was the quality of the rater-ratee relationship ($R^2 = .387$). The best two variable model was participation in the performance feedback session and quality of the rater-ratee relationship ($R^2 = .455$). The best three variable model was secrecy surrounding the appraisal process, participation in the performance feedback session, and quality of the rater-ratee relationship ($R^2 = .475$) and the best four variable model was frequency of evaluation, secrecy surrounding the appraisal process, participation in the performance feedback session, and quality of the rater-ratee relationship ($R^2 = .490$).

**Test of the Relationship Between Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process and Ratee Intentions to Change**

The Part 2 hypotheses predicted that ratee perceptions of the appraisal process influence a) ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses; b) ratee intentions to turnover; and c) ratee intentions to file a formal grievance. These hypotheses were tested by correlational analysis and the results appear in Table 7.

As can be seen in Table 7, hypothesis 11 was not supported. Ratees who were more satisfied with the appraisal process were not more willing to improve upon performance weaknesses than were ratees who were dissatisfied with the appraisal process. However, as predicted in hypothesis 12, a moderately negative correlation ($r = -.47, p = .0001$) was found between ratee perceptions of the appraisal process and ratee
intentions to turnover. Ratees who were satisfied with the appraisal process indicated that they were less likely to quit their jobs than ratees who were dissatisfied with the appraisal process. Finally, hypothesis 13 was also supported ($r = -.67$, $p < .0001$). Ratees who were satisfied with the appraisal process were less likely to file a formal grievance than ratees who were dissatisfied with the appraisal process.

**Summary Analyses: Hierarchical Regression Analyses**

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted on the revised model (see Figure 6) in an attempt to clarify the causal ordering of the variables. This model assumed that organizational characteristics influence ratee perceptions of the appraisal process, which, in turn, influence ratee intentions to change. Thus, ratee intentions to change should be predicted entirely by ratee perceptions of the appraisal process (i.e., organizational characteristics should not have a direct effect on ratee intentions to change).

The results of the hierarchical regression analyses are presented in Table 8 and appear to support the causal ordering of the variables. As can be seen, ratee intentions to file a formal grievance were predicted solely by ratee perceptions of the appraisal process; adding organizational characteristics did not significantly increase $R^2$. Thus, organizational characteristics directly influenced ratee perceptions of the appraisal process which, in turn, affected ratee intentions to file a formal grievance. Contrary to expectations, however, organizational characteristics added to the prediction of ratee
intentions to turnover above and beyond ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. Thus, while organizational characteristics influenced ratee perceptions of the appraisal process, which, in turn, influenced ratee turnover intentions, organizational characteristics also directly affected ratee turnover intentions. Figure 7 presents the
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revised model of organizational characteristics affecting ratee perceptions of the appraisal process and ratee intentions to change.

Differences Among Banking Institutions

To determine if the three banking institutions were significantly different from each other, the data were analyzed with a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The results of the MANOVA (F 30, 140 = 2.02, p < .01) revealed that the three banking institutions differed on the measures in the present study. Univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were then conducted to further examine the significant MANOVA effects. Table 9 presents the results of the ANOVAs. These analyses indicated that the banks were significantly different from each other with respect to span of control, rater training, frequency of evaluations, and participation in the performance feedback session.

The above analyses suggest that the findings of the present study could be spurious, i.e., the results could have been produced because the banking institutions were correlated with organizational characteristics (predictors) and ratee perceptions of the appraisal process (criterion). For example, if one of the banks was higher than the other two banks on both the predictors and criterion, then a
significant relationship would have been produced solely by differences between banking institutions. In order to eliminate such a possibility, a multiple regression analysis which controlled for bank differences was conducted. Ratee perceptions of the appraisal process were regressed upon vectors representing the organizational characteristics after the variance due to banking institutions was removed. The $b$-weight of each predictor was then tested with a $t$-test. As indicated in Table 10, the overall model was significant after the variance in predictors and criterion associated with banking institutions was removed. This finding suggests that the results of this study were not a function of bank differences.

The Effects of Perceived Level of Past Performance

The present study suggests that ratee perceptions of the appraisal process can be best understood in terms of organizational characteristics. Although this explanation appears plausible, a more parsimonious explanation is that ratees who receive high ratings are more likely to perceive their evaluations to be fair and accurate than ratees who receive low ratings. In order to eliminate such a possibility, a multiple regression analysis was conducted which controlled for perceived level of past performance. Ratee perceptions of the appraisal process were regressed upon vectors representing the organizational characteristics after the variance due to perceived level of past performance was removed. The $b$-weight of each predictor was then tested with a $t$-test. The results of this regression appear in Table 11. As indicated in Table 11, the overall model was significant after the variance due to perceived level of past performance was removed from both predictors and criterion. This finding suggests that
ratee perceptions of the appraisal process were not merely a function of perceived level of past performance and that the organizational characteristics affect ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process independent of past performance.
Discussion

Findings of Part 1

The findings of the present study demonstrate that organizational characteristics are significantly related to ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process. Ratees were more satisfied with the appraisal process when they a) perceived their organization to have a policy of openness regarding the appraisal process, b) were evaluated frequently, c) felt that they had an opportunity to participate in the performance feedback session and d) had a supportive working relationship with their supervisor.

The above organizational characteristics may have affected ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process by influencing communication between rater and ratee. Quality of the rater-ratee relationship, participation in the performance feedback session, frequency of evaluation, and openness regarding the appraisal process all facilitate communication between rater and ratee and increase the flow of information about the appraisal process. In other words, these organizational characteristics may affect satisfaction with the appraisal process by clarifying and defining effective performance for the ratee. Moreover, when effective performance is ill-defined in an organization, these organizational characteristics may be acting as substitutes for good measures of performance. In contrast, these organizational characteristics may exert less influence on ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process when performance is objectively defined in an organization.

Several of the organizational characteristics (i.e., span of control, role ambiguity, role conflict, rater training, task identity, task interdependence, and organizational trust) did not affect ratee
satisfaction with the appraisal process. In each case, these variables exert little influence on communication between rater and ratee. Thus, organizational characteristics which do not influence communication patterns or provide ratees with information which clarifies effective performance appear to be unrelated to ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process.

Several methodological problems may have also been responsible for the null results. For example, the reliability of the task identity (.46) and task interdependence (.57) measures were unacceptable. Therefore, one possible explanation for the unsupported predictions of task identity and task interdependence is that the relationship between these organizational characteristics and ratee perceptions of the appraisal process were attenuated due to their low reliabilities. In order to examine this possibility, the correlation between task identity, task interdependence, and ratee perceptions of the appraisal process were calculated after both organizational characteristic measures were corrected for unreliability. This procedure revealed that even with perfectly reliable measures of task identity and task interdependence, there would be no relationship between these two organizational characteristics and ratee perceptions of the appraisal process (r=-.01 and r=.02, respectively). Thus, task identity and task interdependence do not affect ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process in the present study.

Another methodological problem which may have produced the null results is the lack of construct validity for the organizational trust measure. As was noted in the method, past research has not determined whether the organizational trust measure does in fact assess a ratee's
trust in the organization. Thus, while organizational trust was not correlated with ratee perceptions of the appraisal process in the present study, the construct of organizational trust may still be related to ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process.

The distribution of the span of control and role ambiguity measures may have also restricted the relationship between these organizational characteristics and ratee perceptions of the appraisal process. Applying Tabachnick and Fidell's (1983) significance test of skewness, span of control and role ambiguity were significantly negatively skewed. Leptokurtosis was also a problem with the span of control measure (Kendall & Stuart, 1977). Thus, the restricted variance of span of control and role ambiguity in the present study may have accounted for the failure of these variables to correlate with ratee perceptions of the appraisal process.

Findings of Part 2

Part 2 of the present study found that ratee perceptions of the appraisal process were significantly related to ratee intentions to change. Ratees who were dissatisfied with the appraisal process had a higher intention to file a formal grievance and to quit their jobs than ratees who were satisfied with the appraisal process. Thus, since intentions are the best predictors of behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), it appears as if there is a direct link between ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process and employee turnover and grievance rates.

The only prediction not supported in Part 2 of the study was the hypothesized relationship between ratee perceptions of the appraisal process and ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses. One possible explanation for this unsupported hypothesis relates to the
validity of the intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses measure. As was noted in the method, this measure was constructed according to the procedure of Fishbein and his colleagues (1975). The global performance criteria used to evaluate tellers were identified and translated into specific, performance based intention questions. For example, the global dimension of "Job Knowledge and Skills" was transformed into two items: "During the next six months, I intend to increase my knowledge of the services (e.g., IRAs, CDs, loans) offered by my bank" and "I intend to improve my understanding of my bank's policy on cashing checks during the next six months". Tellers rated each intention item on a 7-point Likert-type scale, anchored by extremely likely and extremely unlikely. "Not-applicable" was also added as a response choice for subjects who felt that the item did not apply to their performance history. This response format resulted in the elimination of 39% of the sample, thus suggesting that social desirability may have biased subjects' responses.

Theoretical Significance of the Findings

The present findings confirm the need to include organizational characteristics in Ilgen et al.'s (1979) feedback model. Specifically, organizational characteristics which affect communication and help clarify and define effective performance result in greater acceptance of feedback. The findings also provide some support for the link between feedback acceptance and a desire to respond to the feedback. Specifically, ratee feedback acceptance resulted in decreased intentions to file a formal grievance and turnover.

Applied Significance of the Findings

These findings provide firm support for some traditionally held
views concerning effective implementation of an appraisal system. Numerous authors have proposed that evaluations should be conducted as often as possible, there should be a policy of openness about how appraisals are conducted, supervisors should allow their subordinates an opportunity to express their thoughts and opinions during the feedback session, and supervisors should attempt to develop a supportive, helpful, working relationship with their subordinates (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). The present findings demonstrate that each of these recommendations appears to result in increased acceptance of performance appraisals.

The findings also emphasize the need to consider ratee satisfaction with the appraisal process as a dependent measure when evaluating or developing performance appraisal systems. Dissatisfaction with the appraisal process appears to result in two negative behavioral responses, turnover and grievances. Thus, ratee perceptions of the appraisal process should be heavily weighted when implementing an effective performance appraisal system.

It also appears that if the findings of the present study were implemented, turnover and grievances would probably decrease. Thus, supervisors should develop better working relationships with their subordinates, ratees should be given an opportunity to participate in the performance feedback session, ratees should be evaluated frequently, and the organization should have a policy of openness concerning the appraisal process.

Finally, the importance of perceptions within the context of an appraisal system cannot be overemphasized. Yet, it is important to note
that perceptions of the appraisal process must be correlated to some degree with reality if the performance appraisal system is to be effective.

**Limitations**

Several limitations of the present study must be mentioned. First, the correlational nature of the research prevents causal interpretation of the results. In other words, the direction of the relationship between organizational characteristics, ratee perceptions of the appraisal process, and ratee intentions to change must be viewed with caution. For example, while the model states that organizational characteristics influence ratee perceptions of the appraisal process, which in turn, influence ratee intentions to change, it may be that ratees who are satisfied with the appraisal process are evaluated more frequently or are given more opportunities to participate in the performance feedback session.

Second, the self-report nature of the questionnaires suggests that social desirability, or the tendency for ratees to respond favorably or negatively to all items may have been operating. To resolve this potential problem, data were analyzed using multiple regression analysis since it assesses the unique contribution that each variable makes in the prediction of the criterion. For example, the organizational characteristic of quality of the rater-ratee relationship directly affects ratee perceptions of the appraisal process independent of the other predictors. In addition, the responses to the self-report verifiable items should not be affected by social desirability bias. Numerous studies have found that respondents are unlikely to falsify their responses when the information can be verified (Cascio, 1982).
Third, response bias, or the tendency for ratees to use only a certain portion of the rating scale may have also produced spurious results. In order to eliminate this potential problem, several items were reverse scored, self-report objective items were included in the questionnaire, and scales similar in content were intermixed among the other scales on the questionnaire.

Finally, since this study focused on a single level (i.e., financial institutions), generalizations regarding the results may be somewhat limited. Perhaps, the results would have been different had the study been conducted using another level (e.g., loan officers) in the banks, another type of organization (e.g., engineering firm), or an organization which did not have a formal performance appraisal system.

Future Research

While this study provides strong support for the contention that organizational characteristics influence ratee perceptions of the appraisal process, which, in turn, influence ratee intentions to change, additional research is needed on Ilgen et al.'s (1979) feedback model (see Figure 7). First, other possible behavioral responses (e.g., absenteeism) need to be examined within the context of this model. Second, actual behavioral changes that result from ratee perceptions of the appraisal process need to be researched. Third, more valid measures of certain organizational characteristics, such as organizational trust, are needed. Fourth, the study needs to be replicated using objective measures of organizational characteristics and objective company reports of turnover and grievances. Finally, the present findings need to replicated using other appraisal systems in other organizations at different levels.
In conclusion, this study combined issues relevant to both Industrial Psychology (e.g., performance appraisals) and Organizational Psychology (e.g., organizational characteristics, satisfaction with the appraisal process). If progress is to be made in developing a more effective performance appraisal system, research combining issues relevant to both areas should continue in the future.
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APPENDIX A

Cover Letter
Dear Employee:

Louisiana State University is conducting a study to learn more about organizational characteristics in a number of banks. We are interested in various aspects of your job, such as what you think of your performance appraisal system and how satisfied you are in your job. Because this research is intended to add to our knowledge about work settings, we encourage you to participate.

If our study is to be of any value, we need your help. Please take the time to complete the attached questionnaire. Your response to all questions are completely confidential. None of the completed questionnaires will be seen by anyone except the researchers. Please do not sign your name to your questionnaire. Moreover, the results of this study will be reported so that no individual person can be identified. The results will be available as public information.

Remember, there are "no right answers". We are only interested in receiving your opinion about each of the questions.

When you have completed the questionnaire, mail it directly to us in the attached envelope. No additional postage is required.

Your interest and cooperation are greatly appreciated; be assured that your responses will contribute significantly to this study.

Thank you once again!!

Sincerely,

Stephanie J. Platz
APPENDIX B

Demographic Information
THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS NEEDED FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY

   _____ Male _____ Divorced
   _____ Separated _____ Widowed
   _____ Single, never married

3. Age _____

4. How much formal education have you had?
   _____ Up to some high school
   _____ Completed high school
   _____ Some college
   _____ Completed college
   _____ Some graduate school
   _____ Completed graduate school

5. Approximately how long have you been employed in your current occupation? _____ Years

6. How long have you been employed at this company? _____ Years

7. When was your last performance appraisal? _____ months ago

8. Name of bank ___________________________.

9. Location of bank __________________________.
APPENDIX C

Perceptual Measures of Organizational Characteristics
Span of Control

Using the following format, respond to each of the statements below as they relate to your present job. Please place one number in the blank at the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spatial Distance between Superior and Subordinates Subscale of the Substitutes for Leadership Questionnaire; (Kerr & Jermier, 1978)

The nature of my job is such that my immediate superior is seldom around me when I'm working.

On my job my most important tasks take place away from where my immediate superior is located.

My immediate superior and I are seldom in actual contact or direct sight of one another.

My immediate supervisor/rater supervises a large number of employees.
Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict

Using the following format, respond to each of the statements below as they relate to your present job. Please place one number in the blank at the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict Scale; (Rizzo, House, & Litzman, 1970)

1. I feel certain about how much authority I have.
2. Clear, planned goals and objectives exist for my job.
3. I know that I have divided my time properly among my job duties.
4. I know what my responsibilities are.
5. I know exactly what is expected of me.
6. Explanation is clear of what has to be done.
7. I have to do things that I feel should be done differently.
8. I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it.
9. I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.
10. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.
11. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.
12. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.
13. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.
14. I work on unnecessary things.
Secrecy Surrounding the Appraisal Process

Using the following format, respond to each of the statements below as they relate to your organization's appraisal process. Please place one number in the blank at the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ I know the job dimensions or the aspects of my job that I will be evaluated on.

____ I know what type of rating scale will be used to evaluate me.

____ I know when I will be evaluated.

____ I know how many times a year I will be formally evaluated.

____ I know who will evaluate me.

____ I know why I am evaluated. For example, my evaluation will be used for a merit raise or promotion decision.

____ I know the procedure I must follow to contest what I consider an "unfair" evaluation.

____ I know the format of my performance appraisal session. In other words, I know what will occur in the meeting I have with my supervisor concerning my appraisal.
Participation in the Performance Feedback Session

Using the following format, respond to each of the statements below as they relate to your organization's appraisal process. Please place one number in the blank at the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ I talked the most during my interview with my supervisor.

____ I had an opportunity to express my side during my interview.

____ I discussed plans and objectives during my interview.

____ I have an opportunity to express my feelings when I am evaluated.

____ An action plan is developed when I am evaluated.

____ Progress toward reaching my goals is reviewed when I am evaluated.

____ An action plan related to my performance weaknesses is developed when I am evaluated.
Task Identity

For each item, please circle the response which best describes your present job.

Task Identity Subscale of the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS): (Hackman & Oldham, 1975)

1. To what extent does your job involve doing a "whole" and identifiable piece of work? That is, is the job a complete piece of work that has an obvious beginning and end? Or is it only a small part of the overall piece of work, which is finished by other people or by automatic machines?

1. My job is only a tiny part of the overall piece of work, the results of my activities cannot be seen in the final product or service.
2. My job is a moderate sized "chunk" of the overall piece of work, my own contribution can be seen in the final outcome.
3. My job involves doing the whole piece of work from start to finish, the results of my activities are easily seen in the final product or service.

2. The job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.

1. Very Inaccurate
2. Mostly Inaccurate
3. Slightly Inaccurate
4. Uncertain
5. Slightly Accurate
6. Mostly Accurate
7. Very Accurate

3. The job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.

1. Very Inaccurate
2. Mostly Inaccurate
3. Slightly Inaccurate
4. Uncertain
5. Slightly Accurate
6. Mostly Accurate
7. Very Accurate
Task Interdependence

For each item, please circle the response which best describes your present job.

Task Interdependence Subscale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire; (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979)

1. How often does your job require that you meet or check with other people in this organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all; I never have to meet or check with others</td>
<td>I sometimes need to meet or check with others</td>
<td>Very often; I must constantly meet or check with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How much do you have to cooperate directly with other people in this organization in order to do your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little; I can do almost all my work by myself</td>
<td>A moderate amount; some of my work requires cooperating with others</td>
<td>Very much; all my work requires cooperating with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Climate—An Individual's Trust in the Appraisal Process

Using the following format, respond to each of the statements below as they relate to the atmosphere that surrounds your organization's appraisal system. In other words, we are interested in how the typical supervisor/rater in your division rates people in your organization. Please place one number in the blank at the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trust in the Appraisal Process Survey (TAPS); (Bernardin, 1978)**

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division does not rate people low because that would be admitting personal deficiencies as a supervisor.

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division feels personally responsible for the training of his/her people.

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division feels personally responsible for the performance of his/her people.

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division is reluctant to give negative evaluations to people.

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division seeks mostly to just "keep the peace" with his/her people regarding performance ratings.

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division feels uncomfortable giving performance ratings to people.

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division purposely inflates ratings of people.

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division looks at "average" performance ratings of people as a "damning with faint praise".

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division believes almost all people work at the same high level of proficiency.

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division finds it necessary to approve of other people in order to gain approval for himself/herself.

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division rates people fairly and honestly.

_____ The typical supervisor/rater in my division rates people higher because he/she feels other raters are inflating their ratings.
The typical supervisor/rater in my division sticks fairly close to the "bell curve" in rating people.

The typical supervisor/rater in my division distorts ratings of people to get a better deal for his/her subordinates.

The typical supervisor/rater in my division inflates ratings of people so his/her work group will be happy.

The typical supervisor/rater in my division tends to cluster all ratings about the center of all scales so that people are not rated extremely high or low.

The typical supervisor/rater in my division tends to assign ratings on the basis of a global impression of people.

The typical supervisor/rater in my division rates people leniently because there exists an atmosphere where approval is the norm rather than disapproval.

The typical supervisor/rater in my division operates on the basis of "whoever associates with me is meritorious, therefore my work group is meritorious".

The typical supervisor/rater in my division feels that all people who could have been rated unfavorably have already been discharged from the organization.

The typical supervisor/rater in my division fails to distinguish between the different performance levels of people because these individuals are high or low on one specific dimension.

The typical supervisor/rater in my division distorts ratings of people in order to have a reputation as a supervisor with "influence upstairs".

The typical supervisor/rater in my division tends to rate people high or low on all performance dimensions because they are high or low on one specific dimension.
Quality of the Rater-Ratee Relationship

Before answering the following questions, please think about your working relationship with your immediate supervisor or the individual who rates your performance. All of the following questions ask about this particular working relationship.

Leader-Member Exchange Scale; (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975)

1. Do you usually know where you stand... do you usually know how satisfied your immediate supervisor is with what you do? (circle one)
   
   4 = Always know where I stand  
   3 = Usually know where I stand  
   2 = Seldom know where I stand  
   1 = Never know where I stand

2. Do you feel that your immediate supervisor understands your problems and needs? (circle one)
   
   1 = Not at all  
   2 = Some but not enough  
   3 = Well enough  
   4 = Completely

3. Do you feel that your immediate supervisor recognizes your potential? (circle one)
   
   4 = Fully  
   3 = As much as the next person  
   2 = Some but not enough  
   1 = Not at all

4. Regardless of how much formal authority your immediate supervisor has built into his or her position, what are the chances that he or she would be personally inclined to use this power to help you solve problems in your work? (circle one)
   
   1 = No chance  
   2 = Might or might not  
   3 = Probably would  
   4 = Certainly would

5. Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your immediate supervisor has, to what extent can you count on him/her to help you at his/her expense when you really need it? (circle one)
   
   4 = Certainly would  
   3 = Probably would  
   2 = Might or might not  
   1 = No chance
6. I have enough confidence in my immediate supervisor that I would defend and justify his/her decisions if he/she were not present to do so. (circle one)

1 = Probably not
2 = Maybe
3 = Probably would
4 = Certainly would

7. How would you characterize your working relationship with your immediate supervisor? (circle one)

4 = Extremely effective
3 = Better than average
2 = About average
1 = Less than average
APPENDIX D

Objective Measures of Organizational Characteristics
Span of Control

Respond to the statement below as it relates to your present job. Please place one number in the blank.

My immediate supervisor/rater evaluates the performance of ________ employees. (Include yourself)
Rater Training

Respond to the statement below as it relates to your present job.

My immediate supervisor/rater has completed a course in rater training. (Rater training is a program whereby individuals who evaluate other employees learn how to appraise these individuals more accurately.)

Yes ___  No ___
Frequency of Evaluation

Respond to the statement below as it relates to your present job. Please place one number in the blank.

How often is your performance evaluated each year? ______
APPENDIX E

Measure of Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process
Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process

Using the following format, respond to each of the statements below as they relate to your organization's appraisal process. Please place one number in the blank at the left.

Strongly Disagree Slightly Disagree Neither Agree Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

_____ My performance has been fairly and accurately evaluated.

_____ I consider my most recent appraisal to be fair and accurate.

_____ I understand why my immediate superior/rater evaluated me as he/she did on my last appraisal.

_____ I think evaluations are handled fairly in my organization.

_____ Considering my skills and the effort I put into my work, I think I am evaluated fairly and accurately.

_____ Compared to others, I am evaluated fairly and accurately.

_____ Based on what I contribute to my company, I am fairly and accurately appraised.

_____ I am satisfied with my most recent appraisal.

_____ My appraisal was what I expected.

_____ In general, my evaluation measured up to what I expected.

_____ Considering my skills and the effort I put into my work, I am very satisfied with my evaluation.

_____ Based on what I contribute to my company, I am not satisfied with my evaluation.
APPENDIX F

Measures of Ratee Intentions to Change
Ratee Intentions to Improve Upon Performance Weaknesses

Using the following format, respond to each of the statements below. Please place one number or NA in the blank at the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
<th>Highly Likely</th>
<th>Neither Likely nor Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Highly Unlikely</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

NA, if it is not applicable.

For Example:

___ During the next 6 months, I intend to eliminate any attendance problems that I may have.

1) You would respond not applicable (NA), if you have never been late to work.

OR

2) You would respond 1 through 7 depending on how likely it is that you intend to eliminate this problem.

___ During the next 6 months, I intend to improve upon the weaknesses my evaluation has pointed out.

___ My evaluation highly motivates me to perform more effectively.

___ During the next 6 months, I intend to increase my knowledge of the services (e.g., IRAs, CDs, loans) offered by my bank.

___ I intend to improve my understanding of my bank's policy on cashing checks during the next 6 months.

___ During the next 6 months, I intend to improve by ability to identify bad checks (e.g., forgeries).

___ I intend to balance my window everyday during the next 6 months.

___ During the next 6 months, I intend to increase the number of customers I serve.

___ I intend to be more conscientious about keeping customers' account information confidential during the next 6 months.
During the next 6 months, I intend to be more courteous to bank customers.

I intend to improve my working rapport with bank employees during the next 6 months.

During the next 6 months, I intend to be more effective when communicating with customers.

I intend to be more effective when communicating with other bank employees over the telephone during next 6 months.

During the next 6 months, I intend to eliminate any attendance problems that I may have.

I intend to eliminate any punctuality problems that I may have during the next 6 months.
Ratee Intentions to Turnover

Using the following format, respond to each of the statements below as they relate to your present job. Please place one number in the blank at the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intention to Turn Over Subscale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire; (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979)

____ I often think about quitting.
____ I will probably look for a new job in the next year.
____ I intend to remain at this job for the next 6 months.
____ In the next 6 months, I intend to quit this job.
____ After my evaluation, I do not feel like coming to work.
____ After my evaluation, I feel like quitting my job.
Ratee Intentions to File a Formal Grievance

Using the following format, respond to each of the statements below as they relate to your organization's appraisal process. Please place one number in the blank at the left.

Strongly Disagree  Slightly Disagree  Neither Agree nor Disagree  Slightly Agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

____ If I were to file a formal grievance after my evaluation, I feel like filing a formal grievance.
Footnotes

1Ilgen et al.'s (1979) construct of feedback acceptance closely approximates the variable, ratee perceptions of the appraisal process in the present study. Both refer to the degree to which ratees perceive their evaluations to be fair and accurate. Likewise, the construct, desire to respond in Ilgen et al.'s model is identical to the variable, ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses in this study.

2One subject failed to respond to this item.
Table 1

Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bank 1</th>
<th>Bank 2</th>
<th>Bank 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of tellers</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age (yrs)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal education</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to some high school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed graduate school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of service with respective bank (yrs)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of employment as a bank teller (yrs)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of last appraisal (mos)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. aOne subject failed to respond to this item.
Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities of Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliabilitya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Span of control</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater training</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrecy surrounding the appraisal process</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of evaluation</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the performance feedback session</td>
<td>33.03</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task interdependence</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational trust—an individual's trust in the appraisal system</td>
<td>67.84</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the rater-ratee relationship</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratee perceptions of the appraisal process</td>
<td>59.14</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratee intentions to turnover</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratee intentions to file a formal grievance</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. aReliabilities based on Coefficient Alpha.
Table 3

Correlations Among Organizational Characteristics Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPAN</th>
<th>AMBG</th>
<th>CONF</th>
<th>TRAN</th>
<th>SCRY</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>TKID</th>
<th>TKIN</th>
<th>TRST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBG</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONF</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRY</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.53***</td>
<td>-40***</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKID</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKIN</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRST</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td>-.39***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCH</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.54***</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.50***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  *p<.05.  **p<.01.  ***p<.001.

Key:  SPAN = span of control

AMBG = role ambiguity

CONF = role conflict

TRAN = rater training

SCRY = secrecy surrounding the appraisal process

FREQ = frequency of evaluation

PART = participation in the performance feedback session

TKID = task identity

TKIN = task interdependence

TRST = organizational trust—an individual's trust in the appraisal system

EXCH = quality of the rater-ratee relationship
Table 4
Correlations Among Ratee Intentions to Change Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PWEAK</th>
<th>TURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWEAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURN</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIEVE</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .0001

Key: PWEAK  = Ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses
     TURN  = Ratee intentions to turnover
     GRIEVE = Ratee intentions to file a formal grievance
Table 5

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis: A Test of the Relationship Between Organizational Characteristics and Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSE</th>
<th>17163.35</th>
<th>F - ratio</th>
<th>12.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFE</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>128.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors of Regression, Standardized Beta Weights, t Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Characteristics</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>s_b</th>
<th>STB</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBG</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONF</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRY</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-2.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKID</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKIN</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRST</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.02***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCH</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.0001.

Key: SPAN = span of control
AMBG = role ambiguity
CONF = role conflict
TRAN = rater training
SCRY = secrecy surrounding the appraisal process
FREQ = frequency of evaluation
TKID = task identity
TKIN = task interdependence
TRST = organizational trust-an individual's trust in the appraisal system
EXCH = quality of the rater-ratee relationship
PART = participation in the performance feedback session
Table 6

Results of Stepwise Regression Analysis: A Test of the Relationship Between Organizational Characteristics and Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Characteristics</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>ΔR</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 variable model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the rater-ratee relationship</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/144</td>
<td>90.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 variable model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the performance feedback session</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>2/143</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the rater-ratee relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 variable model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrecy surrounding the appraisal process</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>3/142</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the performance feedback session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the rater-ratee relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 variable model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrecy surrounding the appraisal process</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>4/141</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the performance feedback session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the rater-ratee relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p< .05. **p< .01.
Table 7

Correlations Between Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process and Ratee Intentions to Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PWEAK</th>
<th>TURN</th>
<th>GRIEVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SATFAIR</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .0001

Key: SATFAIR = Ratee perceptions of the fairness of their performance evaluations and satisfaction with the appraisal process

PWEAK = Ratee intentions to turnover

TURN = Ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses

GRIEVE = Ratee intentions to file a formal grievance
### Table 8

**Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis**

**Predicting Ratee Intentions to File a Formal Grievance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in Equation</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/96</td>
<td>68.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Characteristics + Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>6/88</td>
<td>13.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Predicting Ratee Intentions to Turnover**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in Equation</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/96</td>
<td>43.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Characteristics + Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>6/88</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.  *$p<.01$  **$p<.0001$.*
Table 9

Results of the Univariate ANOVAs on Significant MANOVA Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>$X_1$</th>
<th>$X_2$</th>
<th>$X_3$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>2/156</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBG</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>2/160</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONF</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>26.37</td>
<td>2/159</td>
<td>1.34*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2/157</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRY</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>2/160</td>
<td>1.60**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2/156</td>
<td>8.94*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>32.94</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>29.37</td>
<td>2/159</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKID</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>2/159</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKIN</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>2/157</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRST</td>
<td>91.88</td>
<td>97.41</td>
<td>100.16</td>
<td>2/155</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCH</td>
<td>20.31</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>2/156</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATFAIR</td>
<td>60.10</td>
<td>59.14</td>
<td>61.37</td>
<td>2/160</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratee Intentions to Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWEAK</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>23.15</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>2/97</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURN</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>2/157</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIEVE</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2/160</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p<.05  **p<.01.

Key: SPAN = span of control  
AMBG = role ambiguity  
CONF = role conflict  
TRAN = rater training  
SCRY = secrecy surrounding the appraisal process  
FREQ = frequency of evaluation
Table 9: continued

PART = participation in the performance feedback session
TKID = task identity
TKIN = task interdependence
TRST = organizational trust—an individual's trust in the appraisal process
EXCH = quality of the rater-ratee relationship
SATFAIR = ratee perceptions of the appraisal process
PWEAK = ratee intentions to improve upon performance weaknesses
TURN = ratee intentions to turnover
GRIEVE = ratee intentions to file a formal grievance

1 = bank 1
2 = bank 2
3 = bank 3
Table 10

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Controlling for Bank Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSE 16140.55</th>
<th>F-ratio 13.93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFE</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>120.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors of Regression, Standardized Beta Weights, t Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Characteristics</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>s_b</th>
<th>STB</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBG</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONF</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRY</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-2.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.82***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKID</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKIN</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRST</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.88***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCH</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .0001.

Key: SPAN = span of control
     AMBG = role ambiguity
     CONF = role conflict
     TRAN = rater training
     SCRY = secrecy surrounding the appraisal
     FREQ = frequency of evaluation
     PART = participation in the performance feedback session
     TKID = task identity
     TKIN = task interdependence
     TRST = organizational trust-an individual's trust in the appraisal system
     EXCH = quality of the rater-ratee relationship
Table 11

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Controlling for Perceived Level of Past Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSE</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11817.10</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88.19</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors of Regression, Standardized Beta Weights, t Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Characteristics</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>s_b</th>
<th>STB</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBG</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONF</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRY</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKID</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKIN</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRST</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCH</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.0001.

Key: SPAN = span of control
     AMBG = role ambiguity
     CONF = role conflict
     TRAN = rater training
     SCRY = secrecy surrounding the appraisal process
     FREQ = frequency of evaluation
     PART = participation in the performance feedback session
     TKID = task identity
     TKIN = task interdependence
     TRST = organizational trust-an individual's trust in the appraisal system
     EXCH = quality of the rater-ratee relationship
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**Figure 1.** A Process Model of Performance Ratings.
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Figure 2. A Process Model of the Effects of Feedback on Recipients.
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Figure Caption

Figure 3. An Expanded Version of Ilgen, Fisher and Taylor's (1979) Feedback Effectiveness Model.

Note. A portion of this figure is from "Consequences of Individual Feedback on Behavior in Organizations" by D. Ilgen, C. Fisher, and M. Taylor, 1979, Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, p. 352.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>span of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role ambiguity and role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process

Ratee Perceptions of the Fairness of their Performance Evaluations and Ratee Satisfaction with the Appraisal Process
Figure 4. A Framework of Organizational Characteristics Affecting Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process.
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Figure Caption

Figure 5. A Model of Organizational Characteristics Affecting Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process and Ratee Intentions to Change.
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ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

- quality of the rater-ratee relationship
- participation in the performance feedback session
- frequency of evaluation
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Figure 6. A Revised Model of Organizational Characteristics Affecting Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process and Ratee Intentions to Change.
Organizational Characteristics Affecting Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process and Ratee Intentions to File a Formal Grievance

- quality of the rater-ratee relationship
- participation in the performance feedback session
- frequency of evaluation
- secrecy surrounding the appraisal process

Organizational Characteristics Affecting Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process and Ratee Intentions to Turnover

- quality of the rater-ratee relationship
- participation in the performance feedback session
- frequency of evaluation
- secrecy surrounding the appraisal process

rathee intentions to file a formal grievance
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Figure 7. A Model of Organizational Characteristics Affecting Ratee Perceptions of the Appraisal Process and Ratee Intentions to File a Formal Grievance and Turnover.
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