

The significant differences in the operationalization of the concept of employee performance appraisal – A global perspective.

Sujith A S

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Bharata Mata College, Thrikkakara, Kochi, Kerala.

Received: June 05, 2018

Accepted: July 19, 2018

ABSTRACT

Employee's performance is the major concern in every organization. Performance Appraisal is the vital Human Resource practices administered in many organizations with the goal of improving the individual performance of employees and thereby ensure the organizational effectiveness. The operationalisation of the concept of performance appraisal is different from one company to another, one industry to another and one sector to another sector. Similarly the performance appraisal practice of one country is different from one another. The nature and type, management styles, workforce behavior, working environment, regulatory mechanisms, etc are varied from one nation to another. HR practices are also different from one another. The Performance appraisal practice is a multi dimensional global initiative. The concept, methods, employee perception, methodology, technology, culture, legislations, etc are influenced by a Performance appraisal system. Hence the performance appraisal practices of each and every country having significant difference in the operationalisation level. This article aimed to identify the significant differences in the operationalization of the concept of employee performance appraisal of different countries.

Keywords: Human Resources Management, Employee Performance, Performance Appraisal.

Introduction

With the world economic development rapidly moving in the direction of a more globally integrated direction, the pace of the global performance appraisal (PA) in human resources management enforcement and reform should also intimately be kept up and intend to provide adequate authority protection for employees. PA is considered a significant employee assessment instrument and core measurement in HR management. The function of PA will be more and more vital as a strategic partner to assurance the organization's business results could be achieved through successful execution and monitoring of a robust performance management procedure. The application or operationalisation of the concept of performance appraisal system is different from one country to another.

Literature review

Various researchers' experience in the field of performance appraisal is different from one another. Few of available literatures regarding employee performance appraisal are listed below.

Copping (2001) suggested, researching appraisal by precondition, visibility, practicalities, understanding the content of the subordinates' task, and the beliefs and values and communication practice of those involved to both better understand appraisal and ensure its effectiveness.

Grubb (2007) feels that PA are important, to promote organisational efficiency and effectiveness, to increase individual employee performance and satisfaction, to simplify administrative processing and to ensure management, retain control of employee behaviour and attitude.

Lambert (2009) PA is an entirely integrated system involving periodic planned discussion between the manager and employee's total performance against prearranged goals, having the manager to coach and counsel the staff in the area requiring remedial actions to improve the overall performance for the benefit of the employee and the total organisation.

Bhatia & Jain (2012), the success of an organisation is depending on its capability to measure the performance of its members accurately and use its impartiality to optimise them as a vital resource. PA is not only motivated the employee but also improves the productivity level of any organisation.

Kolawole., et al. (2013) PA is a management device for the evaluation of employees and organisational performance. It is an exercise that all organisations whether service or manufacturing must always embark upon to justify every employee's retention in the workplace. PA is used as an employee retention instrument for every organisation.

Cappelli & Conyon (2016) investigated employee PAs using data from a single US firm between 2001-07. They found that PAs are both informative and drive vital components of the service contract. The

employee PA scores are correlated to a range of significant employment outcomes, including merit pay & bonus, promotions & demotions/dismissals, as well as employee quits.’

Statement of the Problem

Performance appraisal is a management tool used by different companies all over the world. The operational aspect of performance appraisal is different from one nation to another according to various circumstances. The method, application, assessment and name itself is varied from one country to another. This study aimed to study the differences in the operationalization of the concept of employee performance appraisal in different countries. The different countries’ performance appraisal systems and its specified name, key features, merits and demerits were considered for this study.

Objective of the study

To understand the significant differences in the operationalization of the concept of employee performance appraisal in a global perspective.

Operationalization of the concept of employee performance appraisal - A global perspective

China (1978)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
1	Chinese managers may reject the concept of having formal PA system in the organisations; they developed their informal ways to evaluate the subordinates.	The cultural aspect guanxi (personal relationships) has a significant influence on the execution and effectiveness of HRM practices	Intuitive performance evaluations, Instinct performance evaluations	Incorporating and rewarding individual input is helping produce satisfaction and motivation	Issues relating transparency, honesty & mutual influence.
JAPAN (1920 -30)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
2	Japan has attempted to adopt the American way of evaluation, but there are still glitches in the Japanese application of this system.	The appraisal system heavily influences salary and promotion.	Rating scale	Employees are measured on skills, overall performance, & attitudes	Subjective, unorganised, and close-minded.
MALAYSIA (1990's)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
3	Malaysia is become more concerned with employee productivity and employee contribution. Additionally, leadership skills, knowledge and expertise, personal traits, and activities performed outside the realm of official duties are taken into account.	Five competencies are evaluated: intellectual capability, interpersonal skills, career orientation, planning & organising capabilities, motivation and others similar criteria's.	Integrated Results-Based Management: IRBM	No issues have been reported outlining unfair practices or abuse of power by managers during performance evaluations.	No link between performance and salary or rewards, the absence of formal review discussion, and lack of well-defined standards..
SOUTH KOREA (1983)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
4	The performance evaluation system provides the information	Companies are not only analysing the amount of work and quality produced by the	Qualitative and Qualitative employee	Both monitory and Non- monitory rewards to the employees	Issues related the ranking of qualitative criteria and

	necessary for a company or publicly owned organisation to be credited in the eyes of the government and other public sectors	employee, but also personality traits, attitudes, harmony, cooperation, and loyalty evaluations	appraisal		some divergence in the incentives for employees.
SINGAPORE(1960)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
5	They used a system known as the Potential appraisal system (PAS) established by Shell Petroleum Company. Presently, the country conducts performance based-evaluations on according to several pieces of criteria.	The vital part of the evaluation of the 'potential' section which assesses an employee's 'currently estimated potential' done by matching job level with salary grade. It can determine employee's long-term development prospects.	Potential Appraisal System	Performance evaluation is based on several criteria. First is the 'helicopter quality', intellectual qualities', employee's results orientation, leadership quality.'	Performance and results information does not determine salaries.
SRI LANKA (1998)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
6	PA in Sri Lankan organization reveals a significant gap between what should exist and what in fact is existing. There is a highly felt need for developing a good PAS and implement it in a planned way.	Eight dimensions of EPES including purposes, policies, criteria & standards, methods, feedback & interviews, training for the evaluator, practices for ensuring accurate implementation & review.	Employee Performance Evaluation System(EPE S)	The organisation uses EPE for administrative purposes, employee growth & program assessment.	Responsible managers do not believe that PA is a driver of job performance and business performance, no objective, lack of expertise.
PHILIPPINES (2007)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
7	The Civil Service Commission Government initiated a re-assessment of the present PAS & introduced a new PMS - Office Performance Evaluation System (PMS-OPES).	A well planned PMS can be compared to a mature tree that produces a rich harvest of fruits:- Focused on the shared outcome (sturdy trunk), Aligned efforts (Branches linked to the trunk), Produces outcome (Fruitful), An environment conducive to performance (Lush and healthy crown), & The embedded culture of performance (Grounded with strong roots)	Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS)	Maintain and improve employee performance as well as the organization's ability to achieve corporate objectives. These goals are achieved through strategy developments, motivational techniques, and other team morale and efficiency boosters	Used commonly only in public sector.
SOUTH AFRICA (1994)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
8	They does not participate in PAs as often or to the	The three different criteria are trait-based, behaviour based, and	Performance Evaluation System	Offer a fair & equitable basis upon which to	The exercise of deceptive information,

	same degree as many other countries. In fact, 60% of South African business organisations do not use or do not have a formal management system	results or outcome based		identify under-performance & recompense good performance.	Damage relationship, Unclear rating system, poorer self-esteem, Unfair standards
NIGERIA (2012)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
9	PASs in Nigeria have been largely characterised non-disclosure of appraisal results to the employees. This secrecy over performance outcomes tends to put in the hands of managers, a potential device of cracking down on 'recalcitrant' employees with impunity	In Nigeria, PA is viewed as a means of bringing about motivation in employees	Annual Performance Evaluation system (APER)	The level of PA awareness is high among the staff and PAS has a vital influence on employee's performance.	Incapability to give on time feedback, lack of objectivity, favouritism & bias of the supervisors, non-rewarding of overtime.
BRAZIL (1994)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
10	According to the OECD, all parts of the federation are required to assess a statutory employee performance at least once a year. Because there is no common model for these appraisals, employees are often asked to evaluate themselves then discuss the self-evaluation with the immediate superior.	Brazilians are more sensitive when it comes to PA are typically done subjectively, focusing on the positives rather than the negatives.	PA is bounded within the federal public service performance management in annual cycles.	Written feedback, a very understanding and collective society, employers must remain honest during evaluations	No common model of appraisals, reviews typically do not determine pay raises or promotions, no set of objectives or criteria used for measuring outcomes.
ARGENTINA (2001)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
11	Evaluations are done by an evaluation committee established by the HR department. This committee makes sure that the immediate supervisor does not allow 'good' reviews to keep favoured employees as	Employee promotions are directly related to PAs	Sistema Nacional para la Profesion Administrativa (SINAPA).	The Evaluation committee in needed to create an environment that produces honest and credible evaluations, promotions are to be directly linked to PAs	Employees who drop below average are often immediately dismissed.

	permanent civil servants, and to assure that the employer is not abusing authority.				
12	MEXICO (1986)				
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
	Mexico utilises PAs to determine promotions and renew work contracts. Mexico is also one of the few countries that do not use assessment results to decide salary increases or deductions. The frequency of assessment is determined by the previous year evaluation resulting in reviews being held annually or quarterly.	Employees are ranked using a four-point scale: successful, requires attention, exceptional not acceptable.	Employee Development and Appraisal Plan (EDA).	Evaluations will then be scheduled several times throughout the year until a 'successful' rating is achieved.	Rigid in nature, If there is continuously no improvement, the employee will be terminated, Misuse of authority.
13	CANADA (1980)				
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
	Canada strives to create an evaluation that not only relates to the employee's specific job description but also describes the activities that have been accomplished throughout the period. The country relies heavily on consistency across past and current evaluations.	Employers focus on four core competencies throughout the evaluation: Demonstrating integrity and respect; Thinking things thoroughly; functioning effectively with others; Initiative & being action-oriented.	Employee performance evaluation	increase satisfaction and employee participation; the employee is allowed to make appeals,	Not flexible, uniform system
14	FRANCE (2002)				
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
	In France has been part of an integrated policy process validated by the immediate supervisor. Final evaluation reports must sign by the employee and the superior performing the evaluation.	This evaluation system incorporates the following: Work objective, Leadership and management section, Professional qualities and personal attributes, Overall assessment of employee performance, Work objectives for the next appraisal period	Five-point system performance evaluation	An important quality for appraisal is the objectivity, evaluations to be directly related to an employee's performance and does not analyze the personal qualities of the individual.	Part-time employees are evaluated less often than full-time employees, no specific direct influence on salary increase or decrease.
15	GERMANY (2007)				
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
	PA has been	Ranks employees by	The	Formal Computer	Many employees

	analysed through the electronic management system.	quality, fairness, usability, promptness & conflict management	electronic performance management system	evaluations are done annually or semi-annually, A rating scale was recognised, job satisfaction was positively linked to PAs	who are less favorable to the use of the computer system, creates a lack of participation.
16	ITALY (2011)				
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
	Italians appraise human resources periodically all over the year, so there is no pileup. Reviews are also conducted frequently to ascertain that performances comply with the company's goals and interests. In recent years, the Italian government has introduced several elements meant to increase motivation and reward employees.	The most important contribution made during the transition was the instalment of performance-related pay systems	PA and review	Reviews are frequently conducted, enhance motivation and remuneration of employees, religions & sexual orientation are completely prohibited from evaluation.	No incentives, Rigid system.
17	POLAND (2001)				
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
	Poland, like the Netherlands, does not use performance evaluations across the boards. The assessments become very significant in potential contract renewals, compensation and career advancement.	These assessments are done every two years in the form of a meeting with the immediate supervisor with the distribution of written feedback is given at the conclusion of the meeting. Poland incorporated a new system based on universal compensable factors such as performance-related pay increases.	PA-based pay system	Evaluation process provides objectivity & rationale, Leadership/management qualities, Training & development of competencies, Ability to work with each other.	Evaluations are done only in every two years.
18	NETHERLANDS (2000)				
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
	In the Dutch culture, employees are typically evaluated semi-annually. The country tends to use its evaluation analysis to a lesser extent than most other countries.	Immediate superiors asses subordinate based on actions undertaken, outputs, & improvement of competencies.	The semi-annual performance evaluation system	Ensure teamwork; Performance related pay is infrequently used, promotions require a separate set of evaluations	No specific laws are governing the use of monetary systems, Subjective
19	PORTUGAL (2004)				
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
	Portugal is the biggest user of performance	SIADAP is based on three components. Goal accomplishment.	The integrated system of PA	Feedback is given to the employee, Portuguese	Many times individuals feel that the review

	assessment out of all other OECD countries. Assessment is mandatory for all employees, managers or supervisors and company authority figures. However, casual employees are excluded from the evaluation.	Behavioural competency. Personal attitude.	- SIADAP.	government use forced distribution to remove widespread leniency quickly.	and the resulting compensation are unfair.
RUSSIA (2000)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
20	Before an employee PA can be done in Russia, all objectives must be approved by order of the company's General Director. Various criteria must be accepted and reviewed before conducting appraisals.	Two weeks before the scheduled assessment, the supervisor will complete a report outlining the employee's expected performance, qualifications, and business skills expected as well as a detailed account of the employee's actual overall performance. Once all of these objectives have been met and approved by the general director, supervisors can begin with the evaluations.	Employee PA	Performance reviews are a very important component of employee satisfaction and morale; Positive results can lead to salary increases, promotions, and bonuses.	Leads to dismissal, Lengthy process
TURKEY (1930)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
21	Use a broad range of criteria to fully assess individuals from activities undertaken, quality and timeliness, values, interpersonal skills, & competency improvements.	There is a four-step process used when conducting performance evaluations in Turkey, and they are: Establishing Job criteria and appraisal standards, Timing of appraisal, Selection of appraisers, Providing feedback	Performance Evaluation	Top management's support, increase the motivation of the employees, s fair and objective	The lack of proper PASs in the public sector. There is a need
SPAIN (2000)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
22	Spain is famous for putting an interesting flair on everything; this, unfortunately, does not transform into its PA System.	There are three main components: type of measures used to rate performance, persons who conduct the reviews, and frequency of appraisals.	Formalised PAS	Performance review to determine pay to a greater degree than many other countries	Lack of clarity, unfairly rank, internal conflicts, and procedures are not valued as seriously.
SAUDI ARABIA (2000)					
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
23	Annual PAs are the widespread technique used to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of an employee.	There are numerous criteria used to evaluate employees in Saudi Arabia, Performance average, Individual personal characteristics and job-related	Annual PA	Supervisors& employees agree with objectives. Preparation of performance efficiency reports, Evaluations are	Purely a formal process, use of the multi-feedback approach.

	Evaluations are used to uncover employee's strengths and weakness and determine if further training is necessary	characteristics, Management objectives, effectiveness. by General		formal, and there are limited complaints from employees.	
24	AUSTRALIA (1998)				
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
	The PA focus on the development of the staff as well as stating future objectives. When evaluation performance is below average, Australian employers discuss and analyze with employees to discover a way to fix the problem before disciplinary action must be taken.	This country remains fair and honest in employee evaluations by using measures and criteria specific to each employee.	PAS	Help to boost the intrinsic value, loyalty, and morale of employees. Fair, transparent, and objective.	Majority employees do not object to the Australian ways as long as Pas is not based on biases.
25	INDIA (1990's)				
	Concept	Key Features	Method	Merits	Demerits
	India uses a specific set of guidelines for appraisals allowing the country to have common outcomes and a facilitated analysis across all companies.	The assessment system consists three main areas: Assessment of work output; Assessment of personal attributes and Assessment of functional competency.	Employee PAS	Increase employee morale, job satisfaction, and effectiveness, implementing the process of evaluating individuals across all levels of the business.	Lack of cooperation of employees, continues technological changes in the environment, Influence from the external environment like, political, cultural, etc

Conclusion

By doing extensive review, it has been found that performance appraisal system is not having much difference except cultural implication. Performance appraisal has both negative and positive aspects in Indian and global companies. In most of the companies the traditional appraisal system is existing, where appraisal is done once or twice in a year and in some companies, feedback system was very deprived or absent. This formed bias in employee assessment because if they have been given poor rating then they will not be in the position to know about their mistakes. If they are given good rating then they will not bother to know their mistakes so that they can improve. Moreover, companies introduced PAS but unable to implement properly which does not fulfill the rationale and some time employee acceptance level is low for the performance appraisal system. Therefore, introduction of performance appraisal system will not serve the purpose; it required effective implementation and well accepted by employees.

References

1. A Profile of the Public Service of Malaysia. (2004). London, UK: Commonwealth Secretariat.
2. Adekola, A. & Sergi, B. (2007). Global Business Management: A Cross- Cultural Perspective. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company
3. Alqahtani, Faiz, Awad (2010) Evaluating the Performance Appraisal System in Public Universities in Saudi Arabia and its Impact on Human Resource Decisions, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: [http:// etheses.dur.ac.uk/361/](http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/361/)
4. Argentina Brutus, S., Derayah, M., Fletcher, C., Bailey, C., Velazquez, P., Shi, K., & Labath, V. (2006).Internationalization of multi-source feedback systems: a six-country exploratory analysis of 360-degree feedback. International Jour- nal Of Human Resource Management, Vol. 17(11), pp.1888-1906.

5. Baskin, M. (2002, May 1). Legal Guidelines for Associations for Conducting Employee Evaluations and Performance Appraisals.
6. Bhatia, K., & Jain, P., (2012). A study of performance appraisal and organisational effectiveness in terms of individual and organisational basis- A comparative study of BSNL and AIRTEL, *International Journal of Arts, Management and Humanities*, 1(1), 63-72.
7. Cabrera, Elizabeth, and Jose Carretero. "Human Resource Management in Spain." 2004.
8. Cappelli, P., & Canyon, M.J. (2016). What to do performance appraisals do? *ILR Review*, 71(1), 88-116.
9. Chasudhry, S., Reid, G., & Malik, W. (Eds.). (1994) *Civil Service Reform in Latin American and the Caribbean: Proceedings of a Conference*. Washington, DC: The World Bank
10. Cheng, K. & Cascio, W. (2009). Performance Appraisal Beliefs of Chinese Employees in Hong Kong and the Pearl River Delta. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol.17(3), pp. 329-333.
11. Chung, K., Lee, H., & Jung, K. (1997). *Korean Management: Global Strategy and Cultural Transformation*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
12. Copping, P. (2001). Is Performance appraisal feasible? Manchester Metropolitan University Business School, Working paper series.
13. Country Case Studies. (2005). In *Performance-Related Pay Policies for Government Employees* (p. 114). OECD.
14. Denisenko, S. & Moukhina, A. (2015). *Legal Aspects of Staff Evaluation*. Saint Petersburg Business Guide.
15. Dr. Kadam, R. (2012). Performance Appraisal and Human Resource Management: A Challenge Before India. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, Vol. 1(4), pp.91-96
16. Dunn, E. (2004). *Privatizing Poland: Baby Food, Big Business, and the Remaking of Labor*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
17. Gori, E., & Fissi, S. (2014). New Trends in Public Sector Performance Measurement and Evaluation: A Closer Look at the Italian Reform. *Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 32(2), pp.101-122.
18. Grobler, P., Wörnich, S., Carrell, M., Elbert, N., & Hatfield, R. (2006). *Human Resource Management in South Africa* (3rd ed.). Belford Row, London: Thomson Learning.
19. Grubb, T., (2007). Performance appraisal Reappraised: It's not all positive, *Journal of human resource education*, 1(1), 1-22.
20. Guidelines on How to Conduct a Performance Appraisal." Australian Business Lawyers and Advisors. N.p., 2011. Web. 22 Dec. 2015.
21. Human Resources Management Country Profiles: Brazil (2012). OECD, HR Management Practice. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/gov/pem/OECD%20HRM%20Profile%20-%20Brazil.pdf>
22. Ingui, Sam. "Performance Reviews and Performance Management of Employees - Criteria for Effectiveness." Colin Biggers & Paisley. N.p., 22 Aug. 2012. Web. 22 Dec. 2015.
23. Islam, R., & Rasad, S., (2005). Employee Performance Evaluation by AHP: A Case Study. Honolulu, Hawaii: dISAHp
24. Jirjahn, U., & Poutsma, E. (2013). The Use of Performance Appraisal Systems: Evidence from Dutch Establishment Data. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 52(4), pp.801-828.
25. Kolawole, T. O., Komolafe, I.T., Aldebayo, A. A., & Adegoroye, A. A. (2013). Appraisal system: A tool for performance in selected organisations in Nigeria, *International journal of sociology and anthropology*, 5(7), 249-261.
26. Koshi, E. (1998). 'Japanization' of a Performance Appraisal System: A Historical Comparison of the American and Japanese Systems. *Social Sciences Journal*, Vol. 1(2), pp.247-262.
27. Lambert, C. (2009). *Filed Sales performance appraisal* (3rd ed.), John Wiley and Sons, New York, 79-83.
28. Morentin, S., Moriones, A., & Sanchez, J., (2011). *Performance Appraisal: Dimensions and Determinants*. Discussion Paper. Universidad Publica de Navarra.
29. *Personnel Policies and Procedures*. (2012). Employee Development and Appraisal Plan (Human Resource Policy No. 2). Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico Public Regulation Commission.
30. Phin, L. (2015). The Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal in the Private Education Industry of Malaysia. Vol. 10(1).
31. Rego, A., Marques, C., Leal, S., Sousa, F., & Cunha, M. e. (2010). Psychological capital and performance of Portuguese civil servants: exploring neutralizers in the context of an appraisal system. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 21 (9), pp.1531-1552.
32. Shibata, H. (2000). The transformation of the wage and performance appraisal system in a Japanese firm. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 11 (2), pp.294-313.
33. Shibata, H. (2002). Wage and Performance Appraisal Systems in Flux: A Japan–United States Comparison. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 41(4), pp.629.
34. Shrivastava, P & Rai, U. (2012). Performance Appraisal Practices in Indian Banks. *A Journal of Management*, Vol. 5(2), pp.46-51
35. Snape, Ed, et al. "Performance Appraisal And Culture: Practice And Attitudes In Hong Kong And Great Britain." *International Journal Of Human Resource Management* Vol. 9.5, pp.841-861.
36. Sookdew, S. (October 1993). *The Performance Appraisal Function in Selected South African Local Authorities*. (Unpublished Masters Dissertation). University of Durban-Westville, Westville.

37. Sujith, AS. (2017). Performance Appraisal Practices in Different Countries – A Review, International Journal for Scientific Research & Development, Vol. 5(3), pp. 1294-1305.
38. Turkey Gurbuz, S., & Dikmenli, O. "Performance Appraisal Biases In a Public Organization: An Empirical Study" Kocaeli Universites Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi (2007).
39. United Kingdom Addison, John T, and Clive R. Belfield. "The Determinants Of Performance Appraisal Systems: A Note (Do Brown And Heywood's Results For Australia Hold Up For Britain?)." British Journal of Industrial Relations 46.3, pp.521-531.
40. Vallance, S. (1999). Performance Appraisal in Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines: A Cultural Perspective [sup*]. Australian Journal Of Public Administration, Vol. 58(4), pp.78.
41. Zhang, Y. & Lovegrove, I. Performance Appraisal for Chinese State-Owned Banking. Liverpool: United Kingdom.