

C

E



Center for
Effective
Organizations

**CONTRASTING PARTICIPANT
REACTIONS TO PARTICIPATION IN
PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS**

**CEO PUBLICATION
T 86-2 (80)**

ALLAN M. MOHRMAN, JR.
University of Southern California

J. BRUCE PRINCE
Concordia University

AUGUST 1993

**CONTRASTING PARTICIPANT REACTIONS
TO PARTICIPATION IN PERFORMANCE
APPRAISALS**

**CEO PUBLICATION
G 86-2 (80)**

ALLAN M. MOHRMAN, JR.
University of Southern California

J. BRUCE PRINCE
Concordia University

August 1993

CONTRASTING PARTICIPANT REACTIONS TO
PARTICIPATION IN PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS

This study considers the effects of subordinate participation on both participants in appraisal events, managers as well as subordinates. Manager utility and satisfaction are predicted by different aspects of participation than are subordinate utility and satisfaction. Criticism of the subordinate's performance tends to dissatisfy both manager and subordinate and has no utility for either even though the manager thinks it does.

Partial financial support was provided by General Electric and by the Office of Naval Research, Organizational Effectiveness Research Programs (Code 452) contract N00014-81-K-0048.

CONTRASTING PARTICIPANT REACTIONS TO PARTICIPATION IN PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS

There have been two parallel developments in performance appraisal that have been gaining momentum in recent years. One is an increasing interest in participative appraisal processes (Burke, Weitzel & Weir, 1978; Greller, 1975; Greller, 1978; Lathan & Wexley, 1981). The other is increasing research that directly compares appraisee and appraiser perceptions of appraisal relevant areas, including the performance rating itself (Henemann, 1974; Smircich & Chesser, 1981), work related attitudes (Wexley & Pulakos, 1983; Wexley, Alexander, Greenawalt & Couch, 1980), satisfaction with appraisal (Mount, 1984), and the feedback process (Ilgen, Peterson, Martin & Boeschen 1981). These two trends are linked. Participation is a process that is used expressly to take into account the potentially differing viewpoints of those participating in a PA event. Research should likewise consider the viewpoints of all the participants in appraisal. Appraisals are not only affected by the contributions of all the participants, but all the participants are potentially affected by the appraisal. In order to focus on these issues methodologically it is important that data are gathered from participants who experience the same appraisal events.

The appraiser, by definition, participates in appraisal events. Because of this, the term "participation" has come to refer to participation by the subordinate. Research on participation in appraisals has, in turn, tended to focus on the subordinate. Certainly the subordinate's reactions to participation are important. They can impact subsequent performance and relations with the manager. In many ways, however, manager reactions to, and perceptions of, subordinate participation are potentially even more interesting. They are more

complex because managers not only react on their own account, but they also draw conclusions about how subordinates react. These reactions and conclusions are important because they can affect the ways managers will approach participation in future appraisals. They also can have an impact on the manager-subordinate relationship and the more general performance of the manager.

Above all, we should not assume that managers and subordinates will react similarly to subordinate participation. If both parties do tend to react similarly, it should be substantiated. If, however, there are differences in the patterns of reactions, then these differences should be empirically shown. In either case, congruence or incongruence of participant reactions to participation can have important implications, not only for the process of performance appraisals, but also for the manager-subordinate relationship, in general.

An earlier study by Greller (1978) serves as a basis for the present study. Greller's study dealt entirely with subordinate data and investigated subordinate reactions to participation in the appraisal feedback interview. Specifically, it focused on two distinct forms of participation, opportunity to participate (which he called "ownership") and actual participation. Additionally it measured the appraisal message communicated to the subordinate (criticism level) during the feedback, the amount of subordinate learning (utility), and satisfaction with the appraisal.

Greller found that the degree of critical feedback to the subordinate had a mixed relation to the subordinate's reactions to the appraisal. It had a small positive impact on perceived utility, on the one hand, but was associated with dissatisfaction on the other. The

degree of opportunity to participate that the subordinate perceived positively affected both appraisal utility and satisfaction and was stronger in its effects than criticism. The degree to which the subordinate actually contributed and had an impact on the decisions made in the feedback session had no relation to either the perceived utility of the appraisal or satisfaction with it.

A number of questions motivated the present study's application of Greller's approach to both managers and subordinates: Do the outcomes for managers follow patterns similar to those for their subordinates? For instance, do managers also experience utility and satisfaction as a function of the subordinate's opportunity to participate? What utility and satisfaction do managers experience when they criticize the subordinate? Can managers assume the subordinate's perspective? Do they know when the subordinate experiences an opportunity to participate, for instance? Do they know when the subordinate is satisfied or has learned from the appraisal? This study pursues these and related questions.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

Data for this study came from nine strategic business units (SBU) of General Electric. These contained a diverse range of PA practices and philosophies. Over 50 different appraisal forms were in use. The nine SBUs offered a wide variety of sites, industrial sectors and technologies.

The primary sources of data were questionnaire responses from manager and subordinate dyads in two separate samples. Respondents in each sample were matched into manager-subordinate pairs so that their

perceptions of their most recent PA meeting could be directly compared. The Before-After (BA) sample consisted of those who completed "Before" questionnaires approximately two months prior to the PA meeting and "After" questionnaires about one to two months after that appraisal session. This sample was randomly selected and stratified by hierarchical level and functional area. About 600 manager and subordinate pairs were initially identified for participation. Non responses occurred, for the most part, due to scheduling conflicts (e.g., revised scheduling of the PA meeting) and staffing changes (e.g., promotions, transfers, terminations, etc.) over the six month period between sample determination and the administration of the "After" questionnaire. Sample erosion, in this kind of study, is compounded by the fact that we can use only pairs of managers and subordinates. Complete After data were obtained from 320 managers and 335 subordinates. Of these, complete subordinate and manager pair data for direct comparison were obtained from approximately 225 pairs. ("Before" questionnaire data are not used in this investigation.)

The After-Only (AO) sample consisted of those who completed their appraisal session during the calendar year prior to the questionnaire administration. This was a random sample, stratified in the same manner as the BA sample. Approximately 600 manager-subordinate pairs were initially targeted. Complete data were provided by approximately 445 subordinates, 450 managers and 395 manager-subordinate pairs.

Both the BA sample and AO sample questionnaires were distributed by company personnel in on-site, group administration sessions or for completion at a time and place convenient to the respondent. The manager questionnaire included the name of the subordinate and requested

that the manager respond with reference to the most recent PA with that subordinate. Subordinates were asked to respond in terms of their most recent appraisal by that manager. Upon completion, the respondents sealed their questionnaires in unmarked envelopes. These were returned in bulk to the researchers for analysis. Confidential identification codes were used to match together supervisor and subordinate pairs.

Measures

The manager and subordinate questionnaires were quite similar, thus manager and subordinate scales measuring the same constructs (e.g., participation) were constructed. The only differences between items used in constructing equivalent scales reflected differences in the respondent's role, e.g., "I invited my subordinate's participation (in the manager's questionnaire) versus "My supervisor invited my participation" (in the subordinate's questionnaire). This provided the opportunity to look at manager and subordinate perceptions on the same constructs investigated by Greller (1978) with nearly equivalent measures. There were no differences between the AO and BA measures.

Three PA characteristics are considered: (a) Participation - Opportunity for the subordinate measures the extent to which the subordinate's participation was invited and both parties shared responsibility for the event. The scale employs three items from Greller's (1978) four-item "ownership" scale. The unused item, "My work was praised," has questionable face validity to participation. The (b) Participation - Contribution by the subordinate scales consists of three items from Greller's "contributions" scale and focuses on the subordinate's behavior and impact on decision making (e.g., "I influenced the goals that were set," "My subordinate made suggestions

about how the job might be done differently.") Finally, (c) Criticism, a single-item measure of the performance evaluation presented at the appraisal session was used to express the extent to which the supervisor was critical of the subordinate's performance. The anchors for this item ranged from "far exceeded normal standards" to "was below minimum standards." While not equivalent, this corresponds conceptually to Greller's (1978) two criticism items (e.g., "my work was viewed as less than satisfactory").

The outcome measures focus on learning and satisfaction. The (d) PA Utility scale indicates the amount of improved role clarity resulting from the PA discussion (e.g., "I learned a lot from the appraisal") and consists of three items from Greller's (1978) four-item "utility" scale. The (e) PA Satisfaction scale uses all three of Greller's "satisfaction" items (e.g., "I feel good about the way the appraisal was conducted"). Like the previous set of constructs, these focused on the subordinate's reactions as perceived independently by the subordinate and the manager. In addition, the manager's own perceived PA utility (e.g., "I have a clearer idea of what my subordinate expects from me because of the appraisal") and satisfaction were assessed.

Descriptive statistics, including standardized alpha coefficients, are presented in Table 1. As evident in the table, all scales had good variances and internal consistency with the possible exception of the manager's view of the subordinate's participation-opportunity. In both the AO and BA samples, the alphas were in the 50s. Interested readers can consult Prince and Lawler (in press) which presents a principle-component analysis of subordinate's perceived opportunity contribution, utility and satisfaction measures.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

RESULTS

Convergence of Manager and Subordinate Perceptions

There are two ways manager and subordinate variables parallel one another in this study: (1) managers and subordinates are asked to respond to common referents (e.g., degree of criticism) and (2) managers and subordinates respond to similar referents (e.g., manager's utility vs. subordinate's utility). Table 2 presents the key correlations among these common and similar referents.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Although the managers and their subordinates experienced the same appraisal event, their measures of that event do not always agree (Table 2). Opportunities to participate that managers think they are making available to subordinates are not highly correlated with opportunities perceived by their subordinates ($r=.13$ and $.11$). Similarly, the contributions that subordinates think they are making are only modestly correlated with the contributions noticed by their managers ($r=.14$ and $.22$). On the other hand, when managers criticize (or praise) their subordinates' performances, the subordinates get a strongly correlated message ($r=.60$ and $.47$).

Both the manager's and subordinate's satisfaction with the appraisal tend to covary somewhat ($r=.19$ and $.23$). Managers are relatively aware of how satisfied their subordinates are with the appraisal ($r=.27$ and $.30$). Nevertheless, the managers' estimates of

their subordinates' satisfaction appear to be colored by their own satisfaction ($r=.46$ and $.52$).

The utility that managers derive from the appraisal is unrelated to the utility their subordinates feel ($r=.04$ and $-.01$); nor do managers have much sensitivity to the utility their subordinates experience ($r=.08$ and $.09$). Managers tend to think the appraisal is useful to their subordinates to the extent they find it useful themselves ($r=.33$ and $.41$).

Subordinate Results

A point of interest in this study is the similarity between the results with the subordinates in this study and Greller's subordinates. To assess this, the same regressions presented in Greller's article (1978) are computed for the subordinates. Utility and satisfaction are the dependent variables regressed on contribution, opportunity, and criticism. These results are presented in Table 3. As can be seen, there are a number of similarities. In both studies, the opportunity to participate is consistently the primary predictor of both utility and satisfaction. Also, the negative impact of criticism on the subordinate's satisfaction is confirmed. As is the case with Greller's subordinates, contribution does not have a direct impact on satisfaction.

There are also a few differences between the two sets of results. First, the amount of criterion variance explained is generally higher in the current study. Second, the positive impact of criticism on utility found in one of Greller's samples was not confirmed. The third and, perhaps, most notable difference is the significant positive impact of contribution on utility.

Insert Table 3 Here

Manager Results.

In Table 4, the manager's reactions (e.g., manager satisfaction) and characterizations of the PA meeting (e.g., subordinate's contribution as perceived by the manager) are employed. Comparing the results with those of their subordinates (presented in Table 3), a number of points of interest emerge. First, in general, the levels of explained criterion variance, although significant, are less in these manager regressions than they are in the subordinate regressions. Second, the pattern that dominates the subordinate results, that opportunity is the major determinant of both utility and satisfaction, occurs in the manager results only in the BA sample when manager satisfaction is the criterion. Contribution is the major determinant of manager's utility in both samples and of manager's satisfaction in the AO sample. Third, there is evidence that criticism has a negative impact on the manager's satisfaction, as well as the subordinate's, but no relation to either party's utility.

Insert Table 4 Here

In summary, it is apparent that subordinates derive utility and satisfaction primarily to the degree they perceive they have an opportunity to participate. Managers, on the other hand, apparently derive utility and satisfaction from the degree they perceive their subordinates actually contribute. Both managers and subordinates experience dissatisfaction to the extent the appraisal is critical of

the subordinate's performance. Criticism predicts utility for neither the manager nor the subordinate.

Manager Perceptions of Subordinate Reactions

Table 5 depicts the degree that the manager's views of the subordinate's reactions are related to the manager's views of the appraisal event. The results offer yet a different pattern of relationships.

The primary predictor of the managers' perceptions of subordinate utility is the perceived contribution of the subordinate. This parallels the Table 4 results where the manager's utility is the criterion (rather than the manager's perception of the utility for the subordinate) and differs from the Table 3 results that use subordinate perceptions. In that analysis, contribution of the subordinate is a secondary predictor. The positive impact of opportunity is consistent across both utility regressions, but unlike the subordinate data regressions (Table 3) the impact in Table 5 is the least important of the three predictors. In the Table 5 regressions, criticism has a significant positive impact on perceived subordinate utility. In the previous tables, criticism has no impact on utility (except in one of Greller's samples).

Criticism emerges in Table 5 as the primary predictor of perceived subordinate satisfaction. In the earlier regressions (Tables 3 and 4), criticism also has a significant negative impact, but one that is secondary to opportunity and, on one occasion, contribution. Opportunity is a secondary predictor of subordinate satisfaction using manager perceptions.

Insert Table 5 Here

In general, the results in Table 5 more closely parallel the pattern presented in Table 4, where the manager's own satisfaction and utility were considered, than the pattern of results presented in Table 3, where subordinate perceptions of their own outcomes are the focus. This occurs despite the fact that the referents of the measures used in Table 5 are the same as those used in Table 3. These results reflect the patterns of the intercorrelations of Table 2 where manager views of subordinate utility and satisfaction are more highly correlated with their own utility and satisfaction than with the subordinate's actual utility and satisfaction, and where interrater correlations of contribution and opportunity are rather low.

Combining Manager and Subordinate Perceptions

Table 6 presents the final set of regressions. Subordinate perceptions of utility and satisfaction are regressed on the manager's characterizations of the PA event. These regressions reflect the connection between those aspects of the appraisal event that the manager recognizes (and presumably could manage) and the actual outcomes the subordinate experiences. Many of the formally significant predictors are non-significant in these regressions. The decrease in explained variance was most noticeable in the utility regressions. Only the manager's perceived opportunity for the subordinate to participate is significantly related to the subordinate's perception of utility. However, this relationship is not verified in both samples. The previously evident impact that contributions of the subordinate have on utility in the other regressions is completely absent from these data.

Insert Table 6 Here

The amount of variance explained in satisfaction also is less than in previous regressions. However, it does remain highly significant. The previously noted pattern of criticism having a negative impact on satisfaction is evident. Contribution is a secondary predictor of satisfaction with these data, although it had shown up only sporadically in previous regressions. Notably absent in these results is the positive relationship between opportunity and satisfaction. This relationship had been present in all previous regressions.

DISCUSSION

Greller's earlier study suggested that it is the perceived opportunity rather than contribution that is key. This study's data demonstrate that contribution, whether it's based on subordinate's or manager's perceptions, often has an impact on key outcomes of PA. Contribution is especially important when the manager's perspective is considered. These results help remind us that the manager's outcomes from appraisal are important too. Subordinate contribution is clearly of major utility to the manager not just secondary utility to the subordinate. Had both views within the manager-subordinate dyad not been considered, opportunity would have continued to be overrated and contribution would have again been underrated in their impacts.

One empirical reason for this result is apparent in the magnitude of correlations between manager and subordinate perceptions of their joint PA experience. While significant, the correlation of each party's perception of opportunity to participate was fairly minimal. Part of this was due to the reliability of the manager's assessment of this

construct. While opportunity was reliably measured by the subordinates in both samples ($\alpha = .77$), the manager measures contained more error variance ($\alpha = .58$ and $.50$). Understandably, managers had more trouble assessing their subordinates' perceived opportunity or "psychological" participation than their actual behavioral contributions to the decision processes in the PA meeting. This latter construct was reliably measured by both parties (alphas ranged from $.73$ to $.78$) and there was a higher (but far from high) level of convergence in terms of intercorrelation between subordinates and manager measures.

There were also low correlations between managers and their subordinates on the extent of learning or improved role clarity the subordinate had experienced. In general, the participants to the PA event tend to co-vary more on their levels of satisfaction than utility. This may happen because managers have more difficulty knowing the subordinate's utility than they do knowing the subordinate's satisfaction. Alternatively, it may occur because the two parties tend to define utility quite differently.

Managers and their subordinates tended to concur on performance level (criticism), but diverged on reactions to it. Previous work (Kay, Meyer & French, 1965; Nemeroff & Wexley, 1977) has suggested that criticism makes the subordinate defensive which, in turn, leads to little or no performance improvement. On the other hand, criticism is a predictor of the utility that the manager thinks the subordinate experiences. Thus there may be a tendency among managers to criticize performance because they believe it will be useful to their subordinates. Nevertheless, there are no indications in the results from the present study that criticism has any relation, positive or

negative, with actual utility, manager or subordinate. When this finding is coupled with the consistent results that criticism leads to dissatisfaction, it raises the question of whether appraisals should involve any criticism at all. In this study, criticism was operationalized in terms of the appraisal rating itself, so these results really question the value of feeding back evaluative ratings. The question can only be raised, however, because satisfaction and utility are only two of many criteria that could be used to determine whether global performance ratings should be fed back.

The fact that there are such divergent patterns in perceptions and interrelationships among perceptions points to an inherent dilemma in assessing PA effectiveness. Arguably, multiple constituencies should be used for this task. But here we see how two key constituents of PA, the parties that actually use the system, often diverge on key reactions to the meeting (e.g., utility) and disagree in a number of ways on the key predictors of the PA success. These kinds of differences can lead to problems that result in many companies continually changing their systems in a effort to come up with the right combination of practices, forms, and philosophies. (Wexley & Klimoski, 1984; Latham & Wexley, 1982).

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates the need to address more than subordinate perceptions in PA research. Too often methods have not matched the complexities of the phenomena we attempt to understand. PA is a multi-person event and should be analyzed with a methodology in which multiple perspectives are employed. Assessing only one party's views and reactions or comparing unmatched, aggregated subordinate and manager

perceptions ignores an important reality which needs to be addressed in expanding our understanding of appraisal processes in organizations.

In the past, divergence in perceptions has been interpreted as evidence of invalidity or error. As noted by Smircich and Chesser (1981) this view stems from one's view of the nature of social reality (Burrell & Morgan, 1979): "Those who subscribe to an ontology of realism would say that differences in reported perception are due to individual distortions of the unique, objective, and 'true' reality" (Smircich & Chesser, 1981, p. 199). Implicit in many of the above interpretations of convergence and divergence is more of a "nominalist" view which holds that social reality is more subjective, and divergent constructions of the appraisal event are not only possible, but probable. The natural extension of the "realist" view of this research would be to develop better measures of such constructs where divergence in perceptions is present, such as opportunity to participate. The nominalist view suggests that different levels of disagreement and agreement in a dynamic interpersonal event like a PA meeting accurately reflects an important aspect of social reality. The natural questions that stem from this view include: (a) When and why do managers and subordinates converge on a shared definition of reality? and (b) What are some consequences for both parties when they diverge or converge on key aspects of their joint experiences?

This study takes a step toward building a "nominalist" view of subordinate participation in appraisals. It presents some general patterns of perceptions and reactions by the participants. More research is needed to determine why managers and subordinates converge

in some areas and diverge in others. Even more importantly, research is needed to trace the consequences of this divergence and convergence.

In summary, this research underscores two important topics in the appraisal literature. One has to do with the characteristics of the appraisal meeting. The other relates to methodological issues in studying PA. On the PA characteristics side, this research underscores the importance of participation in PA. With performance level controlled, participation, in one or both of its two forms, (a) the opportunity to participate and (b) behavioral contribution in the meeting, has important impacts on two key indices of PA effectiveness. Notable in the results are the impacts of contribution by the subordinate. Its importance was not apparent in Greller's research, but was strongly evident here, especially in terms of the manager's perceptions. Participation, it seems, is not something done only for the sake of the subordinate. Future research could usefully explore the situational factors that increase or diminish the amount of behavioral participation by the subordinate, and could usefully delineate the forms and impacts of manager participation.

This investigation also underscores conclusions previously noted by Smircich and Chesser that "research must go beyond the level of agreement in order to explore fully the perceptions resulting from interactions between supervisors and subordinates" (1981, p. 204). The methodological implication of this view is that the dyad, rather than the person, must be the unit of analysis. In general, the bulk of PA research has either used subordinates or managers in isolation from one another to analyze the performance appraisal session. This approach, as well as the strategy of comparing unmatched, aggregate groups of

subordinates and managers, has limited usefulness for the task of deciphering the dyadic relationship at the center of an appraisal event.

REFERENCES

- Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. 1979. Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis. London: Heinemann.
- Greller, M. M. 1978. The nature of subordinate participation in the appraisal interview. Academy of Management Journal, 21(4), 646-658.
- Greller, M. M. 1975. Subordinate participation and reactions to the appraisal interview. Journal of Applied Psychology. 60(5), 554-549.
- Henemann, H. G. 1974. Comparison of self and superior ratings of managerial performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 638-642.
- Ilgen, D. R., Peterson, R. B., Martin, B. A. & Boesch, D. A. 1981. Supervisor and subordinate reactions to performance appraisal sessions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 28, 371-330.
- Kay, E., Meyer, H. H. & French, J. R. P. 1965. Effects of threat in a performance appraisal interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 311-317.
- Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. 1981. Increasing productivity through performance appraisal. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1981.
- Mount, M. K. 1984. Satisfaction with a performance appraisal system and appraisal discussion. Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 5, 271-279.
- Nemeroff, W. F., & Wexley, K. N. 1977. Relationships between performance appraisal interview outcomes by supervisors and subordinates. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Orlando, Florida.
- Prince, J. B., & Lawler, E. E., III. In press. Does salary discussion hurt the developmental performance appraisal meeting? Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. Expected August, 1986.
- Smircich, L., & Chesser, R. J. 1981. Supervisors' and Subordinates' Perceptions of Performance: Beyond Disagreement. Academy of Management Journal, 24(1), 198-205.
- Wexley, K. N., Alexander, R. A., Greenawalt, J. P., & Couch, M. A. 1980. Attitudinal congruence and similarity as related to interpersonal evaluations in manager-subordinate dyads. Academy of Management Journal, 23(1), 320-330.

Wexley, K. N., & Pulakos, E. D. 1983. The effects of perceptual congruence and sex on subordinates' performance appraisal of their managers. Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 666-676.

TABLE 1
Descriptive Statistics^a

	<u>BA Sample</u>			<u># of Items</u>	<u>AO Sample</u>		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Alpha</u>		<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Alpha</u>
I. <u>Subordinate's View:</u>							
1. Contribution by Sub	3.80	1.43	.78	3	4.11	1.33	.73
2. Opportunity for Sub	4.69	1.39	.77	3	4.78	1.34	.77
3. Criticism (Rating)	2.83	1.26	-	1	2.78	1.14	-
4. Utility for Sub	3.59	1.44	.87	3	3.79	1.37	.84
5. Satisfaction of Sub	4.23	1.54	.86	3	4.17	1.50	.85
II. <u>Manager's View:</u>							
6. Contribution by Sub	4.43	1.21	.74	3	4.65	1.16	.77
7. Opportunity for Sub	5.54	.83	.58	3	5.64	.75	.50
8. Criticism (Rating)	2.96	1.26	-	1	2.95	1.18	-
9. Utility for Sub	4.96	.92	.73	3	5.09	.83	.72
10. Satisfaction of Sub	5.34	1.21	-	1	5.32	1.17	-
11. Utility for Mgr	4.15	1.27	.84	3	4.27	1.29	.84
12. Satisfaction of Mgr	5.12	1.08	.82	3	5.07	1.05	.78

a: BA sample consisted of approximately 335 subordinates and 320 managers. The AO sample had approximately 450 subordinates and 455 managers.

TABLE 2
Correlations Between Manager
and Subordinate Perceptions^a
(Matched Pairs)

Key Pairs of Variables:

Manager's and Subordinate's Perceptions of:

	<u>BA Sample</u>	<u>AO Sample</u>
- Contribution by the subordinate	.14*	.22***
- Opportunity for the subordinate	.13*	.11*
- Criticism	.60***	.47***
- Satisfaction of the subordinate	.27***	.30***
- Utility for the subordinate	.08	.09*
Subordinate's Satisfaction & Manager's Own Satisfaction	.19**	.23***
Subordinate's Utility & Manager's Own Utility	.04	-.01
Manager's View of Subordinate's Satisfaction & Own Satisfaction	.46***	.52***
Manager's View of Subordinate's Utility & Own Utility	.33***	.41***

Note: a. The approximate number of cases for first seven pairs of correlations are 236 and 396 for the BA and AO samples, respectively. The approximate N for the last two pairs are 319 and 450 for the BA and AO samples respectively.

* .05 ≥ p > .01 ** .01 ≥ p > .001 *** p ≤ .001

TABLE 3

Subordinate Reactions to and Perceptions of the Appraisal Event

<u>Appraisal Reactions:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>Characteristics of Appraisal Event</u>		
			<u>Beta^a</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Beta</u>
			Participation Contribution by Subordinate	Opportunity to Participate for Subordinate	Criticism
<u>PA Utility for Subordinate</u>					
Greller's Bank Sample ^b	280	.43***	09	38***	15*
Greller's R&D Sample	31	.66 ^c	04	63***	15
GE's BA Sample	224	.58***	20**	47***	03
GE's AO Sample	376	.56***	20***	43***	00
<u>PA Satisfaction of Subordinate</u>					
Greller's Bank Sample	280	.58***	-08	52***	-22**
Greller's R&D Sample	31	.66 ³	-11	70***	02
GE's BA Sample	224	.78***	04	63***	-25***
GE's AO Sample	376	.78***	00	59***	-25***

a. The coefficients are standardized regression weights with the decimals removed.

b. The R value and Beta weights for the Bank and R&D samples are from Greller (1978).

c. Not significant with the small n.

*.05 \geq p > .01

** .01 \geq p > .001

*** p \leq .001

TABLE 4

Manager Reactions to and Perceptions of the Appraisal Event

		Manager Perceptions of the Characteristics of the Appraisal Event			
			Participation- Contribution	Opportunity to Participate	Criticism
<u>Manager's Reactions:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>Beta^a</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Beta</u>
<u>PA Utility for Manager</u>					
BA Sample	224	.41 ***	39 ***	07	05
AO Sample	376	.33 ***	29 ***	13 **	06
<u>PA Satisfaction of Manager</u>					
BA Sample	224	.40 ***	04	34 **	-14 *
AO Sample	376	.35 ***	22 ***	19 ***	-12 *

Note: a. The coefficients are standardized regression weights with the decimals removed.

* $.05 \geq p < .01$

** $.01 \geq p < .001$

*** $p \leq .001$

TABLE 5

Manager's Perceptions of the Appraisal Event
and of the Subordinate's Reactions

Manager's Perception of Subordinate's Reactions	Manager's Perception of the Characteristics of the Appraisal Event:					
	N	R	Participation	Opportunity	Criticism	
			-Contribution for subordinate	to Participate for Subordinate	Beta	
			^a Beta	Beta	Beta	
<u>PA Utility for Sub</u>						
BA Sample	224	.41 ***	32 ***	15 *	18 **	
AO Sample	376	.42 ***	34 ***	17 ***	20 ***	
<u>PA Satisfaction of Sub^b</u>						
BA Sample	224	.55 ***	03	29 ***	-43 ***	
AO Sample	376	.41 ***	13 **	16 ***	-31 ***	

Note: a. The Beta coefficients are standardized regression weights with the decimals removed.

b. This was a single-item from Greller's satisfaction with PA scale.

* $.05 \geq p < .01$ ** $.01 \geq p < .001$ *** $p \leq .001$

TABLE 6

Subordinate Reactions to and Manager's Perceptions
of the Appraisal Event
(Matched Pairs)

Subordinates' Reactions:	N	R	Managers' Perceptions of:		
			Contribution- of Subordinate Beta ^a	Opportunity to Participate for Subordinate Beta	Criticism Beta
<u>PA Utility for Subordinate</u>					
BA Sample	224	.15	11	03	-07
AO Sample	376	.15 *	08	11 *	01
<u>PA Satisfaction of Subordinate</u>					
BA Sample	224	.34 ***	16 *	01	-28 ***
AO Sample	376	.26 ***	11 *	06	-20 ***

Note: a. The coefficients are standardized regression weights with the decimals removed.

* $.05 \geq p < .01$

** $.01 \geq p > .001$

*** $p \leq .001$