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ABSTRACT

Performance appraisals are prevalent in all credible hospitality organizations today (Capelli, 2016). After an extensive review of the literature, it is apparent that there is a considerable disconnect between the execution of the performance appraisal and the outcomes that a practitioner would expect. With the use of the implicit person theory (IPT) and the five-factor model (FFM), this study pursued a view of how the personality disposition of a manager may affect how a performance appraisal is perceived by subordinates suggesting that innately some managers are better suited to conduct performance appraisals. The aim of this research was to assess the relationship between the employee’s perceived fairness and effectiveness of a recently conducted performance appraisal and a manager’s IPT disposition and FFM personality attributes.

Paired data were collected using four established instruments; two for the predictor variables and two for the dependent variables. IPT Disposition Survey (Dweck, 1999) and FFM Survey (Shafer, 1999) were used to collect predictor variable data. Justice Measures Survey (Colquit, 2001) and Effective Performance Evaluation Survey (Longenecker, Liverpool & Wilson, 1988) were used to collect dependent variable data. Additionally, demographic and descriptive data were obtained. A response rate of 77% (N=90) was received after hand-delivered survey packets were distributed to the manager and the employee samples. The participants were from 20 different hospitality organizations located in the northeast region of the United States; the sample was derived from hotels (7), restaurants (8) and private clubs (5).

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson’s Coefficient correlation analysis, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and regression analyses to test 15 hypothesis and to answer five research questions. Statistical significance was found between IPT incrementalism
and perceived fairness \[ r (90) = .400, p < .000 \]. Regression analysis revealed IPT incrementalism was statistically significant in predicting perceived fairness \( F (1, 89) = 16.722, p < .000 \). Statistical significance was also present between IPT incrementalism and perceived effectiveness \[ r (90) = .435, p < .000 \]. Regression analysis revealed IPT incrementalism was statistically significant in predicting perceived fairness \( F (1, 89) = 20.501, p < .000 \). Among the manager sample, statistical significance was found in agreeableness of FFM related to effectiveness \( F (1, 89) = 4.508, p = .037 \). Lastly, sex and age were examined for differences in means. Among the employee sample, a \( t \) – Test for equality of means revealed a statistically significant difference in means between sex and fairness \[ t (88) = -1.99, p = .049 \]. Practical and research implications are discussed; recommendations for further research and limitations regarding this present research are included.

**Keywords:** performance evaluation, manager personality, employee perceptions, fairness, effectiveness
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Most supervisory and managerial employees in the hospitality businesses today are on the “front line” of human resource management (Baum, 2008; Watson, Maxwell, & Farquharson, 2007). With the use of the implicit person theory (IPT) and the five-factor model (FFM), this study will analyze the relationship between the personality disposition of hospitality managers and how performance appraisals are perceived by managers and their subordinates. Discussion in this chapter is organized in the following sections: (1) overview of the issues, (2) statement of the problem, (3) purpose of the study, (4) brief description of methodology, (5) significance of the study, (6) limitations of the study, and (7) conclusions.

Overview of the Issues

Supervisors and line managers in hospitality organizations often play a major role in human resource functions, including conducting performance appraisals (Solnet, Kralj, & Baum, 2015). Performance appraisals are an additional managerial responsibility for front-line managers in which the effectiveness of their execution is proving to be a critical ingredient in the very important areas of recruitment, retention, and motivation. In addition, having an effective performance appraisal system ensures hospitality organizations stay competitive in a shrinking labor pool. The department manager or supervisor within the hospitality organization is charged with this responsibility, yet rarely are they formally trained in how to conduct a proper performance appraisal. The managers are closest to the situations regarding line level employee performance and usually become proficient in the process of employee performance appraisals as they acquire an understanding of the impact and the importance of the process.

Performance evaluation systems are central to a cross-section of management functions, such as determining employee compensation and rewards, providing developmental feedback,
documenting administrative decisions, succession planning, and reinforcing organizational norms (Cascio & Aguinis, 2005). Most modern organizations rely on some form of performance appraisal system to provide employees with feedback and to help organizations make decisions (Cleveland, Murphy, & Williams, 1989; Landy & Farr, 1980).

There are many different procedures, systems, and forms employed in conducting performance appraisals. The three most common forms used by hospitality organizations are management by objective (MBO), behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS), and 360 Rater. All three are used effectively within hospitality organizations today. The evaluation system that works well for one company will not automatically work well for another establishment (Umbreit, Eder, & McConnell, 1986). Furthermore, specific evaluation forms and procedures are often administered for different departments within a hospitality organization. For example, for a salesperson, the performance appraisal procedure most often used would be MBO because of its ability to quantitatively measure the achievements of goals. The MBO contains measurable pre-set goals and objectives that the employee would then be evaluated on regarding reaching the goals and to what extent they achieved the goals, after an agreed amount of time had elapsed. In evaluating a senior manager or executive, the evaluation procedure would be the 360 Rater because of the comprehensiveness of the information obtained from the procedure. 360 Rater obtains feedback regarding the employee from multiple sources including subordinates and peers as well as supervisors. The information is then analyzed from multiple angles, which produces a comprehensive evaluation. For line level employees in the hospitality industry, the evaluation procedure most often used would be the BARS evaluation procedure because of its ease of use and the flexibility of the procedure’s application. The form would typically contain a Likert scale with a description of the performance objective in which the rater is forced to choose
a rating within each category. After each category, the manager is asked to elaborate with written information related to the evaluation that they selected as to provide examples of the behavior and to add validity to the assessment. Whichever system or form is used, one aspect of the procedure remains constant and that is the rater, which by definition is the manager conducting the evaluation. An appraisal instrument, no matter how carefully developed, is only as good as the people who use it (Latham, Almost, Mann, & Moore, 2005).

Knowing what performance appraisal procedure to utilize is typically dictated by the hospitality organization. However, the design and functional parts of the review are only one part of the development. How the interpersonal part of the review is managed can make or break your success as a manager, and the development and success of your employees (Shumacher, 2008). Despite the best intentions on the part of the managers, most performance review discussions tend to deflate employees instead of energizing them (Thompson, 2012). It seems that some managers are adept at the art of conducting a performance appraisal and others struggle with the procedure; nonetheless, all managers can be trained to do better jobs of counseling their subordinates (Hoppock, 1958). A performance evaluation that is accurate, fair and delivered appropriately can have a positive influence on an employee and has the potential to achieve improved performance. The employee must actually believe that there is a need to improve, and so they must accept the feedback received, and therefore we see research on employee reactions as an important step in future research (DeNisi & Pritchard, 2006).

Skepticism as to the quality of the information obtained from human evaluation has persisted for nearly as long as the field of psychological measurement (Thorndike, 1925; Wells, 1907). Given that unfair performance appraisals can be detrimental to the employee and the organization, it is important additional research be conducted as to why some managers struggle
when conducting the appraisal process (Heslin & VandeWalle, 2011). It is possible that the damage incurred from an unfair or ineffective performance appraisal is magnified in the hospitality industry because the performance of hospitality employees has a direct connection to the success of their employers with the level of service they extend to their customers.

There are many aspects of the process of conducting an employee performance evaluation, and perhaps the most important area is establishing benchmark standards or operational parameters of which the employee is going to be compared to and measured against, including the employee’s past performance. It is the operational parameters of the performance appraisal in which an employee becomes a front and center issue. Greenberg (1996) found consistent applications of standards to be a determinant of fair performance appraisals. If employees do not believe in the system perceiving it to be bias, unjust and inaccurate, then the employee will not accept the feedback and simply disregard the outcomes (Levy & Williams, 2004). Performance standards are developed to inform employees of the level of performance they are expected to achieve or the objectives they are expected to accomplish (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984).

This research investigated the perceptions of the fairness and effectiveness of performance appraisals from the perception of the employee. Fairness is considered an essential tenet of an accepted and effective performance evaluation system (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998). If performance appraisals are perceived as unfair, they can diminish rather than enhance employee’s attitude and performance (Kay, Meyer, & French, 1965; Latham & Mann, 2006). When employees do not perceive fairness in the methods used for a performance appraisal, the results of such are rendered insignificant (Wilson, 1991; Roberts, 1998; Blau, 1999; Eichel & Bender, 1984; Grote, 2010). Evans and McShanne (1988) suggest that the more
the employees believe the evaluation process to be fair, the more likely it is for them to endorse the system and accept its outcomes.

In recognizing the need to research the perception of the employee relating to the fairness and effectiveness of the performance appraisal, this research focused on evaluating the rater using the theoretical framework of the implicit person theory (IPT). A manager’s IPT disposition indicates how the manager feels about the usefulness of performance evaluation process and because possessing various attributes of the IPT alters the delivery of the evaluation, this was a critical first step in the overall approach of this research. Secondly, this research utilized the five-factor model (FFM) to further analyze the relationship between the manager’s personality traits and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of a performance evaluation from the employees’ viewpoint. It is recognized that there has been extensive research on performance appraisals within the hospitality industry. However, no known research has explored performance appraisals within the hospitality industry utilizing manager’s IPT and FFM assessments while assessing the fairness and effectiveness of a performance appraisal from the employee’s perspective.

**Statement of the Problem**

One of the most challenging parts of the hospitality industry is to attract and retain the best employees, as these employees can directly contribute to the competitive advantage of the organization (Law & Tam, 2008). In the labor-intensive hospitality industry, employees play an important role in providing quality services to guests, and employees’ knowledge of keeping a high level of guest satisfaction would thus be a key issue to help generate on-going business (Cheung & Law, 1998; Powers & Barrows, 1999). Therefore, managers and supervisors refine
their performance appraisal skills through experience in the field in order to obtain and maintain a certain level of competence in this area in an effort to stay current and competitive.

As the performance appraisal process is a vital part of managing a workforce and contributes to the overall competitiveness of an organization, a calculated review of the fundamental issues surrounding performance appraisals is necessary. The first fundamental issue is rater subjectivity or rater bias. The rater is defined as the manager who conducts and executes the evaluation with their subordinates, and the problematic situation is what one rater believes to be poor performance another rater may perceive as average. There is no rating instrument, based on subjective judgment that can guarantee a true reflection of a person’s job performance (Umbriet, Eder, & McConnel, 1986). Since the categories of evaluation and the subsection of the forms are all pre-set, the evaluation simply comes down to how the rater interprets the employee’s job performance against pre-set benchmarks within each category. This introduces a wide range of confounding variables related to potential rater bias affecting the results such as dynamics of relationships, culture bias, similarity bias, halo and horns effect and there are many more discussed in this study’s literature review.

A second problematic issue of performance appraisals is that reporting on a subordinate’s performance, and delivering the evaluation during a one-on-one meeting can be an intimidating task for even for an experienced manager. Performance appraisals represent one of the more difficult tasks that managers are required to perform in fulfilling their job responsibilities (Feldman, 1981). Regardless of the proficiency and experience the manager or supervisor has in conducting performance appraisals; it is a process that is intimidating and uncomfortable. The same holds true for even the veteran hospitality employee as they are never eager to engage in the process and often will not seek out this formal feedback procedure. There is probably
nothing in the field of management that is more common, and there is practically no other human
resources tool utilized universally by organizations that people disdain more than performance
appraisals (Cappelli, 2016). The greatest denigrated (as well as disliked) aspect of human
resources management is the process of evaluating an employee’s job performance since it is
almost always an uncomfortable experience for everyone involved (Kondrasuk, 2010). Even
though the process may be uncomfortable and intimidating, the information shared through a
properly conducted performance appraisal can have long-lasting positive effects on an employee
that can result in improved performance which creates a successful outcome for the organization.

In contrast, because unfair performance appraisals can have such a negative impact, it is
important to investigate why organizations are challenged when conducting performance
appraisals (Heslin & VandeWalle, 2011). Many studies have looked at the tools that are in place
and how effective they are, how to use them, when they should be used, and the frequency in
which they should be conducted. Thomas and Bretz (1994) state that the performance appraisal
has remained a largely unsatisfactory endeavor and that everyone involved tend to anticipate
appraisal feedback sessions with fear and loathing. Although it may be a meeting that the
supervisor and the employee do not look forward to, the importance of the subject matter
overrides the sensitivity of the situation. As Shumaker stated (2008), performance reviews are a
vital part of developing employees, and the use of performance appraisals within the hospitality
industry not only helps identify training needs for employees, it also acts as a common tool that
serves all the major stakeholders involved. It has been strongly suggested that an effectively
administered performance appraisal system can provide the subordinate, the manager, and the
organization with a myriad of positive benefits (Cascio, 1982).
With the application of the IPT and the FFM personality assessments, this study examines the relationship between predisposed personality dispositions of a manager conducting a performance appraisal and the effects this has on employee’s perceived fairness and perceived effectiveness of the performance appraisal.

**Purpose of this Study**

Research regarding the use of and procedures surrounding performance appraisals has been extensive. The areas of instrumentation application, frequency analysis, as well as other fundamental procedural attributes have been analyzed and thus has received much research attention. There has been no known research related to the hospitality industry that has investigated how a manager’s personality disposition affects the perceived fairness and perceived effectiveness of an employee related to a recently conducted performance appraisal. As an alternative to following the popular path of performance appraisal research as it relates to the process, the forms, and the administrative functions; the aim of this study was to investigate the rater’s personality and how this effects the perceived fairness and perceived effectiveness of the procedure from the employees perspective. Moreover, this study objectively evaluated the manager’s personality with the use of well-established instruments, IPT survey and FFM survey, and measured the relationship these metrics have on the perceived fairness and effectiveness of the employee evaluation. Recognizing there is no known previous hospitality research in this specific area, this study fills a void that exists in hospitality performance appraisal research related to examining the relationship between a manager’s pre-disposed personality disposition and the employees’ perception of fairness and effectiveness.

The purpose of this study was to expand on the existing literature and contribute to academic research and assist with improving practical applications regarding the performance
appraisal process within the hospitality industry. This study fills a gap that currently exists in the hospitality performance appraisal literature by utilizing the IPT and FFM as the framework for the investigation and analysis of the performance appraisal. Moreover, this study breaks ground by focusing on the critical post-evaluation perceptions of employees that center on the rater. The following research questions and hypotheses guided this study:

RQ1: How does a manager’s IPT disposition impact an employees’ perceived fairness of performance evaluations?
   H1: A manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.

RQ2: How does a manager’s IPT disposition impact employees’ perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations?
   H2: A manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

RQ3: How does a manager’s personality (FFM) impact the perceived fairness and effectiveness of performance evaluations of their subordinates?
   H3: A manager’s (FFM) Agreeableness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.
   H4: A manager’s (FFM) Consciousness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.
   H5: A manager’s (FFM) Openness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.
   H6: A manager’s (FFM) Extraversion positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.
H7: A manager’s (FFM) Neuroticism negatively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

RQ4: Controlling for a manager’s FFM, does IPT disposition explain additional differences in employees’ perceived fairness or effectiveness of performance evaluations?

H8: When controlling for a manager’s FFM, IPT incrementalism disposition explains additional positive differences in employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.

H9: When controlling for a manager’s FFM, IPT incrementalism disposition explains additional positive differences in employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

RQ5: Are there any differences in perceived fairness or effectiveness based on demographic variables?

H10: An employee’s sex has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H11: An employee’s sex has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

H12: A manager’s sex has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H13: A manager’s sex has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

H14: An employee’s age has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H15: An employee’s age has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.
**Brief Description of Methodology**

The methodology used in this research was exploratory and investigated correlational relationships between the independent and dependent variables. Demographic information obtained from the samples included: (1) age, (2) industry experience, (3) sex, (4) education level, (5) job title, (6) industry segment employment. Regression analysis was utilized to assess the relationship between the independent variables and dependent variables. The independent variables are identified as the manager’s IPT score and the manager’s FFM scores. The dependent variables are identified as the results of the two employee surveys; the justice evaluation survey scores and the effective performance appraisal survey score. In total, four well-established instruments were utilized including; the IPT survey, the FFM survey, the justice survey, and the effective performance appraisal survey.

The sample of managers and employees were paired in the analysis as to analyze the relationship between the results. The sample size for manager participants was 90, and the sample size of the employees was 90; indicating one manager and one employee within each pairing. The sample was derived from a cross-section of hospitality industries including hotels, restaurants, and private clubs. The manager must have had to be employed by their organization for more than twelve months, and the employees had to have worked with the manager for at least twelve months. The performance evaluation that the employee was asked to evaluate was a recently conducted evaluation that was less than twelve months old. The geographical location of the data collection took place in the northeast region of the United States that is a well-known, upscale, summer vacation destination. The researcher spent many years working in this area and has many industry contacts that assisted in the participation of this study.
The method of data collection was in person with the use of paper surveys, and the researcher met with each participating organization in face to face. This process of data collection assisted with the explanation of the study, as well as promoted and ultimately improved participation. This study was conducted with the highest moral and ethical expectations, complete with the necessary and standard policies in place including IRB approval. The IRB approval and exempt form is located in Appendix A, Human Subjects Approval. Additionally, signed informed consent forms were obtained from all participants prior to engaging in the survey packets. All data collected was stored in a secure location and remained confidential with only the researcher having access. After pairing the manager/employee dyads, all identifying numbers were destroyed. Further, all data has since been destroyed so that no identification to the participants could ever be made. After the data was collected and cleaned, the statistical methods previously mentioned were executed with the use of the statistical programming package SPSS version 22.

**Significance of Study**

A survey by Pulakos (2004) indicated that only 10% of employees feel that their company’s performance evaluation system helps them enhance their performance. One of the main purposes of the performance appraisal process is for the manager to communicate deficiencies in performance so that the employee’s performance improves. However, the literature on this subject indicates that there is a disconnect between execution and outcome. The lack of effectiveness regarding performance appraisals is of particular interest in the hospitality industry as it is labor dependent and reliant on the performance of employees. Arguably, the hospitality industry has much at stake when it comes to performing performance appraisals that are effective due to their proven relationship with creating and establishing a productive
workforce. Hospitality is an industry that remains highly labor-intensive where labor expenses are often the biggest expense item on the profit and loss statement (Brien & Smallman, 2011). Barney (1995) and Guest (1987) point out that the contributions of employees’ performance directly affect the quality of services, which is a direct outcome of the role of the performance appraisal. Given performance appraisals established relationship with increased motivation, commitment, and performance, understanding its antecedents is important for researchers and practitioners (Cook & Crossman, 2004; Jawahar, 2006; Pearce & Porter, 1986).

Employees’ perceptions toward the appraisal process have been shown to affect the efficacy of the appraisal system, which in turn influences organizational productivity and profitability (Langan-Fox, Bell, McDonald, & Morizzi, 1996). Therefore, it is important to research areas of the performance appraisal that may influence an employee’s perception of fairness and effectiveness related to the performance appraisal process. Utilizing the IPT and the FFM in this study, the aim was to provide empirical research in which future research is able to build upon. From a practitioner’s standpoint, this study addresses the fact that there are differences in rater’s personalities that have major ramifications that relate to the employee’s perception of fairness and effectiveness of the performance evaluation. The evidence within this study suggests that it is important to evaluate the IPT disposition of a manager before allowing them to engage in performance appraisals. At a minimum, being exposed to the findings of this study should encourage hospitality organizations to better understand the performance appraisal process as it relates to employee’s perceptions. In turn, this may lead to more training and development in the area of performance appraisals and potentially have industry benefit from providing attention to the rater as well as the rated.
Limitations of Study

This study attempted to make several important contributions and, as with most studies, this study has limitations. It is to be acknowledged that this study is not a true experiment. The selection process for the sample was not the desirable random sampling method in which each sample of the population has an equal probability of being selected. A less desirable sample known as a nonprobability sample or convenience sample was utilized that employed a strategy whereby participants were recruited based on their accessibility (Babbie, 1990). Because this study employed a convenience sampling technique to obtain participants and did not employ a simple random sampling technique, it is unable to be deemed a true experiment. When individuals are not assigned or chosen from the population randomly, the procedure is called a quasi-experiment, which would be appropriate recognition for this study. As the design of the study is multi-sourced and utilizes paired data, proceeding with this type of sampling has been established in the research and was deemed appropriate from a practical standpoint.

Another limitation of this study is that it is a field study that examined the reactions to real performance appraisals that had meaningful consequences for employees. However, the participating organizations being from three different hospitality segments, most likely differed in the administration of their performance appraisal process. Recognizing that this affects the external reliability of the study, the researchers attempted to gather as much data from like organizations as much as possible to reduce this limitation. An initial review of the participating organization’s performance appraisal procedures was conducted to ensure similarity among the procedures. If a performance appraisal procedure was deemed unlike the others, that organization was not included in the study.
Also a limitation was the fact that the sample was represented by three different hospitality segments and this design was implemented for practical purposes related to gaining more participation and reaching an adequate sample size. However, combining employee data from hotels, restaurants, and private clubs may have had an effect on the results. In referencing the convenience sample, the sample was purposive as well. The participants were from a specific area of a northeast region of the United States which limits the generalizability of the results to other parts of the United States.

Finally, the study relied on multiple instruments in the form of self-administered questionnaires. In doing so, the researcher had no control regarding the conditions that the questionnaires were conducted and was unable to assess that conditions for all participants were appropriate and similar.

**Conclusion**

Performance appraisals have long been an important method for improving workplace effectiveness (Reb & Cropanzano, 2007). These appraisals serve a variety of important purposes, such as identifying individuals for promotion, providing developmental feedback, underscoring training needs, and assigning merit pay (Cardy & Dobbins, 1994). Focusing on the fact that the performance appraisal is a long-standing staple in human resources management and one that has proven its importance, the focus of this study was simple; it was to assist in improving the process of performance appraisals for front-line employees in the hospitality industry, which in turn, will hopefully assist the managers, the organization, and the hospitality industry as a whole. It is evident that the performance appraisal is a powerful management tool that when administered properly, can produce numerous of positive outcomes for those involved. An appropriate means of performance evaluation in an organization is crucial for identifying
strength and weaknesses and for maintaining job commitment and improving performance on an ongoing basis (Church, 1995). There is existing literature suggesting that a firm’s ability to adopt a suitable performance evaluation system can assist the firm in facing the globally competitive environment and attaining desired goals (Chenhall, 1997; Foster & Sjoblom, 1996; Powell, 1995).

There is no dispute over the importance or the positive benefits of an effective performance appraisal system. However, even if an organization has the correct procedures, protocols, and tools in place, it still may have an ineffective performance appraisal system due to the inherited nature of the rater’s personality disposition. With the use of two well-established personality measurement instruments, this study’s aim was to assess the relationship between the management results from these two instruments and the employee results measuring perceived fairness and effectiveness. In doing so, this study attempted to illuminate the importance of addressing issues associated with the rater and maintain a focus on the rater. Managers rate the same performance differently and this study delves into this area by assisting in the understanding as to why this may occur. Moreover, because statistically significant relationships were discovered, this study begins to illustrate how organizations can improve on the disparity of performance evaluations by employing a new found strategy to have employees perceive them to be more just and more effective.

The aim of this study was to expand on the existing literature and contribute to academic and practical applications related to performance appraisals. With the use of the IPT and the FFM in this area, this study provides empirical research in which future research can build upon. From a practitioner’s standpoint, the motivation for this study was to address that there are differences in raters and that human resources departments may begin to address this. The
evidence within this study suggests that it may be important to evaluate the IPT disposition of a manager before allowing them to engage in performance appraisals. At a minimum, being exposed to the findings within this study should encourage more hospitality organizations to be more sensitive to the overall performance appraisal process and potentially shift the focus of the procedure from the rated to the rater. From an academic standpoint, this research could be developed further by other academics so that additional findings and key relationships may be discovered in the future.

**Definition of Terms**

Below are definitions of key terms that are used throughout this study

**Agreeableness (FFM):** “concerns to the degree to which individuals are cooperative, warm, and agreeable versus cold, disagreeable, and antagonistic” (Salgado, 1997, p. 30).

**Conscientiousness (FFM):** “measures the extent to which individuals are hardworking, organized, dependable, and persevering versus lazy, disorganized, and unreliable” (Salgado, 1997, p. 30).

**Effectiveness:** “the effectiveness of performance appraisals are a matter of perspective. The effectiveness of each system depends on each individual organization’s chosen method and the metrics used to indicate success” (Balle, n.d., p. 1).

**Entity implicit person theory (IPT) disposition:** “assumes that personal attributes influencing human behavior are static and are unable to be enhanced significantly over time” (Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995).

**Extraversion (FFM):** “extraversion concerns the extent to which individuals are gregarious, assertive, and sociable versus reserved, timid, and quiet” (Salgado, 1997, p. 30).
**Fairness:** “studies have shown that employees’ perception of justice in the workplace is related to physical and mental health (Robbins, Ford, & Tetrick, 2012) as well as performance, job satisfaction (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001), and job involvement (Heponiemi, Manderbacka, Vanska, & Elovainio, 2013)” (Enoksen, 2015, p. 723).

**Five-factor model (FFM):** “the five-factor model of personality is a hierarchical organization of personality traits in terms of five basic dimensions: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience” (McCrae & John, 1992, p. 215).

**Implicit Person Theory (IPT):** “suggests that people hold assumptions about the plasticity of personal attributes, such as ability and personality” (Heslin & VandWalle, 2011).

**Incremental implicit person theory (IPT) disposition:** “assumes that personal attributes are relatively malleable and able to be developed and improved” (Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995).

**Neuroticism (FFM):** “neuroticism concerns the degree to which the individual is insecure, anxious, depressed, and emotional versus calm, self-confident and cool” (Salgado, 1997, p. 30).

**Openness to experience (FFM):** “openness to experience defines individuals who are creative, curious, and cultured versus practical with narrow interests” (Salgado, 1997, p. 30).

**Performance evaluation:** “a measure of performance communicated as standards in the business and industry level standards translated to individual performance” (Prowse & Prowse, 2009, p. 198).
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Ghorpade and Chen (1995) suggested that performance appraisals are inevitable in all organizations, large and small, public and private, local and multinational, and the purpose of the performance appraisal process is to afford information to managers that will allow them to positively impact the performance of the employee (DeNisi & Pritchard, 2006). However, a review of the literature is not consistent with this viewpoint. An extensive review of literature related to performance evaluations in the hospitality industry revealed very little theory application to hospitality industry research studies. Most of the existing research studies concentrating on performance appraisals in the hospitality industry are conceptual and exploratory research papers, which are void of theoretical approaches. Moreover, the extant literature on performance appraisals concentrate on best practices, latest trends and the various forms and procedures used in the process of performance appraisals.

Multiple theories were reviewed for consideration regarding this research on performance appraisals research in the hospitality industry, and three theories emerged as most relevant to the objectives of this study: (1) the expectancy theory, (2) the image theory, (3) the implicit person theory (IPT), and the five-factor model of personality (FFM).

**Expectancy Theory**

The expectancy theory, or Reiss’s expectancy model, identifies three fundamental concerns related to performance evaluation; (1) injury, (2) anxiety, and (3) negative evaluation (Reiss, 1991). The attraction to this theory was that the theory proposes people feel anxiety before and during a performance appraisal. Further, the expectancy theory assumes the employee fears a negative evaluation which also seemed to fit this research; this was also supported by the extant literature regarding this subject. However, even though the injury fear
could be portrayed as a psychological, personal injury, or injury to personality, this did not seem to apply to the aim of this study, and therefore, Reiss’s expectancy model was removed from consideration.

The expectancy theory does deserve to be discussed as it relates to human resources literature and the application of such theoretical viewpoints. It was introduced by Edward Tolman and further developed by Victor Vroom. The expectancy theory of motivation is based on the belief that people are motivated to achieve goals that are unique and will enhance their attempt to achieve these goals if they believe the following: (1) the harder they work, the better perception of their performance, (2) if they execute their responsibilities successfully, they will be justly compensated, and (3) to be motivated to extend the necessary with energy and focus to achieve the goal, the compensation for doing so must be something the person is highly desirous of and is deemed essential by the employee (Lawler, Porter, & Vroom, 2009). The premise is that it is rooted in how employees are motivated to execute on the desired performance as it pertains motivation, in addition to how employees are managed. If an effective manager can utilize monetary and non-monetary strategies to motivate an employee, then they are being effective and have a firm understanding relating to underpinnings that are connected to this philosophy. Ultimately, the motivation to take a course of action is the employee’s choice; however, if an astute manager can institute effective balance as it pertains to effort, performance, and rewards, it will be beneficial for all stakeholders involved. To evaluate how an organization is performing related to the expectancy theory of motivation, the organization could review their turnover rates and retention rates in various areas of their operation. Should they find discrepancies, it may be suggested that they investigate the rewards (monetary and non-monetary) that are being offered to their employees and evaluate the compensation structures
across different apartments. Another strategy an organization could utilize is comparing job
duties and employee expectations that coincide with the expected rewards with like organizations
to ensure they are within the accepted and expected norms.

**Image Theory**

Image theory was the second theory considered for application toward this research
study, and it is defined as a theory that attempts to explain decision making in organizational
settings and assumes people use different strategies when making decisions, versus when making
judgments (Beach & Mitchell, 1987). Two aspects of the image theory were appealing. The
first is that the image theory assumes people focus on what is wrong and then focus on what is
right. The second is people weigh negatives more than positives. There was intrigue surrounding
these aspects of the image theory since the literature points to the fact that performance
appraisals are made up of two parts (administrative – behavioral). The two aspects of the image
theory (decision-making – judgments) seem to coincide with these two parts of performance
appraisal. After further review, the image theory did not prove to be suitable for research that
stems from evaluating the perceptions of the employee regarding the fairness and effectiveness
of a performance appraisal. However, it is interesting to note that image theory is heavily rooted
in a person’s values and beliefs as it relates to decision making. Moreover, it is the influence that
values and beliefs have that guide a person’s decision-making process. In this way, image theory
differs from the normative view of decision making which portrays making decisions as
gambles. The principles that guide image theory are rationality, analysis, orderliness, and
maximization (Beach & Mitchell, 1987).
Implicit Person Theory

The third theory considered for this research was the implicit person theory (IPT). Leadership styles, personalities, mood characteristics, and personal disposition can cause fluctuations in the effectiveness of performance appraisals (Neck et al., 1995). Therefore, there seems to be compelling reasons to evaluate the different approaches a rater may utilize and this can be achieved through the application of IPT. IPT posits individuals hold assumptions about the plasticity of personal attributes, such as ability and personality (Heslin & VandeWalle, 2011). People have IPTs that lie somewhere along a continuum from incremental IPT to the entity IPT assessment scale anchor points (Dweck, 1999). IPT has a scale of measurement, and it was assessed using the eight-item, domain-general “kind-of-person” degree measurement established by Levy and Dweck (1997). This measure evaluates implied principles that include the domains of ability and personality that are extremely relevant to employee related performance appraisal research.

Prior research has established that employees possess either an entity or incremental IPT disposition. The entity IPT assumes that personal attributes influencing human behavior (e.g., ability and personality) are for the most part, static and therefore, are unable to be enhanced significantly over time. Managers possessing an entity IPT disposition do not invest in training or development programs because they do not believe they can improve the performance of an employee. The incremental IPT assumes that personal attributes are relatively malleable and able to be developed and improved. Therefore, they believe in and utilize training and development programs (Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995). Managers possessing an incremental IPT disposition would rather coach and counsel rather than reprimand and punish, as they believe people can improve their performance through training and development (Dweck, 1999;
Dweck et al., 1995). Each IPT disposition occurs at roughly equal frequency. Moreover, neither IPT is related to people’s aptitude, training, or intellectual complexity (Dweck & Molden, 2008). Research has shown, however, that people who hold an entity theory view of personality take different approaches to understanding behaviors and forming impressions of others than do those who hold an incremental view (Hong, Chiu, Dweck, & Sacks, 1997). Research has established that people with an incremental IPT are more likely than entity theorists to believe that other people can improve, before helping them to do so (Levy & Dweck, 1997).

The fact that clear conceptual links can be drawn between what is known about how IPT influences the way managers act toward their employees was a salient indication that this was the appropriate theory to apply to this research. The literature thoroughly discussed the importance of manager/employee relationships, approaches to the different evaluation techniques, and staying consistent and unbiased throughout the performance appraisal process. After an extensive review of the literature surrounding performance evaluations in the hospitality industry, the discovery was the fact that there is very little theory being applied to the hospitality industry research studies in this area. Most of the research studies concentrating on performance appraisals in the hospitality industry are conceptual and exploratory research papers which do not contain theoretical approaches. Furthermore, the research studies reviewed concentrated on best practices, latest trends and various forms and procedures used in the process of performance appraisals. The IPT is broken into two parts, the judge (entity IPT) and the counselor (incremental IPT). The following explains the IPT and its application to the evaluation of how a manager’s IPT disposition may influence an employee’s perceived fairness and perceived effectiveness of performance appraisals in the hospitality industry.
Leadership styles, personalities, mood characteristics, and personal disposition can cause fluctuations in the effectiveness of performance appraisals (Neck, et al., 1995). Noting the above, there seems to be compelling reasons to evaluate the different approaches and methods a rater may utilize and this can be achieved through the application of the Implicit Person Theory. Implicit Person Theory (IPT) theorizes individuals hold assumptions about the plasticity of personal attributes, such as ability and personality (Heslin & VandeWalle, 2011). People have IPT’s that lie somewhere along a continuum from incremental IPT to the entity IPT assessment scale anchor points (Dweck, 1999). The IPT scale of measurement was assessed using the eight-item, domain-general “kind-of-person” scale established by Levy and Dweck (1997). A person is naturally inclined to possess either one or the other (entity or incremental). Each theory occurs at roughly equal frequency (Dweck & Molden, 2008). It appears that people who hold an entity theory view of personality take different approaches to understanding behaviors and forming impressions of others than do those who hold an incremental view (Hong, Chiu, Dweck, & Sacks, 1997). A prototypical entity IPT disposition assumes that personal attributes are largely a fixed entity and are not likely to change even with proper training and development while an incremental IPT disposition assumes that such personal attributes are adaptable and can be improved with proper feedback, training, and developmental programs (Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995).

Research has established that people with an incremental IPT are more likely than entity theorists to believe that other people can improve, before helping them to do so (Levy & Dweck, 1997).

Entity Implicit Person Theory - assumes that personal attributes that influence human behavior (e.g., ability and personality) are largely fixed and thus not likely to
change much over time. They don’t invest in training or development because they don’t believe it works.

Incremental Implicit Person Theory – reflects the assumption that such personal attributes are relatively malleable and able to be developed. They counsel rather than punish and believe that people can improve their performance through training and development. (Dweck, 1999; Dweck et al., 1995).

**Five-factor Model of Personality**

The five-factor model of personality (FFM) was utilized in this research study. Often referred to as the big five, the FFM has five distinct domains that are used to assess personality traits of individuals. In incorporating the FFM into this present study, it is important to note that each of the five domains of the FFM were utilized individually as predictor variables with the outcome variables of perceived fairness and perceived effectiveness of employees related to a recently conducted performance appraisal. The five domains of the FFM include:

- **Conscientiousness**: demonstrated as being orderly, well-organized, and achievement driven.

- **Neuroticism**: related to the degree of emotional control and stability and having control of impulses.

- **Extraversion**: exudes increased behavior in sociability, confidence, and verbal communication

- **Openness**: refers to having an advanced intellectual curiosity and a desire for a variety in life.

- **Agreeableness**: denotes being cooperative, helpful and empathic towards others.

(Miller, 1991)
The five factors of the FFM do not complete the description of personality, they simply represent the strongest levels of personality trait description (McCrae & John, 1992). As discussed by McCrae, Costa and Busch (1986), the five factors of FFM measurement:

gives a complete characterization of the person only at the global level. The factors represent groups of traits that co-vary, but are not necessarily interchangeable. A moderate score in extraversion, for example, might be obtained by an individual who was energetic but aloof, or lethargic but friendly, or average on both energy level and sociability. For many purposes, these distinctions are essential (p.144).

It is important to include a measurement of personality when assessing performance due to the influence personality has on achievement (Komarraju, Karau, Schmeck, & Avdic, 2011). Moreover, an employee’s performance evaluation is grounded on the achievements of that employee based on performance goals and objectives over a set period of time. In a review of the literature on personality evaluations, the FFM is a method that is highly respected and utilized throughout disciplines such as social psychology and organizational behavior and therefore it was utilized for this present research study. Although not without its critics, FFM seems to be the primary personality evaluation for social scientists and organizational behavior researchers. Therefore, FFM complements this present research study’s objectives in investigating how a manager’s personality disposition effects an employee’s perception of fairness and effectiveness related to a recently conducted performance appraisal.

Performance Appraisals

Performance evaluation systems are central to a cross-section of management functions, such as determining employee compensation and rewards, providing developmental feedback, documenting administrative decisions, succession planning, and reinforcing organizational
norms (Cascio & Aguinis, 2005). Most modern organizations rely on some form of performance appraisal system to provide employees with feedback and to help organizations make decisions (Cleveland, Murphy, & Williams, 1989; Landy & Farr, 1980). Ghorpade and Chen (1995) suggested that performance appraisals are inevitable in all organizations, large and small, public and private, local and multinational. The latest studies show that in the private sector, 90% of the workforce utilize appraisals and it is apparent there is good reason for the proliferation of performance appraisals as they are one of a very few management tools strategically utilized across an array of various industries and across most, if not all international borders (Capelli, 2016). It is evident that the employee appraisal process is a prevalent human resources tool that most organizations are aware of and utilize to some extent. These appraisals serve a variety of important purposes, such as identifying individuals for promotion, providing developmental feedback, underscoring training needs and assigning merit pay (Cardy & Dobbins, 1994). As one reviews the list of reasons why organizations would utilize an effective performance appraisal process, it is apparent that the areas effected, positively or negatively, are at the cornerstone of an organization’s operational productivity and ultimately, its success. A company’s performance evaluation process can be a useful instrument for employee motivation and development when employees perceive their performance appraisals to be fair and accurate (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979). Moreover, to achieve a positive outcome regarding a performance appraisal, the employee must perceive the information to be relevant and correct. Additionally, the process of the performance appraisal must be perceived by the employee as a just process, or there is danger in the experience to have negative performance effects due to the effect the results of the appraisal have on the employee. The performance appraisal outcomes
themselves can have an important influence on employee’s reactions toward their work, their managers, and the establishment they work for (Thurston & McNall, 2009).

The goal of the performance appraisal is to provide information that will best enable managers to improve the performance of an employee (DeNisi & Pritchard, 2006). However, a review of the literature is not consistent with this viewpoint. A current analysis of this subject revealed that just ten percent of employees believe that the performance appraisal system utilized by their organization assists with enhancing performance (Pulakos, 2004). The lack of effectiveness regarding performance appraisals is of particular interest in the hospitality industry as it is labor dependent and reliant on the performance of employees. Hospitality is an industry that remains highly labor-intensive where payroll costs are frequently the single largest item on the balance sheet (Brien & Smallman, 2011). With the implementation of a robust performance appraisal system, a hospitality organization is seemingly making a prudent investment in human and financial resources. The return on this investment is dependent upon the parties involved, how engaged they are in the process and their ability to execute the process of performance appraisals effectively. Often, these aspects are neglected which leads to lessening the significance of the performance appraisal process both for the organization and the employee. Barney (1995) and Guest (1987) point out that the contributions of employees’ performance directly affects the quality of services, which is a direct outcome related to the role of the performance appraisal. Hospitality organizations are apprised of the benefits of a healthy performance appraisal system and most have the resources to implement such a process, yet a breakdown exists at the execution level. It is imperative to investigate this specific area that seems to impede progress and reduce the return on investment. Given performance appraisals established relationship with increased motivation, commitment, and performance,
understanding its antecedents is important for researchers and practitioners (Cook & Crossman, 2004; Jawahar, 2006; Pearce & Porter, 1986).

Fairness is considered an essential tenet of an accepted and effective performance evaluation system (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998). A performance appraisal that is perceived as fair and effective can produce a myriad of positive effects for both the employee and the organization. When the performance appraisal is perceived to be fair and effective, the employee will be more motivated, feel appreciated, and be provided with a sound understanding of where their performance deficiencies lie. They would also be left feeling management support and clear objectives as to how to overcome those deficiencies. Additionally, the organization receives the benefit of having a more engaged employee who, due to a fair and effective performance appraisal, is performing at a higher level. This illuminates the importance of delivering the performance appraisal so that the process is perceived as fair and effective, the employee was justly treated throughout the process and the feedback was relevant, useful and aids in the overall development of the employee. If performance appraisals are perceived as unfair, they can diminish rather than enhance employee’s attitude and performance (Kay, Meyer, & French, 1965; Latham & Mann, 2006). When employees’ do not perceive fairness in the process of performance appraisals, they are quick to deny the accuracy of the results and the effectiveness of the procedure (Wilson, 1991; Roberts, 1998; Blau, 1999; Eichel & Bender, 1984; Grote, 2010). Evans and McShanne (1988) suggest that the more the employee believes the evaluation process is fair, it increases the chances they will trust the process and accept its outcomes.
History and Development of Performance Appraisals

Research on performance appraisals dates back as far as the early 1920’s and has continued to the present day (DeNisi & Prichard, 2006). It could be assumed that the research conducted during this time would have resulted in a clear road map for practitioners to utilize surrounding best practices involving the use of performance appraisals; unfortunately, this has not been the case. However, much has been learned about the performance appraisal process over the span of many decades and improvements have been made as the process has evolved. As the process of evaluating an employee’s performance is examined, a few major elements are apparent and consistent in the performance appraisal application. In reviewing the process that entails a comprehensive performance appraisal, it is clear that it is a two-part process; administrative and developmental. However, before delving into dissecting these two disparate areas of a performance appraisal, to gain a better perspective on how the process developed over time, a brief review on the historical perspective is important as it provides a lens as to why this process exists and how it has matured over time.

The first uses of a performance appraisal process can be traced back to the early 1900’s with very few applications existing at that time. Muchinsky stated that in the 1900’s, industrial engineers had designed the first evaluation process that was used in the first world war to evaluate the performance of Army officers. With continuous work for many years, scales were developed to measure the performance of employees with documented implementation in 1922 (Pulakos, 2009). During the industrial revolution, another form of performance appraisal came into existence known as the pink slip. Henry Ford evaluated the employees on his assembly line each day and if they were to be invited back the next day, they received a white slip in their individual work mailboxes. If Mr. Ford deemed their performance sub-par and not meeting the
standards he had implemented, the employee would receive a pink slip in their mailbox, indicating they had been terminated (Woods, Sciarini, & Breiter, 1998). The pink slip, otherwise known as a layoff notice, was used as a performance appraisal. Around the same timeframe, the scales being developed and utilized by the government slowly progressed and matured over the next several decades. The proliferation of performance appraisals was established through the industrial revolution era which was a time when these bureaucratic organizations first started monitoring organizational output (Fandray, 2001). The performance appraisal in this era was not commonly viewed as a positive experience and was associated with negatively. The use of performance appraisals during this time epoch was usually linked to reactivity and punishment for poor performance. However, organizations gradually adopted more refined methods of seeking improvement in the workplace, which lead to ultimately choosing rewards over punishment (Kennedy & Dresser, 2001).

This unfortunate beginning for the performance appraisal process may still have lingering effects on the how the overall process is viewed in its contemporary application. Finding that the typical performance appraisal is disliked by both the appraiser and appraise should not be a surprise as the procedure began with strong negative connotations (Kondrasuk, 2012). It wasn’t until the mid-1950’s that a critical incident technique which completely focused on management by objective (MBO) was used by Peter Drucker in organizations as the most useful device to define and measure specific goals (Pulakos, 2009). This was a significant discovery in the area of organizational performance and was readily implemented by many organizations searching for a competitive advantage. The initial response to the MBO format of appraising employees was favorable and proved to be effective in improving the productivity of employees. Organizations were now equipped with the first performance appraisal system that was measurable with
confirmed effectiveness. However, because the MBO evaluation process was so time-consuming, organizations slowly moved toward behavioral scales. Specifically, organizations were shifting from the use of the MBO process to a behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS), in which each scale focuses on different job dimensions with different rating scales (Rashidi, 2015).

In the early 1960’s, more organizations were utilizing performance appraisal systems and the type most prevalent during this timeframe, due to ease of use and economics, were trait based systems focusing on specific traits such as punctuality, loyalty, and attitude. However, these trait based performance appraisals were not similar to what we know of these systems and how practitioners use these systems today. The early use of the trait based performance appraisal systems were void of any conversation and feedback sessions with the employees and often, the evaluations were kept confidential and not shared with the employee. They would be part of the annual review process and become a part of the employee’s confidential employment folder. It is important to note that at this same time in history was the passage of Title VII in which human resources departments came under scrutiny to ensure legal processes as this act made it illegal to allow sex, age, race, religion, or ethnicity to influence decisions regarding the recruitment, training, upgrading, compensating, demoting, or terminating employees. This act provided a level playing field for all employees as it related to training and development and no longer were performance appraisals kept confidential (Latham, Almost, Mann, & Moore, 2005). However, for much of the 60’s, industry was largely concerned with management by objective (Drucker, 1954) which was rooted in motivation theories that were prevalent during this timeframe (DeNisi & Pritchard, 2006).
During the 1970’s, employees started to receive formal feedback sessions from their managers regarding their performance which assisted with the improvement of performance by acknowledging weaknesses and addressing the weaknesses with customized training programs. In this phase, productivity and quantifiable achievements of employees were considered and the appraisal was more control based as opposed to developmental oriented (Rashidi, 2015). The 1990’s brought much development to the MBO, BARS, as well as the trait based performance evaluations procedures. At this time, the 360 rater was introduced as well as the balanced scorecard and other return on investment employee evaluations systems. In the 90’s, much of the practitioner’s attention had shifted to these multi-sourced appraisal and feedback procedures (DeNisi & Pritchard, 2006). Bladen (2001) pointed out that these multi-sourced processes were gaining acceptance in mainstream human resources practices as establishments began implementing these comprehensive models of performance appraisal. However, some developed more of a hybrid model of performance appraisal, which contained some of the original and more traditional systems. More recently, there has been a trend toward non-traditional performance appraisal systems. These new systems stress the importance of developmental meetings between a manager and subordinate with these meetings occurring frequently and often, unplanned; as opposed to the traditional appraisal procedures that emphasized ratings and rankings (Coens & Jenkins, 2000; Lawler, 2000).

As one can imagine, with the inception of Title VII and the challenges of implementing a fair and effective performance appraisal system for all employees brought a new element for organizations; performance appraisal lawsuits. As lawsuits from performance appraisals became commonplace, it was necessary for organizations to have a better understanding of what they must have in place to be protected from discrimination lawsuits stemming from a performance
appraisal. Those processes are comprised of: (1) the appraisal approach is related to a job description, (2) the system of evaluating employees is based on a behavioral approach, (3) there is an existing document for evaluating and then coaching the employee, (4) reliability and validity of the appraisal outcome has been recorded, (5) the results of an appraisal have been discussed with the employee, and (6) organizations can demonstrate that appraising and coaching of employees is equitable (Latham et al., 2005). Applying these systems to protect against discriminatory situations revealed many challenges as companies were not familiar with these important issues. This caused organizations to take a closer look at what they were trying to accomplish through the use of performance appraisals which helped to define what was once a loosely defined process.

The term “performance appraisal” has been synonymous with performance evaluation, performance review and other similar terms in addition to being referred to: (1) a measurement tool to evaluate a subordinate’s performance as an employee, (2) a meeting that evaluates a subordinate’s performance on the job and where that performance is discussed and relevant feedback is provided to the employee, (3) a procedure of developing subordinate’s performance objectives and expectations, evaluating actual job performance, providing positive and constructive feedback, and implementing a plan as to how to improve performance through the use of setting goals and expectations for another period, or (4) performance management with job performance appraisal as a part of it (Dessler, 2011). As organizations continued to hone the purpose of the performance appraisal, the definition and goals of the process were further developed to assist practitioners in approaching a procedure that they were not all that comfortable with.
As more and more ideals were published and shared throughout academia and industry, a firmer, clearer understanding and definition of the performance appraisal process surfaced. The performance appraisal is a discrete, formal, organizationally sanctioned event, usually not occurring more frequently than annually, which has outlined performance dimensions that are used in the evaluation process (DeNisi & Pritchard, 2006). The dimensions of the performance appraisal are what has evolved, the main goal of improving employee performance with the use of this process has remained. The ultimate goal of performance appraisals should be to provide information that will best enable managers to improve employee performance and therefore; the employee performance appraisal process affords management information to assist in their approaches and efforts in accomplishing improved employee’s performance (DeNisi & Pritchard, 2006). Unfortunately, this is not always the result practitioners experience after conducting a performance appraisal, and more often, there are negative effects related to the employee’s reactions related to the performance appraisal procedure.

The primary purpose of appraising employees is to have them accept and possess a commitment for ongoing improvement; unfortunately, the results of most appraisals often decrease this desire instead of increasing it (Latham et al., 2005). As industry acknowledged this was the case, coupled with the increase in litigation surrounding the use of performance appraisals, the performance appraisal developed into a two-part process.

The performance appraisal process is an interesting scenario because it is an administrative process intended to determine the allocation of resources, yet it is also a human and social one where relationship preservation between parties is important (Pichler, 2012). This illustrates the idea that the performance appraisal process is made up of two main parts that accomplish two different tasks. The majority of performance appraisal research shows there are
two core elements of a performance appraisal: (1) administrative and (2) developmental (Kondrasuk, 2010). Since performance appraisals are often an annual event for employees, there is a convenience factor of being able to attend to the administrative obligations that an employer has along with conveying the information related to the performance of the employee at the same meeting. There seems to be no particular emphasis or importance placed on or between the administrative part or the developmental part, however, if both parts are not handled well and in concert, the employee is left with negative perceptions regarding the experience (Shumaker, 2008).

Cleveland and her associates (Cleveland, Murphy, & Williams, 1989) presented a classification of reasons for conducting appraisals in organizations indicating the two separate roles of the performance appraisal, within-person conclusions (strengths/weaknesses) and between-person conclusions (who to consider for upward mobility). In this case, it is clear that the developmental role is the feedback offered on strengths and weaknesses and the administrative role is the promotion consideration. However, it is unclear if these two roles or in fact, purposes of the performance should occur at the same meeting. In analyzing the two purposes more closely, the two areas discussed at the performance appraisal meeting are disparate in nature. This leads to the potential for the rater to be placed in the uncomfortable role of playing both a coach and a judge of employee performance (Eichel & Bender, 1984; Grote, 1996). Moreover, the evaluator is providing feedback regarding the employee’s job performance, which is a difficult conversation by itself. Couple this with unclear outcomes, and it begins to become a daunting experience for both parties, the manager and the employee. Unfortunately, this is the performance appraisal system that has evolved and it is the current and most prevalent procedure practiced today.
At its most basic level, performance appraisals are used to stimulate the productivity of managers, supervisors, and staff but the ratings are also used as the basis for decisions about promotions and transfers, pay increases, and terminations (Umbreit, Eder, & McConnell, 1986). Moreover, it is customary to distinguish between the two different purposes of the performance appraisal; administrative and developmental. As discussed, the administrative appraisal part of the performance appraisal can result in wage adjustments, or other rewards such as promotions, career opportunities, or actions to remedy disciplinary or capability issues, perhaps resulting in dismissal. In this manner, the manager is acting as a judge and this is when commitment can degenerate into resigned compliance with widespread resentment and perceptions of inequity. Few managers enjoy playing the role of the judge, and the expectation of tension during the evaluation can be as difficult as the evaluation interview itself (Kent, 1981). Conversely, the developmental part of the performance appraisal is related to enhancing an employee’s performance and can often result in different access to organizational resources such as education and training. This approach is almost universally seen as desirable and effective in gaining commitment and achieving trust (Armstrong & Baron, 1998). The challenge practitioners are faced with is how to properly mend these two procedures together to have each area be as effective as possible while co-existing. Because each area has its own unique set of distinct objectives, it is clear that the parts of the process should stand-alone and be separated from the other. Thus a flow, or a plan for the performance appraisal can be constructed from this viewpoint.

To assist in this process of creating an agenda for the performance appraisal, the extant literature suggests that first part of the performance appraisal should be the judicial process (administrative), and the concluding part of the process be the counselling part (developmental).
Administrative decisions based on standards and objective results should be made first and quickly; the developmental phase consisting of individual goal development is attended to take place further into the process and often should take additional time (Kondrasuk, 2012). This process affords the employee with a comprehensive meeting where significant issues surrounding the health and direction of their employment is discussed. Therefore, this should be a very calculated, well-planned meeting where conflict and inconsistencies are to be avoided. There may be misunderstandings and communication issues that arise due to the amount of different information discussed at the performance appraisal meeting. To combat these concerns, the manager should be well versed at defining the two-part process of the appraisal to the employee. The suggested most efficient way to resolve these issues is to cleanly separate the different aspects of the meeting so that the employee knows when each purpose is occurring (Grote, 1996). In this two-part format, the employee is often very open to the counselor role the manager undertakes during the second phase of the process. However, it is often the first part of the process where the manager undertakes the role of the judge where the meeting can be more challenging for both parties.

It is important to note that although one area of the employee appraisal process may be more comfortable (developmental) than the other (administrative), it is imperative that they both receive complete attention. Moreover, it is critical to the employee that the information provided for both parts are thoroughly discussed and communicated, especially the difficult parts that tend to be abbreviated which leads to employees’ becoming disenchanted with the process. There should be an evenness to the approach while planning the process with each individual employee, as there is much at stake and the reactions from such a meeting can be long lasting for the employee. However, there is evidence in recent literature on this subject that indicates many
organizations are linking performance appraisals more closely with employee development and separating this from decisions about pay and promotions (Armstrong & Baron, 1998).

Nonetheless, a well-implemented performance appraisal system has positive impacts on the performance of employees, which leads to an organization’s effectiveness. Conversely, an ineffective system will have negative influences on the performance of employees, and will reduce the efficiency of the organization, and will lead to a waste of time, money, and effort (Rashidi, 2015).

**Performance Appraisal Issues**

The most significant challenge for human resources departments is to ensure and demonstrate that an organization’s human capital is contributing to strategy implementation, business objectives, and organizational performance in important and measurable ways (Kusluvan, Kusluvan, Ilham, & Buyruk, 2010). The key underlying point is being able to effectively and objectively measure performance. The basic premise would be to celebrate and reward efficiencies and productivity, as well as attend to performance deficiencies that would accompany newly updated performance goals and objectives. Unfortunately, it is not that simplistic, and when the managers are evaluating their subordinates, many other confounding factors play a role in the process, which is extremely difficult to control. The major difficulty with most performance appraisal systems is that the judgments involved are frequently biased, involving mainly personality characteristics, or viewpoints that are unable to be confirmed (Umbreit et al., 1986). This introduces a myriad of issues to consider when a manager is contemplating the execution of a performance appraisal with a subordinate. Research has established a number of factors that affect performance ratings that can introduce imprecision and bias (Heslin, Latham, & VandeWalle, 2005; Landy & Farr, 1980) such as managers’
political motives (Longenecker, Gioa, & Sims, 1987) appraise’s impression of management (Frink & Ferris, 1998), the quality of supervisor-subordinate relationships (Tepper, Uhl-Bien, Kohut, Rogelberg, Lockhart, & Ensley, 2006), the nature of the task to be rated (Lee, 1985), the purpose of the rating (Scullen, Mount, & Judge, 2003), and the social context in which the ratings are conducted (Levy & Williams, 2004). Trying to manage all of the different facets can be overwhelming for the manager attempting to conduct an employee performance appraisal, yet it must be understood that there exists no rating-instrument based on subjective judgment that can guarantee a true reflection of a person’s job performance (Umbriet et al., 1986). Moreover, it is the astute manager that understands that at best, some subjectivity will be a part of all performance appraisals. The most successful outcomes of performance appraisals acknowledge this up front and forge ahead with the clear objectives surrounding how best to improve the employee’s performance since performance evaluations have long been an important method of improving workplace effectiveness (Reb & Cropanzano, 2007). As noted, these appraisals serve a variety of important purposes, such as identifying individuals for promotion, providing developmental feedback, underscoring training needs, and assigning merit pay (Cardy & Dobbins, 1994). Moreover, many academics and practicing managers regard performance appraisals as one of the most valuable human resources tools (Thomas & Bretz, 1994). Unfortunately, they are not treated as such and often the performance appraisal process is not fully understood by the manager charged with conducting this process that has been acknowledged as critically important to the overall effectiveness of an organization’s workforce.

Performance appraisal feedback is provided whether it is sought or not, and an understanding of the individual differences that may influence ratings and reactions are important (Culbertson, Henning, & Payne, 2013). Moreover, since the process of evaluating
one’s employees is commonplace and it is an expected procedure all managers can anticipate, the importance of recognizing the embedded challenges relating to subjectivity does not seem to get its fair share of attention. In fact, performance appraisals are more often a reflection of the appraiser’s overall bias than they are of the performance of the employee (Latham, Almost, Mann, & Moore, 2005). One viable explanation for this situation is economics. To conduct and follow through on an effective performance appraisal takes a considerable amount of time and effort, which is extended to each employee within an organization. However, since this process of affording each employee with an effective, well-planned performance appraisal has proven to create a more productive workforce, it is an investment that there is a considerable return on, some tangible and some intangible. Unfortunately, what affects the overall results of a performance appraisal is the fact that managers are frequently not trained in the performance appraisal process nor given the necessary training to perform the appraisal process effectively and consistently (Robert, 1998; Wilson, 1991; Fletcher, 2001; Vinson, 1996; Gray 2002).

It has been established that the majority of organizations utilize a performance appraisal system and yet, there is very little training offered to the managers that are responsible for the well-established human resources function. Job performance evaluation is one of the most imperative, most widely used, and arguably, the most unpopular human resources management activity (Kondrasuk, 2012). As such, avoidance in both developing and participating in performance appraisal training programs is commonplace in most organizations. It is an unfortunate situation whereas managers are charged with this responsibility and yet are not trained in the process, nor do they have any interest in doing so. However, the training programs that are in existence simply offer a framework regarding the procedure itself and includes some subconscious areas to be cognizant of while the procedure is taking place. The framework itself
would instruct the manager on basic procedural obligations and policies such as the importance of having a dedicated meeting space that would be free of interruptions and one that is private. Additionally, the manager would be trained on how to prepare for the meeting as well as having the proper paperwork in place in advance. Other areas of the training framework would include how to properly explain the procedure to the employee, as well as the sequence of activities that normally takes place. Grote (2010) recently stated that the ideal performance appraisal should contain 5-steps: (1) subordinate performance dialog where the manager meets with the subordinate for approximately forty-five minutes to an hour at the start of the year to plan out the performance objectives for the year, (2) subordinate job execution where the subordinate actively participates in their job and seeks to achieve the established objectives, (3) employee performance assessment where the manager fills out the performance appraisal and discusses it with their supervisor before discussing it with the subordinate. The manager also decides administrative decisions such as compensation modifications at this time, (4) employee performance appraisal interview where the manager meets with the subordinate for forty-five minutes to an hour to discuss the results of the evaluation, including a self-appraisal conducted by the subordinate, and dialog on developmental strategy, and (5) the manager and the employee plan a future meeting to establish the upcoming year’s objectives and the process starts again. The procedural part of employee performance appraisal would utilize these five steps as the framework for how to perform a proper performance appraisal. The key to the framework training and execution is to maintain a balance within each of the procedures as it relates to the process of performance appraisal. 

The ideal performance appraisal system is a procedure that establishes performance expectations (for the manager and the employee), having the employee participate in job
responsibilities with efforts pointing toward pre-established objectives, evaluating and providing feedback as to the actual performance, and utilizing the results of the evaluation so that it is beneficial to the employee, the manager, and the organization (Kondrasuk, 2012). Although the procedural part of the performance appraisal process may seem to be void of emotion, it is all too often not the case as maneuvering from beginning to end can be challenging for the manager. Having a well thought out approach and applying the proper framework can produce many positive benefits as well as prevent negative consequences. Cheung and Law (1998) stated that the major benefits of using a good method of performance appraisal are to motivate employees by providing recognition of their efforts and to help employees map out a career path and give them guidance to needed training and development.

The second and more challenging area of performance appraisal training is how to become aware of and effectively control the confounding variables that have such an effect on the manager’s ability to remain objective. When examining the definition of performance, it is understood that performance is the unity of two elements: behavior and results. Furthermore, when a manager is evaluating an employee, they should be attempting to focus on these two overlapping indicators since both behavior and results are tangible, measurable, and objective (Performance Based Management, n.d.). In conducting a performance appraisal, the manager is assessing the behavior of the employee against pre-set goals and standards relating to the results such behavior produced or not. Behavior is objective, measurable, and tangible; behavior is a fact (Performance Based Management, n.d.). However, research would suggest that this is the area of conducting performance appraisals that is most challenging and simply focusing on the tangibles of behavior and maintaining objectivity is rare. Moreover, being aware of and controlling subjective influences, known as bias, is the major challenge in evaluating
performance. A manager’s judgments about many things are affected by our perceptions, and while a manager appraises a subordinate, the assessment includes the subordinate being evaluated with the effects of the manager’s predisposed biases (Performance Management, n.d.).

In most cases, the manager conducting the performance appraisal is unaware that certain built-in biases are affecting the measurement of performance for each individual separately. Therefore, part of the training a manager would receive regarding performance appraisals would be biased awareness training. Managers should be aware of their possible biases, so they can try to eliminate them from the assessment process. Some of the more prevalent subconscious biases that may affect a manager’s judgment, and ultimately the evaluation of an employee, are as follows:

Halo – a tendency to form a generalized positive impression of an employee, resulting in rating the employee high on all rating criteria rather than independently rating each item (Performance Management, n.d.).

Horns – opposite of the halo effect, with general negative impressions of an employee resulting in artificially low ratings. This bias may surface if the manager generally dislikes, or has little confidence in the employee (Performance Management, n.d.).

Central Tendency – an inclination to have the results of an evaluation be centered on being average when applying a rating scale. For example, if an instrument measured one to ten, with five being the average, many evaluators refrain from using the points at either end of the scale. The tendency is for almost all ratings to fall within the four to six range (Performance Management, n.d.).

Leniency bias – Strictness bias – a tendency to be lenient or strict when conducting the evaluation; the manager is more lenient or strict with one employee as compared to another.
Same-as-me or attribution bias – a tendency to rate subordinates who are seemingly comparable to the manager more positively than subordinates who are unlike the manager (Performance Management, n.d.).

The biases listed above are the most prevalent in the research involving performance appraisals, and there are many others. Some sort of bias influences most if not all performance appraisal, so much so Murphy (2008) stated that performance appraisal systems are little more than organizationally sponsored popularity contests and tell us little about employee performance. Additionally, because rater bias is an aspect of performance appraisal training most managers are not afforded, there is a common understanding among academics and practitioners that performance appraisal ratings are commonly referred to as ineffective measures of job performance (Murphy, 2008). Bias is an area that can be minimized, yet not marginalized, through proper rater bias training. At the basic level, the bias training should be maintained at the awareness level and progressively develop from that standpoint. The important fact to retain is that rater bias skews the results of an objective performance appraisal by introducing subjective judgments unrelated to actual performance. Variance (bias) is introduced by the rater or the interaction between the rater and the ratee is typically conceptualized as a form of bias, a systematic variance that is unrelated to true performance (Hoffman & Woehr, 2009).

As in all facets of an organization, offering training and development programs within areas known to have weaknesses or to be ineffective proves to assist in addressing and improving these areas of concern. In preparing for and performing a performance appraisal, the process should be similar for all employees as it has been expressed in the extant literature that rater bias is prevalent. Therefore, more organizations should consider formal training and developmental programs surrounding this essential human management resources tool. Developing the
effectiveness of employees requires enriching their capabilities and attitudes through identifying their weaknesses, and providing specific training programs to address performance issues (Boswell & Boudreau, 2002). Moreover, it is in the best interest of the organization to enhance their managers’ ability in the areas of performance appraisals because when conducted correctly, they have proven to have a myriad of significant benefits for all stakeholders involved.

A manager’s review of employee performance has been perceived as a combination of informal and formal techniques, which together have the potential to contribute to the motivation of the individual employees and their work groups, and to provide organizations with a strategic advantage in their ongoing pursuit of competitive goals and imperatives (Nankervis & Compton, 2006).

Performance Appraisal Approaches

There are many different procedures, systems, and forms employed in conducting performance appraisals and most employ an instrument with approximately 8 – 12 items that are measured through the process of evaluation. The instrument used in employee evaluations provides the footing for appraising employees as it is the basis for making administrative and developmental decisions in a uniform and consistent manner (Latham, Almost, Mann, & Moore, 2005). However, there is a number of different instruments used by organizations that are commonplace with no one instrument being the preferred choice to implement and maintain by practitioners. Over the last thirty years, both academics and practitioners have rigorously analyzed and critically examined the use and effectiveness of performance appraisals within an organizational context and unfortunately, no consensus exists as to what type of performance appraisal system best meets the desired objectives (Kondrasuk, 2012). There is no a consensus among practitioners regarding the most superior instrument to utilize, although some instruments
do align more efficiently with some positions as opposed to others. Nonetheless, hospitality industry executives continue to protest regarding scholarly research within this subject matter due to its limited usefulness, and academics continue to complain about the issues in this area in the field (Banks, & Murphy, 1986; Ilgen, 1993; Ilgen, Barnes-Farrell, & McKellin, 1993). As this dialog carries on, it is important to note that along with the correct application of the proper performance appraisal instrument, there is also the issue of the benchmarks or standards the employee is measured against. How these standards or benchmarks are applied are a crucial step in the performance appraisal process. One of the keys to performance appraisals is the development of valid performance criteria which are evaluative dimensions and standards against which an individual’s attributes, motives, abilities, skills, knowledge, and behaviors are measured (Bernardin, La Shells, Smith, & Alvares, 1976). Assuming rigorous thought and consideration has gone into developing the standards on which the employees will be measured against, it is then time to implement the proper instrument as the measuring device.

The four most common instruments used by hospitality organizations are management by objective (MBO), behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS), graphic rating scale, and Rater 360. All four of these instruments are used effectively within hospitality organizations today and it is clear that there are strengths and weaknesses in particular areas of each application. Additionally, the evaluation system that works well for one company will not automatically work for another establishment (Umbreit, Eder, & McConnell, 1986). Furthermore, specific evaluation forms and procedures are often administered for different departments within a hospitality organization. For example, for a salesperson, the form most often used would be MBO because of its ability to quantitatively measure the achievements of goals. The MBO instrument would contain measurable pre-set goals and objectives that the employee would then
be evaluated on regarding reaching the goals, and to what extent they reached the goals after an agreed amount of time had elapsed. In evaluating a senior manager or executive, the form would be the 360 Rater because of the completeness and amount of material gathered from the procedure. 360 Rater obtains feedback regarding the employee’s performance from multiple sources including subordinates and peers as well as supervisors. The information is then analyzed from multiple angles, which produces a highly comprehensive evaluation. For line level employees in the hospitality industry, the form most often used would be the BARS form or the graphic rating scale because of its ease of use and the flexibility of the procedure’s application. The form would typically contain a Likert-type scale with behavioral descriptions in which the rater is forced to choose a rating within each category. After each category, the manager is asked to elaborate with written information related to the evaluation that they selected as an example and to add validity to the assessment. A summary of the most utilized instruments is as follows:

MBO – management by objective which was initially brought forth by Peter Drucker (1954), is an outcome-based evaluation procedure that measures the employee’s contribution to the organization’s success and goal attainment which operates as follows: a managerial process whereby organizational purposes are diagnosed and met by joining superiors and employees in the search of jointly approved goals and objectives that are specific, measurable, time-bound, and joined to an action plan (Woods, Sciarini, & Breiter, 1998).

BARS – instead of concentrating on outcomes or personality traits, behaviorally anchored rating scales are designed to evaluate the employee’s actions, and BARS are used to evaluate what individuals actually do when performing their jobs, rather than the results or the level of effectiveness (Woods, Sciarini, & Breiter, 1998). First introduced by Smith and Kendall, the
behaviorally-anchored rating scales were designed to provide multidimensional criteria necessary to evaluate the behavioral complexities inherent in most jobs and help to reduce rater bias (Smith and Kendall, 1963).

Graphic Rating Scale – a simplistic extension of the BARS instrument, this instrument is more simplistic than the others in that the appraiser is forced to comment on the characteristics that may or may not be relevant to a particular job. However, the forced choice appraisal systems helps reduce rater bias which, along with ease of use and flexibility of application are this instrument’s strengths. The use of this instrument may be initially attractive, on the other hand, one must contemplate its weaknesses that are often times the results are oversimplified statements that cannot provide a complete or an accurate description of employee performance.

360 Rater – this instrument provides multisource feedback which provides a comprehensive way of appraising employees as it improves the accuracy of the appraisals through multiple viewpoints that are obtained, and it increases perceptions of fairness by ensuring a bias source (e.g., one’s boss) is not over-represented in the appraisal process (Latham, Almost, Mann, & Moore, 2005). It is important to note that the 360-rater procedure expends many resources, as is a time-consuming and costly procedure.

Behavioral Observation Scales – also known as BOS, this instrument is very similar to the BARS application in that involves a procedure of identifying the important parts of a particular job; however what makes this different is that employees are assessed related to how often they portray the desired behavior necessary to be evaluated as effective performance. The application of BOS is particularly effective when the manager and employee work closely together so that the managers have the opportunity to constantly observe the employee’s behavior which would net a proper evaluation (Latham & Wexley, 1977).
Strengths – Weaknesses Dichotomy – less utilized than the other instruments, the strengths-weaknesses format is often recommended because it is personalized, facilitates the exchange of usable information, and requires thought of the evaluator. The practical use of this instrument is its downside as it facilitates much discussion and can lead to misunderstandings and disagreements as well as be a lengthy process (Woods, Sciarini, & Breiter, 1998).

When an organization is contemplating which instrument to utilize, there is much to consider and examine before making a selection. Should the goals of the evaluation be outcome-based (sales, profit margin), the instrument of choice would be MBO. This bottom line approach is basically a goal attainment measure which is the closest instrument to an objective performance appraisal as it eliminates the subjectivity from the performance evaluation.

However, as Donald Petersen, a former CEO of Ford Motor Company has noted, the emphasis on goal attainment is ironically the weakness of the MBO. When receiving a good appraisal is contingent upon goal attainment, ingenious ways are often found by the employee to make easy goals appear difficult to administrative decision makers (Woods, Sciarini, Breiter, 1998).

Although MBO may be an effective measure of accountability, the instrument does not offer any information about how to improve performance or suggest training for deficient areas of performance. If the evaluation is based on behavior such as punctuality, the instrument of choice would be BARS or BOS. Behaviorally anchored rating scales and behavioral observational scales are the two most utilized performance appraisal procedures, and these instruments are typically specifically created around a job description. BARS and BOS instruments measure specific ways to execute an organization’s strategic plan by making it clear what an employee should engage in to be productive, and what the employee should do to initiate specific performance improvement strategies. Moreover, they reduce the ambiguity by setting common
expectations that make it explicit what the employee should stop or start doing (Latham, Almost, Mann, & Moore, 2005).

Finally, should the goal be to evaluate the traits of the employee, such as commitment or reliability, the instrument of choice would be the graphic rating scale. Trait-based scales are also best utilized to assess attitudinal and personality variables such as loyalty, creativity, and initiative (Latham, Almost, Mann, & Moore, 2005). With the use of trait-based scales such as graphic rating scales, unless the instrument’s contents are discussed in advance with the employee and specifically defined, the instrument can lead to subjective judgments as the traits are very general and the evaluation is left up to the interpretation of the manager conducting the performance appraisal. Additionally, trait-based scales fail to suggest ways to improve performance as it is simply a subjective evaluation of performance based on the effectiveness of the trait attributes of the employees as observed and assessed by the manager. The choice of which instrument to implement within a particular organization is a monumental decision that must be made after much consideration and debate as to what instrument best fits that organization. Regardless of the organization, while embarking on the decision of what instrument best fits an organization, it would be strategic to utilize the primary purpose of the performance appraisal as the foundation for making the decision. The primary purpose of performance appraisal is to diagnose and remedy performance-related problems and to thereby increase individual job performance and organizational productivity (DeNisi & Gonzales, 2000).

Whichever instrument is used, one aspect of the procedure remains constant and that is the rater, the manager conducting the evaluation. An evaluation tool that measures performance comes down to how effective the raters are in utilizing it, no matter how judiciously it was established (Latham, Almost, Mann, & Moore, 2005). Reporting on a subordinate’s
performance and delivering the evaluation during a one on one meeting can be an intimidating task for even an experienced manager making what would seem like a mundane ritual turn into an extremely challenging experience. Performance appraisals represent one of the more difficult tasks that managers are required to perform in fulfilling their job responsibilities (Feldman, 1981). The functional, or administrative part of the review is only one part of the performance appraisal process. How the interpersonal part or the developmental part of the review is managed and delivered can determine your ability as a manager, and the development and success of your employees (Schumacher, 2008). Despite the best intentions on the part of the managers, most performance review discussions tend to deflate employees instead of energizing them (Thompson, 2012). Some managers may never learn, other managers do not need guidance, but within this spectrum of performance appraisal ability, the majority of managers can be trained and developed to improve their ability to counsel employees on improving their performance (Hoppock, 1958).

There has been extensive performance appraisal research focused on the procedural aspects such as reliability and validity of performance measurement. Additionally, researchers have also examined stakeholder involvement and providing feedback as it relates to performance management. As expected, there are many varying conclusions as to the most effective processes, and in trying to evaluate what may be the best course of action to take in monitoring and measuring employee performance, there is much to consider. Folger and Bies (1989) have identified seven elements of a performance appraisal that are important to employees receiving the evaluation:

(1) giving adequate consideration to employees’ viewpoints  
(2) suppressing bias  
(3) applying decision-making criteria consistently across employees  
(4) providing timely feedback to employees after evaluations are made
(5) providing justification for the evaluation(s)
(6) being truthful in communication
(7) treating employees with courtesy and civility

The extent to which the appraisal meets the needs and expectations of the employee is considered one of the key components of the performance appraisal process (Jawahar, 2006). Therefore, it is critical that the manager understands that there is much to consider prior to engaging in the formal process of conducting the performance appraisal. It is also important that the manager appreciates the fact that the performance appraisal process most likely will be an uncomfortable endeavor and the goal would be to follow the seven elements outlined above as closely as possible. With experience and additional training, the manager can become more proficient in the process as well as more comfortable executing on this responsibility. The overarching assumption is that performance appraisals are a complicated social process (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995) that needs to be better understood to help guide future research (Pichler, 2012). If managers were able to understand this and comprehend that the performance appraisal process is a unique and challenging exercise, it might relieve them of the anxiety felt before and during the process. The most maligned and dreaded aspect of human resource management is the process of evaluating an employee’s job performance (Kondrasuk, 2012). It is a meeting that neither the manager nor the employee anticipates void of nervousness and apprehension. Employees generally dread the performance evaluation meeting as much as their supervisors do, because few people enjoy listening to a cataloging of their flaws, even if it is tempered by praise, which is also part of the evaluation (Kent, 1981). In addition, there is a reluctance to play judge and jury on the part of the manager and distrust on the part of the employee, arising out of the marked discrepancies between rhetoric and reality, which promotes the performance appraisal being perceived as
inconsistent, subjective, and political (Newton & Findlay, 1996). To combat these valid concerns, there are some basic elements of the performance appraisal process to maintain, and if this is accomplished on a consistent basis, the performance appraisal process can be a positive and productive experience for the manager and the employee. Previous research has effectively indicated that there are three uncomplicated factors organizations must remember with regard to individual performance appraisals: (1) subordinates want performance appraisals despite their apprehension about them, (2) performance appraisals should be conducted in a professional manner, and (3) the feedback is most effective when the culture around the process possesses a high-level trust, honesty, commitment, and collaborative dialog between the manager and the subordinate (Longenecker, Liverpool, & Wilson, 1998).

However, it is not only the employees and the managers that are vested in the process of performance appraisals, the organizations themselves are as well. Performance appraisals have been said to be one of the six deadly diseases that keep organizations from performing at their peak (AlQahtani, 2015). Since there is the possibility of considerable benefits as well as potential harm to an organization when conducting performance appraisals, it is important that the organization completely comprehends why they engage in this process to begin with. As previously noted, the performance appraisal is arguably one of the most prominent human resources tools that is prevalent in organizations and employee attributes are directly influenced by human resources management policies, practices, and capabilities of the organization (Barney & Wright, 1998; Coff, 1997; Lado & Wilson, 1994; Mueller, 1996). Therefore, it is imperative that organizations fully understand why they engage in this laborious, challenging, and potentially rewarding process. The potential functions served by the performance appraisal process include:
• Let’s employees know where the stand
• Documents and recognizes employee performance
• Enhances the relationship between the employee and the manager
• Assists in employee development
• Enhances employee motivation
• Employee productivity in raised
• Permits employees feedback about their job performance
• Creates and implements specific job goals and objectives
• Provides explanation for employee pay increases
• Facilitates rich dialog between the employee and the manager

(Longenecker, Liverpool, & Wilson, 1988).

To attempt to achieve these functions of a performance appraisal could be rather intimidating and at the same time, the question may arise related to if in fact the process is actually worth the anxiety and effort. Organizations and managers alike should not be daunted by the performance appraisal process and should implement a robust system of appraising their employees and continue to learn from and improve the system over time.

Performance Appraisal Outcomes

Another trend in recent literature which is leading down the right track is the focus on employee reaction to appraisals as an important outcome variable (DeNisi & Pritchard, 2006). Moreover, not only does the manager focus on properly conducting a quality and comprehensive performance appraisal, but they also must be keenly sensitive to how the employee perceives the performance appraisal experience. It is a critical final step in the cumbrous performance appraisal process that if not given due attention can cause much effort to dissipate rapidly.
Employee acceptance and satisfaction with the performance appraisal system is essential for its optimal effectiveness (Levy & Williams, 2004). As the performance appraisal process begins and progresses through its various, yet calculated stages, the employee is gathering information regarding experience and is evaluating the justness of the performance appraisal process. Moreover, the employee is utilizing fairness as the evaluating measurement related to accepting and being satisfied with the feedback.

A performance evaluation that is accurate, fair and delivered appropriately can have a positive influence on an employee and has the potential to achieve improved performance. The employee must actually believe that there is a need to improve, and so they must accept the feedback received and therefore, we see research on employee reactions as an important step in regard to future appraisal research (DeNisi & Pritchard, 2006). Therefore, if the employee deems their performance appraisal as unfair, the exact reason that the process exists is suddenly unattainable. It is critical to comprehend how performance evaluation characteristics are related to appraisal reaction because appraisal reactions are related to job attitudes (Pettijohn, Pettijohn, & d’Amico, 2001) and changes in job performance (Jawahar, 2006; Nathan, Mohrman, & Milliman, 1991). More specifically, the performance appraisal outcomes themselves can have an important influence on employee’s reactions toward their work, their supervisors, and their organizations as a whole (Thurston & McNall, 2009). This can work for or against the manager and it is simply the perception of the employee as it relates to fairness and effectiveness that determines the reaction of the employee. If employees do not perceive the system to be fair, the feedback accurate, or the manager to be trustworthy, then employees are most likely not going use the feedback they receive (Levy & Williams, 2004).
Academics, as well as practitioners, should view this as an opportunity to learn more about what affects the employee’s perceptions related to the performance appraisal process. Knowing that to have some optimism in the process of improving performance lies with the perception of the employee provides key insight as to how to further research and understand in this highly influential process. Instead of focusing research on the processes and procedures, efforts should turn toward manipulating the outcomes in such a way that the performance appraisal focus is on ensuring the employee gauges the experience as worthwhile and fair. In this way, the performance appraisal function changes from an all-encompassing evaluative measure to an employee betterment-centric experience. When employees feel their evaluations are accurate and just, the organization can use the appraisal system as a practical application to enhance the motivation and the development of the employees (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979). Anything that enhances employees’ self-esteem and conveys the idea that employees are appreciated, valued, recognized and respected will increase their satisfaction, commitment, and performance (Kusluvan, Kusluvan, Ilham, & Buyruk, 2010). Therefore, it is highly important that research in the area of performance appraisals turn toward gaining a better understanding regarding what impacts the perceptions of the employee specifically related to fairness and effectiveness.

In examining the performance appraisal process, fairness and effectiveness are the areas of employee perception that dictates the performance appraisal from being motivating and successful or discouraging and unproductive. Performance appraisal scholars should continue to consider the importance of perceptions of appraisal and its influence in the appraisal process (Pichler, 2012). In this manner, it is the objective of this study to focus on this area of the performance appraisal process. Moreover, investigating how the rater’s disposition and
personality can influence the perceived fairness and effectiveness of a performance appraisal will be the focus of this study. Ultimately, the performance appraisal process end goal is improved employee performance. How this can be achieved at a higher occurrence rate is what this study will attempt to investigate. Studies focusing on employee reactions to appraisals are a significant process in assisting academics and practitioners to comprehend how appraisals can be used to actually improve performance (Taylor, Masterson, Renard, & Tracy, 1998).

**Performance Appraisal in Hospitality**

Human resources and the appraisal of employees’ performance grows in importance as firms attempt to maintain their competitive advantage in the lodging industry (Umbreit, 1986). Since performance appraisals are omnipresent in hospitality organizations, they should be viewed as a tool that can have a powerful influence in the areas that matter most to such businesses.

Performance evaluation processes are commonplace in almost all hospitality organizations and it is imperative that the employee perceive them as fair and accurate if they are to foster efforts that extend beyond expectations which is a key attribute in organizations achieving advantages over their competitors (Rowland & Hall, 2012). Many other key performance features critically important in the hospitality industry known to contribute heavily to the success of these organizations are byproducts of having an effective and just performance appraisal process in place. However, if performance appraisals are perceived as unfair in an organization, the outcome will negatively affect the employees and their desire to exceed expectations will be severely reduced (Rowland & Hall, 2012). Because acts such as going the extra mile and attending to details are so important in the hospitality industry, the performance appraisal process should point its efforts in producing positive employee reactions. When
considering the workforce attributes within a hospitality organization, it is quite possible that by simply improving the employee’s perceptions of their performance evaluation it will enhance their productivity and morale. Factors relating to the realities of and the state of the people management in the hospitality industry area as follows: the availability low-skilled and easily expendable employees; the presence of a large selection of unemployed people; a lack of significant and meaningful research; the competitive pressure on organizations; the lack of unionization; unprofessional managers and owners; high costs and small profit margins; unstable and insufficient demand; stark necessities of the structure and conditions of the industry such as seasonality and small and medium size organizations; and low cost-low price business strategy (Kusluvan et al., 2010). This current state of the hospitality workforce further illuminates the need to further explore how the performance appraisal perceptions of employees in the hospitality industry can be enthusiastically embraced as human resources function that benefits all stakeholders. In a fluctuating economic environment, described as possessing pressures to enhance productivity and minimize costs, evaluating the performance of an organization’s employees will hold an influential role in assisting to ensure a firm’s competitive advantage (Rowland & Hall, 2012). Anderson (1993) advocated that as the competition in the labor markets becomes more intense, there is an increasing trend of using performance appraisals as a key element of human resources management since the appraisal system plays a key role in promoting positive attitudes and contributing to employee’s effectiveness. In an industry dependent upon the performance of their employees to establish themselves and remain successful, understanding how to create the positive performance appraisal experiences should be viewed as an opportunity to better the employee as well as the organization.
How an organization manages their employees is a key determinant in how effective they are in executing in the areas of customer satisfaction and loyalty, service quality, competitive advantage, organizational performance, and business success (Bitner, Booms, & Tetrault, 1990; Schneider, 2003). As such, it is evident that it is time to view the performance appraisal experience as a major influence as to how the workforce within hospitality organizations are managed. Having the ability to conduct performance appraisals that are perceived as fair and effective should become the main operational focus of all hospitality human resources departments. It is argued that human capital or assets, including employee knowledge, skills, experience, personality internal and external relationships, attitudes, and behaviors are essential in creating firm-specific advantages. Moreover, few people would reject the proposition that the human element in tourism and hospitality organizations is critical for service quality, customer satisfaction, loyalty, competitive advantage and organizational performance (Kusluvan et al, 2010). Through further understanding how to become more adept at harnessing the positivity the potential fair and effective performance appraisals have, organizations within the hospitality industry will become more productive and contribute significantly to the success of all stakeholders involved; including the employees, the managers, and the organization. Field research is now warranted on whether performance appraisal accuracy and fairness within organizations as perceived by their employees can be improved (Heslin, Latham, & VandeWalle, 2005).
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Performance evaluations have long been an important method of improving workplace effectiveness (Reb & Cropanzano, 2007). Therefore, it would be beneficial for organizations to become more proficient in conducting performance evaluations. With the use of IPT and FFM, this study takes a unique approach to evaluating the fairness and effectiveness of performance appraisals.

The following research questions and hypotheses guided this study:

RQ1: How does a manager’s IPT disposition impact an employees’ perceived fairness of performance evaluations?

H1: A manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations?

RQ2: How does a manager’s IPT disposition impact employees’ perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations?

H2: A manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

RQ3: How does a manager’s personality (FFM) impact the perceived fairness and effectiveness of performance evaluations of their subordinates?

H3: A manager’s (FFM) Agreeableness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

H4: A manager’s (FFM) Consciousness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.
H5: A manager’s (FFM) Openness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

H6: A manager’s (FFM) Extraversion positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

H7: A manager’s (FFM) Neuroticism negatively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

RQ4: Controlling for a manager’s FFM, does IPT disposition explain additional differences in employees’ perceived fairness or effectiveness of performance evaluations?

H8: When controlling for a manager’s FFM, IPT incrementalism disposition explains additional positive differences in employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.

H9: When controlling for a manager’s FFM, IPT incrementalism disposition explains additional positive differences in employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

RQ5: Are there any differences in perceived effectiveness or fairness based on demographic variables?

H10: The employee’s sex has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H11: The employee’s sex has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

H12: The manager’s sex has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H13: The manager’s sex has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.
H14: The employee’s age has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H15: The employee’s age has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

**Research Design**

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between a manager’s personality disposition and the effect this has on the employee’s perceived fairness and effectiveness relating to a recently conducted performance appraisal (less than twelve months old). This study utilized a quantitative methodological approach while investigating correlations and associations among the independent variables and dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Paired Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPT disposition FFM (5)</td>
<td>Justice Measures (4)</td>
<td>MGR - EMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT disposition FFM (5)</td>
<td>Effectiveness Instrument</td>
<td>MGR - EMP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study investigated the relationship between the rater’s IPT disposition and the effect this has on the employee’s perceived fairness and perceived effectiveness of a performance appraisal. In decomposing IPT, there is compelling rationale as to why this may produce insight into various aspects of the performance appraisal procedures. For example, if a manager’s IPT disposition is partial toward an entity rating versus being partial toward an incremental rating, the theory would suggest different outcomes when predicting an employee’s perceived fairness and effectiveness of the performance appraisal. This is because a manager possessing an entity IPT disposition may not believe that their employees can improve performance through the use of feedback and training and would deliver the performance appraisal feedback in a
transactional, unenthusiastic manner, without encouragement or insight (Dweck, Chui, & Hong, 1995). The manager possessing an incremental IPT disposition believes that employee’s performance can improve with the use of performance appraisal feedback and would deliver the feedback in coaching and counseling style reinforcing the positive aspects of the process (Dweck, Chui, & Hong, 1995). Therefore, a formal assessment of the manager’s IPT rating was be necessary to obtain. To do so, a well-established, reliable and valid survey instrument was utilized. This instrument is known as the IPT Rating Scale (Appendix A) (Levy & Dweck, 1997).

IPT disposition was assessed using the eight-item, domain-general “kind-of-person” measure developed by Levy and Dweck (1997). The IPT scale assesses implicit beliefs that cut across the domains of ability and personality, both of which are relevant to employee performance. This scale, labeled Beliefs About Human Nature, has four items that measure entity beliefs and four that measure incremental beliefs. A sample entity belief item is as follows: “Every person is a particular type of person, and they can’t really change the type of person they are.” A sample incremental belief item is as follows: “People can substantially change the kind of person they are.” The test-retest reliability of this scale data over a 1-week period and over a 4-week period was .82 and .71, respectively (Levy & Dweck, 1997). Prior research has reported high internal consistency at .93 (Levy et al., 1998), as well as construct validity (Dweck, 1999). Participants rate each item on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the anchors; 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Consistent with Levy et al. (1998), responses to the entity-worded items were reverse scored. A mean IPT score was calculated for each manager, high scores represent an incremental IPT disposition and a low scores represent an entity IPT disposition. Reverse scoring the entity items to produce a single scale was guided by the substantial empirical evidence regarding the unitary nature of incremental and entity beliefs (Levy & Dweck, 1997).
The second instrument used to collect the other independent variable data was a well-established FFM instrument (Appendix B) (Shafer, 1999). This FFM instrument utilizes column trait-term pairs presented on a single page. Each of the five domains of the FFM were individually evaluated for each participant. The trait-term pairs are rated using a seven-point differential type scale. For example, shy and outgoing would be presented on a differential type scale for self-evaluation with a seven-point spread, and the instructions ask participants to mark on the scale between shy and outgoing in which they recognize the best area that describes themselves in general. The outcome is a mean score for each of the five personality domains contained within the FFM.

There were two different instruments utilized regarding the dependent variables, and the first was the four different justice measure domains known collectively as the organizational justice measures (Appendix C) (Colquitt, 2001). The four different justice measurements analyzed were procedural (7 items), distributive (4 items), informational (5 items), and interpersonal (4 items). In utilizing this instrument, all items used a five-point scale with anchors of; 1 = to a small extent and, 5 to a large extent. Each of the four domains produced a single mean score for each participant.

The second instrument utilized regarding the dependent variables was the effective performance appraisal instrument (Appendix D) (Longenecker, Liverpool, & Wilson, 1988). This seven-item instrument employed a four-point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (4) strongly agree and it is important to note that a neutral point was not included as an option because the items posed were either a function or purpose of the performance appraisal or not. A singular mean score represents the participant’s overall perception of the effectiveness of a performance appraisal that was conducted less than twelve months prior.
Sample Populations

The sample population was paired managers and employees, and the number of participating pairs was 90. This sample size is consistent with other studies found in the review of the literature regarding similar research approaches utilizing paired data as well as utilizing IPT. All manager and employee pairs were actively working together within the hospitality industry, specifically working together at a hotel, a restaurant or a private club. Therefore, the sample was represented by three distinct hospitality industries and this design was implemented for practical purposes related to gaining more participation and reaching an adequate sample size.

The sample was a convenience sample of both managers and employees working at upscale hotels, restaurants, and private clubs in the northeast region of the United States. This market segment and geographical location was selected due to the researcher’s familiarity with this area. All hospitality organizations participating in this study were independently owned and operated. Therefore, the sample is absent of participation from franchise models of hospitality management.

Survey Procedures

This study was conducted with the utmost confidentiality in mind, and all necessary protocols and proper resources were consistently utilized throughout this study. IRB approval and exemption was obtained before engaging in any portion of data collection. Potential participants including organizations, managers, or employees were not contacted before this approval and exemption was confirmed.

The researcher contacted representatives from organizations by phone or email and they were introduced to the proposed study. Working with either owners, senior management or a
human resources representative, managers were identified for participation in the research. Once this identification had taken place, initial contact was made by the organization’s representative and the study was introduced to the manager. The fact that participation was voluntary and that the results would be confidential was stressed to the managers at the time the study was introduced. When the manager agreed to participate, they were provided a survey packet with the following information:

1. Background information on the purpose of the study
2. Consent form
3. Demographic information form
4. IPT rating scale survey
5. FFM survey
6. Thank you and researcher contact information
7. A non-sealed envelope with instructions directing the participants to place the completed materials in the envelope once finished, seal the envelope and return it to the organization’s representative for collection by the researcher.

All information was hand delivered directly from the organization’s representative to the manager and the completed survey packets were physically retrieved in no less than forty-eight hours by the researcher. This was to ensure the information was filled out promptly and to maintain confidentiality. Once collected, the data was securely stored and not shared with any internal or external sources or organizations. Ensuring complete confidentiality to the manager placed participants at ease and increased participation in the study.

The second population consisting of the employees followed the same guidelines as the manager’s guidelines previously described. The number of employees participating was the
same as the managers, 90; because the design of the study paired the employee with their specific manager. Employees were chosen randomly from the roster of employees from the manager’s department with the assistance of the organization’s owners, upper management or a human resources representative. The strategy employed in randomly choosing the employee for participation was to pick the third employee on the manager’s roster of employees. In most cases, the manager’s weekly schedule was used applying the same methodology. Once the identification of the employee had taken place, initial contact was made by the organization’s representative and the study was introduced. In some instances, the third employee on the manager’s roster was not available and in those cases, the fourth employee was selected and this continued, going next to the fifth and sixth employee until employee participation was confirmed. The fact that participation was voluntary and confidential was stressed to the employees at the time the study was introduced. When the employee agreed to participate, they were provided a survey packet containing the following information:

1. Background information on the purpose of the study
2. Consent form
3. Demographic information form
4. Justice Measure Rating Scale
5. Effectiveness Rating Scale
6. Thank you and researcher contact information
7. A non-sealed envelope with instructions directing the participants to place the completed materials in the envelope once finished, seal the envelope and return it to the organization’s representative for collection by the researcher.
All information was hand delivered directly from the organization’s representative to the employee and the completed survey packets were physically retrieved in no less than forty-eight hours by the researcher. Once collected, the data was securely stored and not shared with any internal or external sources or organizations. Ensuring complete confidentiality to the employee placed participants at ease and increased participation in the study.

**Data Collection**

The managers and employees were informed that the purpose of this study was to assess how managers evaluate an employee’s work performance. Informed consent forms were signed and collected from all participants. Demographic information collected from all participants included: sex, age, professional experience (years), education level, job title, and which hospitality industry they are currently working in (hotel, restaurant, private club).

Data collection part one: obtained manager’s survey packet including: signed informed consent form, demographic information, IPT rating scale survey and FFM survey information from managers.

Data collection part two: obtained employee’s survey packet from the employees that have been evaluated by their specific managers, creating a paired data scheme. The employee survey packet included; signed informed consent form, demographic information, justice measures survey, and the performance appraisal effectiveness survey.

Using the assistance of the human resources office and other related administrative offices within the organization to assist with the randomly chosen employee (third on roster or schedule) supported the reliability and validity of this study. The performance evaluation that the employee provided feedback on was no more than twelve months old to ensure the feedback provided was current and applicable.
Once each paired sample was established, the information and the surveys were coded for proper identification purposes. Concurrently, the consent forms and any other identifying information related to the participant’s identity was separated from the descriptive information and the surveys. The paired data information used for data analysis was only identifiable by the coding in place and no other personal identification material was present.

**Data Analysis**

Regression analysis was applied to determine how well a manager’s IPT disposition was able to predict the employee’s perceived fairness and effectiveness regarding their most recent performance evaluation. For this study, the employee’s performance evaluation was required to be less than 12 months old. An analysis of the bivariate scatterplots of the variables were examined. A curvature of the relationships was not evident and therefore, a log transformation of the variables was not necessary. In introducing the multiple independent variables, a backward stepwise regression method was utilized. Additionally, a review of the residuals of the major variables were observed as distributed normally which was done by producing histograms for the residuals as well as probability plots. In doing so and to enhance the regression analysis, an analysis of multicollinearity was done through an inspection of independent variables. This ensured that the independent variables were not highly correlated with each other which could have led to problems with understanding which independent variables contributes to the variance explained in the dependent variable as well as it may point to technical issues in calculating the regression models. In investigating for any outliers or influential data points, the data was absent of both and, therefore casewise diagnostics and a measure of influence such as Cook’s Distance was not necessary.
Reliability and Validity

All possible actions were taken to ensure a high level of reliability and validity of the scores. With regard to processes, all applications used to perform procedures and to collect data were consistent and did not differ in any way. Procedures and protocols were followed through with accuracy and precision. Many standards to ensure reliability of scores were embedded within this methodological approach including; how the data was specifically collected, strict guidelines as to who can participate, length of employment, location of participants, ownership models utilized, and pre-assessed determinants of how the paired data must be collected. As previously stated, Cronbach’s Alpha was utilized to test for internal consistency related to the instruments utilized in this study for the independent variables. Examinations of multicollinearity were also utilized regarding the independent variables. To specify the strength of validity related to this study’s design, the design of this study utilized the proper, well-established and proven instruments in all applications. This study has taken into consideration all of the necessary variations related to validity of scores and this study has been designed and executed with this in mind as the content of the items within the instruments fit the research objectives.

Confidentiality and Professionalism

It was the intention of the researcher that the utmost integrity be applied to every facet of this research project. Standard and specific protocols were followed, including applying for and receiving IRB approval and exemption. Because this study used human beings as the sample populations, IRB approval and exemption was obtained prior to engaging in any data collection. A standard protocol that was followed in this research and that is enforced by IRB was the use of informed consent forms being signed by all participants. This form was furnished to each
participant along with a detailed explanation as to its meaning, as well as background information related to the purpose of the study. A critical step in this process was the fact that potential participants understood that their participation was voluntary and that an individual may retract their participation at any time with no reason given. The informed consent required a signature of agreement and an understanding from all participants, and this was obtained in advance of engaging in any research and data collection. The executed informed consent forms were kept in a highly secure location that only the researcher may have accessed. The quality of this research is of extreme importance, and it was important to portray this to participants. To accomplish this, it was paramount that this research process protected and respected the confidentiality and anonymity of all participants. This included all participants, full and partial (in the event a participant discontinues prior to finishing, they will still be protected under this covenant). All information and data collected from participants was kept completely confidential and the anonymity of participants completely secure. The researcher was the only one with knowledge of the data and the ability to access the data. There was a zero tolerance factor for the potential for harm to come to the participants of this research. In no way did the researcher introduce potential harm (physical, mental, or otherwise) to participants relating to engaging in this research. The contrary was the expectation, and it was the hope and desire of the researcher that participants in this study were enlightened by the subject matter and by their participation. Finally, this research is free of bias and discrimination of any kind. Prudently following pre-set protocols, as well as applying well-known parameters on protecting against bias and discrimination in research were strictly in place and acted as a firm structure for this research. The ultimate goal in providing complete assurance of bias and discrimination-free
research is to show that the research was independent of any pre-conceived agendas and was impartial in every possible way and was in place throughout the process of this research study.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chapter 4 presents results and a discussion of the results. It is organized in the following sections; (1) description of the sample, (2) demographic statistics of the samples, (3) descriptive statistics of the samples, (4) an analysis and discussion of the five research questions including a summary of the hypotheses tests outcomes with quantitative data to support the findings. The relationship between the manager’s personality and the employee’s perceived fairness and effectiveness of a recent performance appraisal are presented and discussed.

Description of Sample

234 paper survey packets were hand-distributed to 20 different hospitality organizations. The sample was made up of dyads between a sample of employees and a sample of managers. There were a total of 117 employee/manager survey dyads distributed; a total of 117 employee survey packets distributed paired along with 117 manager survey packets distributed. The pairing of the data was a critical step in the overall data collection. Of the 117 pairs distributed, a total of 102 were collected indicating a response rate of 87% which is consistent with Brown and Arendt’s study (2011) in which they hand-delivered surveys to 41 hotels and the results were a 83% response rate. Further, of the 102 paired survey responses, a total of 90 pairs were filled out completely and usable for this study. Twelve returned dyads were unusable due to missing data. From the original 117 paired surveys distributed, 90 were usable for this study indicating a 77% return rate. The researcher’s former professional and current personal relationships contributed to the successful return rate and the overall acceptance to participate by the 20 hospitality organizations that engaged in this study. In addition, as indicated in prior research, hand delivering and interacting with the organization’s representatives positively influenced the response rates (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009). The strategy of hand delivering the surveys
and interacting directly with the 20 organization’s representatives was an effective approach in gaining acceptance toward participation. The 90 usable paired samples were collected from 20 different hospitality organizations derived from three areas within the industry; hotels, private clubs and restaurants, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired data sample source</th>
<th>Organization type</th>
<th>paired samples</th>
<th># of organizations</th>
<th>average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Club</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Statistics of Samples

Table 2 presents the demographics of the paired samples including age, sex, and education level. Mean age of the employee sample was 34.17 \( n=90 \) with a range reported of 19 to 64 years of age. Mean age of the manager sample was 43 \( n=89 \) with a range of 27 to 66 years of age. The means of each sample indicate that they are from different generations and as proposed by Lub, Bijvank, Bal, Blomme, and Schalk (2012); different generations will hold diverse psychological obligations with their employers, and evaluate the aspects of their psychology contract differently. Managing a multigenerational workforce and the challenges that come along with that are fairly new. Today’s work environments now consists of four different generations for the very first time and organizations must make policy adjustments so that a work environment may be created that is appealing to all employees, whatever their generation (Kapoor & Solomon, 2011). This would be especially true for the hospitality
industry as the industry is labor intensive. Moreover, the employee’s age sample mean of 34.17 seems to be high although this could be attributed to two factors. The first is the area that the sample was drawn from is a luxury hospitality market where compensation is known to be high compared to the national averages. Additionally, the longevity of the employee sample is on the high side as well with 44.5% of the employee sample having been employed at their current position for over five years (Table 3). In reviewing the national average age for front desk clerks working at hotels and resorts, it is reported that the average is 34.9 years of age (DataUSA, n.d.). There are other positions to consider, however it is interesting to note that the employee age sample mean of 34.17 would seem high may in fact be in line with other geographical markets and age of the employee may not be linked to employment longevity.

The sex of the employee sample was 50% female respondents and 50% male respondents and for the manager sample, there were 61% male respondents and 39% female respondents. Sex as a concept can be examined individually from other demographics, but in the field, sex is reviewed in connection with other statistical data (Adib & Guerrier, 2003). Although employee sex is further analyzed in relation to RQ5 for perceived fairness and effectiveness, as it relates to demographic statistics for this section, it is reviewed individually and for observational purposes. In reviewing the percentages, it is interesting to note that 39% of the manager sample were female which seems to be higher than expected as hotels usually hire males as managers with the understanding that wives provide considerable support to their husband’s career and thus aid in the household compensation (Adkins, 1995; Guerrier, 1986).

Education levels as reported by the employee sample (n=89) was: high school (39.0%), some college (34.4%), college degree (33.3%), and advanced college degree (1.1%). Education levels as reported by the manager sample (n=90) was: high school (7.8%), some college (27.8%),
college degree (60.0%), and advanced college degree (4.4%) (n=90). The importance of higher education levels for employees and managers in the hospitality industry is often questioned and the focus has been more on a broad and generic skills development approach with broad learning outcomes rather than narrower abilities or competencies. This broad focus recognizes the dynamic nature of the hospitality employment in the new millennium and the requirement for employees and managers to acquire this set of generic skills (Raybould & Wilkins, 2005). The concern over whether a college degree is necessary for managers in the hospitality industry is not new. This present study reveals that 35.6% of the managers that participated in this study did not possess a college degree or an advanced degree (although this study did not collect information related to what type of degree) which is a fairly high percentage suggesting that to become a manager in the hospitality industry, obtaining a college degree is not required for upward mobility within this field. Gilbert and Guerrier (1997) revealed that there are major differences in the way industry and academics perceive the importance of skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary for college graduates to perform at a high level in the hospitality industry. This would suggest that, although a college degree may be helpful in career development, it is not entirely necessary. This present study is consistent with this mindset as 64.4% of the managers obtained a college degree or an advanced college degree and 35.6% did not possess a college degree.

In reviewing the categories of education level, the category of “some college” represented 34.8% of the employee sample and 27.8% of the manager sample. However, “some college” was not defined on the survey nor did it offer additional descriptive information and therefore, may have a wide range of responses (a college class or two to achieving an associate’s degree). This potential range of responses within the “some college” item may be difficult to interpret in the data. Additionally, the category of “advanced degree” represented 1.1% of the
employee sample and 4.4% of the manager sample. However, “advanced degree” was not defined on the survey nor did it offer any additional descriptive information and therefore, may have a wide range of responses (M.S., Ph.D., JD). This potential range of responses within the “advanced degree” item may be difficult to interpret in the data, although the frequency of this data is minimal.

Table 2

Demographics of Participants (N=90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex (employees)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex (managers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (employees)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (managers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level (employees)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level (managers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 includes data related to items in the demographic survey for both the employees and managers. Items include: job title, tenure in the hospitality industry, and tenure with current organization.

Job title item on the employee and manager survey was an open-ended question that forced the respondent to write a response. The employee responses indicated ten different job titles and the manager responses indicated six different job title responses. The most represented employee responses to job title were in the area of front desk operations, food and beverage, and housekeeping. Front desk was the most represented (n=24, 26.7%), followed by server (n=21, 23.3%), and housekeeping (n=14, 15.6%). The employee responses that were the least populated related to job title were host/hostess (n=3, 3.3%), attendant (n=2, 2.2%), and engineer (n=2, 2.2%). In general, the responses and percentages are consistent with the workforce populations within the participating organizations. For example, the front desk, food and beverage department and housekeeping departments were the larger departments within the participating organizations. From the 6 different manager job title categories reported, the most represented manager job titles were manager (n=64, 71.1%), director (n=13, 14.4%), and GM (n=10, 11.1%). The manager responses that were the least populated related to job title were CFO (n=1, 1.1%), Chef (n=1, 1%), and Innkeeper (n=1, 1.1%). Unfortunately, the majority of the responses from the manager job title question do not afford the researcher the ability to identify particular domains of responsibility, i.e., food and beverage, front office, human resources.

The hospitality industry employs a substantial amount of workers worldwide, approximately 8.3% of total employment opportunities exist in the tourism and hospitality industry (Schlentrich, 2008). Additionally, work in the hospitality industry is portrayed as temporary (Harris, 2009), periodic, convenient, and physically demanding (Lee-Ross, 1999),
part-time, low skilled feminized (Adib & Guerrier, 2003; Korczynski, 2002). The present study’s results on employee longevity, as well as education levels, related to the employee sample may support these statements. Employee responses to the item years of experience in the hospitality industry (n=83) revealed a mean of 10.7. The tenure of one to five years was highest age range (n=26, 31.3%), followed by six to ten years (n=23, 27.7%), and sixteen to twenty years (n=17, 20.5%). Manager responses to the item years of experience in the hospitality industry (n=88) with a mean of 18.08. The tenure of sixteen to twenty years was the highest age range (n=24, 27.3%), followed by six to ten years (n=18, 20.5%) and eleven to fifteen years (n=15, 17.1%). It is interesting to note that the mean for employees regarding years of experience in the hospitality industry was 9.88 and the manager’s mean was 18.08. Possible rationale for this could be the age of each sample as it would be expected that the employee age would be considerably lower. The age statistics from this study would support age being rationale for the manager having a higher tenure in the hospitality industry as the mean age for the employee sample was 34.17 and the mean age for the employee sample was 43.

The years with current organization for the employee response (n=90) produced a mean of 6.09 with a highest age range of one to five years (n=50, 55.5%), followed by six to ten years (n=24, 26.7%), eleven to fifteen years (n=11, 12.2%) and sixteen to twenty years (n=5, 5.6%). The years with current organization item for the manager responses (n=90) produced a mean of 9.88 with the highest age range of six to ten years (n=34, 37.8%) followed by one to five years (n=22, 24.4%), eleven to fifteen years (n=20, 22.2%), sixteen to twenty years (n=11, 12.2%) and over twenty years (n=3, 3.3%). Contrary to this present study’s findings, organizational loyalty appears to be low throughout the hospitality industry as the temporary nature of jobs in the hospitality industry allow workers to change jobs frequently. It seems many hospitality
employees and managers consider hospitality employment temporary while searching for employment in other industry sectors (Rydzik, Pritchard, Morgan, & Sedgley, 2012). This present findings would be consistent with the previous statement in regard to the employee sample because 55.5% of the employee sample had been employed by their current employer for five years or less. However, there does not seem to be support for the manager sample in this regard as 75.6% of the manager sample had been employed with their current employer for six years or more.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptives</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(employee, n=90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front desk</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostess</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job titles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(manager, n=90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chef</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic data was collected from both the employee sample and the manager sample focusing on performance appraisal experience, rating level on last performance evaluation, anxiety levels felt during last performance evaluation, and intent to leave current organization.

Items on the employee survey and the manager survey were consistent and the same instrument was used for each sample. Table 4 includes data related the following questions for the employee
sample and the manager sample: (1) total number of performance evaluations participated in career, (2) total number of performance appraisals with current organization, (3) rating on last performance evaluation, (4) level of anxiety felt during last performance evaluation, and (5) intent to leave current organization.

Contrary to what many industry executives believe, most hospitality organizations utilize regular performance appraisals (Woods, Sciarini, & Bretier, 1998). The employee response to total number of performance appraisals participated in career ($n=86$) produced a mean of 7.0 and the age range of one year to five years showed the highest frequency ($n=47, 52.2\%$) followed by six to ten years ($n=23, 25.6\%$) before dropping off considerably. The manager response to the total number of performance appraisals participated in career ($n=82$) produced a mean of 10.4 and a fairly even spread through years one to ten. Years six to ten showed the highest frequency ($n=26, 28.9\%$), followed by years one to five ($n=24, 26.7\%$) and eleven to fifteen ($n=18, 20\%$) before dropping off considerably. The frequency of performance appraisals employed by most hotel organizations is once a year (Woods et al., 1989). Utilizing the norm of one performance appraisal per year for employees and managers and comparing the means of number of performance appraisal participated in career and tenure in the industry, the results from this present study would indicate that performance appraisals were conducted less than once a year during the employees and managers hospitality career. Employee’s tenure in the hospitality industry mean was 9.88 years and the employee mean for total number of performance appraisals participated in career was 7. Manager’s tenure in the hospitality industry was 18.08 years and the manager mean for total number of performance appraisals participated in career was 10.4. This may suggest that within the present study, during the course of their career, performance
appraisals were more geared for the front line employees and not necessarily as important for the managers.

The total number of performance appraisals participated in with current organization for employees (n=89) produced a mean of 5.2 and years one to five showed the highest frequency (n=59, 65.6%) followed by six to ten years (n=21, 23.3%) before dropping off considerably. The item number of performance appraisals participated in with current organization for managers (n=90) produced a mean of 8.36 and years one to five showed the highest frequency (n=37, 41.1%) followed by six to ten years (n=32, 35.6%) and eleven to fifteen years (n=12, 13.3%) before dropping off considerably. In a previous study related to hospitality workers performance appraisal frequency, approximately 66% of responses indicated utilizing appraisals once a year, followed by a much smaller percentages using appraisals twice a year (Woods et al., 1998). The results for total number of performance appraisals participated in with current organization for the employee and manager sample is in line with the statement above indicating approximately 66% of hospitality workers receive a performance appraisal once a year. The employee mean for tenure with current organization was 6.09 and the employee mean of total number of performance appraisals participated in with current organization was 5.2. The manager mean for tenure with current organization was 9.88 and the manager mean of total number of performance appraisals participated in with current organization was 8.36. This data, as compared to overall tenure in the hospitality industry and overall performance appraisals received in career for both the employee and manager sample, this may suggest that performance appraisals are have become more relevant recently.

The item “how you were rated on your last evaluation” asked employees and managers to choose one of the following responses: (1) below average, (2) average, (3) above average, and
(4) outstanding. The choices of responses for this question are consistent with a commonly used behavioral anchored rating scale performance appraisal with the exception that the option of “unsatisfactory” was omitted. This option was omitted because the surveys were self-reported. The employee sample \((n=89)\) highest response frequency was above average \((n=40, 44.4\%)\) followed by average \((n=27, 30.0\%)\), and outstanding \((n=22, 24.4\%)\). It is interesting to note that the below average category for the employee sample had a response frequency of zero \((n=0, 0\%)\). The manager sample \((n=88)\) highest frequency was above average \((n=55, 61.1\%)\) followed by outstanding \((n=22, 24.4\%)\) and average \((n=11, 12.2\%)\). It is interesting to note that the below average category for the manager sample had a frequency of zero \((n=0, 0\%)\). It is also interesting to note that both samples highest response frequency was above average by a considerable margin and it is important to be reminded that the surveys were self-reported.

Although there are benefits to self-evaluations, often self-reported ratings are not consistent with outside, independent observations, such as the workplace model of a manager conducting a performance appraisal on a subordinate. Despite of some evidence that self-ratings are good for employee training, development and enhanced communication among managers and employees (Carrol & Schneier, 1982), field research indicates a recurring lack of congruency among self-ratings and ratings provided by others (Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988).

Both samples were asked to evaluate their level of anxiety during their last performance evaluation. To illustrate the point that anxiety is typically present during the performance evaluation process, Capelli (2016) stated; there is probably nothing in the field of management that is more common, and there is practically no other human resources instrument applied commonly by employers that workers dislike more than performance evaluations. Additionally, feeling fear and stress often goes along with the process of performance appraisals (Kondrasuk,
The results of this study would be consistent with this outlook toward the process of performance appraisals for both samples, and even more so within the employee sample. The manager sample data related to this area reveals that the managers feel far less anxiety than the employees. The item “what was the level of anxiety felt during your last performance appraisal” asked employees and managers to choose one of the following responses: (1) no anxiety, (2) moderate anxiety, (3) strong anxiety, and (4) intense anxiety. The employee sample response ($n=88$) showed strong anxiety ($n=38, 42.2\%$) had the highest frequency followed by moderate anxiety ($n=34, 37.8\%$), no anxiety ($n=13, 14.4\%$) and intense anxiety ($n=3, 3.3\%$). The manager sample response ($n=89$) showed moderate anxiety ($n=44, 48.9\%$) had the highest frequency followed equally by no anxiety ($n=22, 24.4\%$) and strong anxiety ($n=22, 24.4\%$). The manager sample for the choice of intense anxiety felt during last performance appraisal showed a frequency of one ($n=1, 1.1\%$). It is interesting to note that the employee sample response indicated that 83.3% felt moderate or higher anxiety during their last performance appraisal. Additionally, the manager sample response indicated that 75.3% felt moderate or higher anxiety during their last performance appraisal. It is interesting to note that employees and managers alike feel considerable anxiety associated with the experience of a performance appraisal.

Among other potential reasons for anxiety related to performance appraisals, Thomas and Bretz (1994) indicate that line staff and supervisors disdain the performance appraisal process due to the fact that neither were part of developing the appraisal form, suggestions for changes in the process are not asked of the line staff or supervisors, and supervisors don’t enjoy giving, and line staff don’t enjoy receiving, negative feedback. The results of this present study would support this outlook on how managers and supervisors feel about participating in performance appraisals.
The next item addresses a well-known issue in the hospitality industry; the potential for attrition, or intent to leave. Work in the hospitality industry has been characterized by high levels of attrition and described as periodic and unexpected; having low job security, low pay and minimal skill levels (Iverson & Deery, 1997). The item “level of intent to leave current organization” asked employees and managers to choose from one of the following responses: (1) no plans to leave, (2) not likely to leave, (3) maybe leaving, and (4) definitely leaving. The employee sample response (n=90) showed maybe leaving (n=33, 36.7%) had the highest frequency followed by no plans to leave (n=27, 30.0%), not likely to leave (n=20, 22.2%) and definitely leaving (n=10, 11.1%). The manager sample response (n=90) showed no plans to leave (n=36, 40.0%), followed by not likely to leave (n=35, 38.9%) and maybe leaving (n=19, 21.1%). The results of this study seem to be consistent with the well-known issue of attrition in the hospitality industry for the employee sample. 47.8% of the employee sample indicated that they were maybe leaving or definitely leaving their current organization. However, 78.9% of the manager sample indicated that they were most likely to stay in their current position. The definitely leaving category for manager sample had a frequency of zero (n=0, 0%). It is interesting to note the disparity of the response to this question between the employee sample and the manager sample. Regarding the intent to leave and organizational attrition, the manager sample in this study seems to be less consistent than the employee sample when reviewing the extant literature on this subject. Surveys published in 1987 and 1990 produced the annual attrition rate for managers within hotels at 46% and 44% respectively (Hiemstra, 1990). These percentages are consistent with the employee sample of this study, however, they are inconsistent with the manager sample within this study. One explanation for the inconsistency in
this area among the manager sample might be the longevity of the manager sample with current organization \((m=9.88)\).

Table 4

Demographics of Participants \((N=90)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of performance evaluations in career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(employee, (n=86), mean=7.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of performance evaluations in career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(manager, (n=82), mean=10.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of performance evaluations with current organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(employee, (n=89), mean=5.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of performance evaluations with current organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(manager, (n=90), mean=8.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. (continued)

Rating received during most recent performance evaluation
(employee, \(n=89\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Employee (n=89)</th>
<th>Manager (n=88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating received during most recent performance evaluation
(manager, \(n=88\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Employee (n=89)</th>
<th>Manager (n=88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anxiety level felt during last performance evaluation
(employee, \(n=88\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anxiety Level</th>
<th>Employee (n=89)</th>
<th>Manager (n=88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No anxiety</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate anxiety</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong anxiety</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intense anxiety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anxiety level felt during last performance evaluation
(manager, \(n=89\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anxiety Level</th>
<th>Employee (n=89)</th>
<th>Manager (n=88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No anxiety</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate anxiety</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong anxiety</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intense anxiety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intent to leave current organization
(employee, \(n=90\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan to Leave</th>
<th>Employee (n=90)</th>
<th>Manager (n=89)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No plans to leave</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not likely leaving</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe leaving</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely leaving</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intent to leave current organization (manager, n=90)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No plans to leave</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not likely leaving</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe leaving</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely leaving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics of Samples**

This section presents descriptive data obtained from the four different questionnaires. For the employee sample, this includes the justice measures scale (distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational) (Colquit, 2001) and the performance appraisal effectiveness scale (Longenecker, et al. 1986). For the manager sample, this includes the implicit person theory (IPT) scale (Dweck, 1999) and the five-factor model (FFM) (Shafer, 1999) (openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, and extraversion). The relationships between a manager’s personality and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of an employee related to a recently conducted performance appraisal are presented and discussed. All items on all scales were self-reported.

**Mean Ratings of Manager’s IPT Disposition**

Table 5 provides mean ratings of the eight items contained in the IPT scale. Using self-reported responses, data were collected using a 6-point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly Agree to 6=Strongly Disagree). Items 5-8 on the IPT scale were revered scored (inverted). The IPT scale outcome is comprised of two parts, incremental IPT disposition and entity IPT disposition. An outcome higher than 3.5 would indicate the manager possesses an incremental IPT disposition indicating the manager believes coaching and training employees can improve performance. An outcome of 3.5 or lower would indicate the manager possesses an entity IPT disposition...
indicating the manager does not believe coaching and training employees can improve performance.

The mean range for the eight items \((n=90)\) was a low of 3.66 and a high of 4.04 indicating similar responses across the IPT items. The first three items on the IPT scale, (1) “Everyone is a kind of person and there is not much that they can do to really change that,” (2) “The kind of person someone is is something basic about them and it can’t be changed very much,” and (3) “People can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can’t really be changed,” reported the lowest means of 3.67, 3.68, and 3.66 respectively. The fourth item on the IPT scale, “As much as I hate to admit it, you can’t teach an old dog new tricks. People can’t really change their deepest attributes,” reported the highest mean of 4.04. Items five through eight reported means with a low of 3.82 and a high of 3.97. Item five “People can change even their most basic qualities” reported a mean of 3.82. Item six “Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic characteristics” reported a mean of 3.79. Item seven “People can substantially change the kind of person who they are” reported a mean of 3.86. Item eight “No matter what kind of person someone is, they can always change very much” reported a mean of 3.97. The composite IPT scale result was 3.81 indicating the managers’ sample possess stronger incremental IPT attributes over entity IPT attributes.
Table 5

**Mean Ratings of IPT Scale Statements (N=90)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPT statements (a = .88)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is a kind of person, and there is not much they can do</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To really change that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kind of person someone is is something basic about them and it can’t be changed very much</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can’t really be changed</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As much as I hate to admit it, you can’t teach an old dog new tricks. People can’t really change their deepest attributes.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People can change even their most basic qualities</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic characteristics</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People can substantially change the kind of person who they are very much</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No matter what kind of person someone is, they can always change very much</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Mean</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Scale is 1 = Strongly Agree to 6 = Strongly Disagree, items 5-8 reversed scored*

The IPT scale was developed Dweck (1999) and the construct is related to the fact that people have two different implicit theories about the nature of people; entity theorists and incremental theorists. They are implicit theories because people cannot express them, or make them explicit. Entity theorists believe people’s traits are fixed and cannot be changed and incremental theorists believe people’s traits can change and be improved.

For reliability of the scale, alphas for the IPT scale reported by Park and John (2010) was .89 (study 1). After using the scale multiple times, Yorkston, Nunes, and Matta (2010) reported alphas of .86 to .93. The first four items on the scale signify entity theory while items five through eight signify incremental theory. For this present study, the reported Cronbach’s alpha for the IPT scale was $a = .88$ indicating good internal consistency among scale items and supports the reliability of the scale.
Dweck (1999) postulated that someone with an entity IPT disposition believes that a person’s ability and personality are static which leads them to judge a person quickly. Moreover, once the judgement is made, it is rarely revisited or modified. However, Dweck (1999) also postulated that a person with an incremental IPT disposition will modify their judgement of people’s ability and personality as they believe these areas are dynamic and change with different situations, especially when new, relevant information is received. The manager sample in this present study relating to IPT disposition revealed an incremental disposition ($m=3.81$). This is perceived as a positive signal for the hospitality industry due to its ever changing environment where employees need to adapt to new situations and problem solve quickly, due to the amount of training and development efforts that are deployed, and the need to offer upward mobility opportunities to it workforce. Managers with an incremental IPT disposition would support these efforts and would have an ongoing evaluation system for their employees which may be perceived by the employee as the manager being fair and effective.

**Mean Ratings of Manager’s Five Factor Model**

Table 6 provides mean ratings of the 30 items on the five-factor model (FFM). The data is presented and organized by the five different FFM categories: (1) Extraversion, (2) Neuroticism, (3) Conscientiousness, (4) Agreeableness, and (5) Openness. Each category contains six items. The administration of the scale consisted of a column of trait-term pairs which are opposite terms (i.e., shy – outgoing) and the trait-term pairs are self-evaluated by participants by using a 7-point Likert-type scale. Instructions direct participants to choose the best location along the scale, using the trait-terms as scale anchors, that describes their personality most appropriately (Shafer, 1999).
The six items related to extraversion reported a mean range of 4.54 to 5.47. The lowest mean reported was “quiet – talkative” reported a mean of 4.54 followed by “introverted – extraverted” and “shy – outgoing” which reported means of 4.63 and 4.70 respectively. Means for extraversion reported the highest included “loner – joiner,” “retiring – social,” and “reserved – friendly” reported means of 4.81, 5.09, and 5.47 respectively. The reported grand mean for extraversion was 4.87.

The six items related to neuroticism reported a mean range of 3.57 to 4.04. The lowest mean reported was “unworried – fearful” reported a mean of 3.57 followed by “self-assured – worrying,” and “hardy – vulnerable” which reported means of 3.84 and 3.86 respectively. Means for neuroticism reported the highest included “calm – anxious,” “un-agitated – tense” and “at ease – nervous” reported means of 3.98, 4.02, and 4.04 respectively. The reported grand mean for neuroticism was 3.86, the lowest grand mean of the FFM categories.

The six items related to conscientiousness reported a mean range of 5.21 to 5.74. The lowest mean reported was “unorganized – orderly” reported a mean of 5.21 followed by “lazy – hard working” and “weak-willed – self-discipline” which reported mean of 5.48 and 5.62 respectively. Means for conscientiousness reported the highest included “careless – thorough,” “quitting – persevering,” and “un-responsible – responsible” reported means of 5.63, 5.73, and 5.74 respectively. The reported grand mean for conscientiousness was 5.57, the highest reported grand mean of the FFM categories.

The six items related to agreeableness reported a mean range of 4.64 to 5.31. The lowest mean reported was “critical – lenient” reported a mean of 4.64 followed by “stubborn – flexible” and “antagonistic – acquiescent” which reported means of 4.74 and 4.89 respectively. Means for agreeableness reported the highest included “disagreeable – agreeable,” “headstrong – gentle,”
and “vengeful – forgiving” reported means of 4.97, 4.97 and 5.31 respectively. The reported grand mean for agreeableness was 4.92.

The six items related to openness reported a mean range of 3.70 to 4.92. The lowest mean reported was “realistic – philosophical” reported a mean of 3.70 followed by “down to earth – imaginative” which reported a mean of 4.28. Means for agreeableness reported the highest included “unartistic – artistic,” “conventional – original,” “uncreative – creative” and un-inquisitive – inquisitive” which reported means of 4.43, 4.43, 4.56, and 4.92 respectively. The reported grand mean for openness was 4.39.

Table 6

Mean Ratings for FFM Scale Statements (N=90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFM Statements</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion (α = .92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy – Outgoing</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet – Talkative</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverted – Extraverted</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiring – Social</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved – Friendly</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loner – Joiner</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism (α = .89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At ease – Nervous</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-agitated – Tense</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm – Anxious</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unworried – Fearful</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assured – Worried</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy – Vulnerable</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness (α = .85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy – Hard working</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-responsible – Responsible</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak willed – Self-discipline</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitting – Persevering</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless – Thorough</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unorganized – Orderly</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness (α = .91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head strong – Gentle</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vengeful – Forgiving</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeable – Agreeable</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn – Flexible</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antagonistic – Acquiescent</th>
<th>4.89</th>
<th>1.29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical – Lenient</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Openness ($a = .88$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncreative – Creative</th>
<th>4.56</th>
<th>1.52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unartistic – Artistic</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down to earth – Imaginative</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional – Original</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninquisitive – Inquisitive</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic – Philosophical</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 7-point Likert-type scale

Table 7

*Mean ratings for FFM Categories (N=90)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFM Factors</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 7-point Likert-type scale

The FFM instrument utilized in this study was developed by Shafer (1999) and is known as a brief rating scale relating to the five factor model of personality assessments. Brief rating scales are of value to researchers when time is an issue relating to assessing individuals, when there is a large number of participants to assess, or when other scales are being administered at the same time (Shafer, 1999). Since time spent participating in this research was of paramount concern to the participants and this research was administering other instruments along with the FFM instrument, it was appropriate to apply a brief FFM rating scale for this present research.

For reliability and internal consistency of the FFM scale regarding this present study, Cronbach’s alpha was reported to be $a = .87$ which implies the measures were not unidimensional and supports the reliability of the scale. The five domains of the FFM are defined in the Definition of Terms on page 17 of this document. The FFM domain
conscientiousness had the highest reported mean by a considerable margin. It is defined as measures “the extent to which individuals are hardworking, organized, dependable, and persevering versus lazy, disorganized, and unreliable” (Salgado, 1997, p. 30). This is interesting to note as the definition of conscientiousness seems to be consistent with a management profile within the hospitality industry as the hospitality industry is a people industry that requires customer around the clock 7 days a week leading to long hours and working weekends (Kim, Shin, & Umbreit, 2006).

Mean Ratings of Employee’s Justice Measures

Table 8 provides the mean ratings of the 20 items of the justice measures. The data is presented and organized by the four justice domains: (1) procedural justice, 7 items, (2) distributive justice, 4 items, (3) interpersonal justice, 4 items, and (4) informational justice, 5 items. The administration of the scale was self-reported using a 5-point Likert-type scale with anchors of (1) to a small extent and (5) to a large extent. Each item within the four justice constructs begins consistently with “to what extent” followed by the particular item. The present study utilizes the four justice measures and the 20 items contained within the four measures of justice as a means of assessing an employee’s perception of fairness related to a recently conducted performance evaluation.

Procedural justice is concerned with making and implementing decisions according to fair processes (Maises, 2013). This seven item justice construct is the largest of the justice measure constructs and reported a mean range of 2.69 to 3.89. The lowest reported mean was item 2 on the scale “have you had influence over the outcome arrived at by those procedures” ($m=2.69$) followed by item 6 “have you been able to appeal the outcome arrived at by your procedures” ($m=2.70$), item 1 “have you been able to express your views and feelings during
these procedures \(m=2.84\) and item 3 “have those procedures been applied consistently \(m=3.37\). The highest reported mean was item 7 “have the procedures upheld ethical and moral standards \(m=3.89\) followed by item 5 “have those procedures been based on accurate information” \(m=3.56\) and item 4 “have those procedures been free of bias” \(m=3.60\).

Distributive justice is centered on the equitable distribution of resources among its workforce (Maises, 2013). This four item justice measure reported a mean range of 2.97 to 3.39. The lowest reported mean was item 3 “does your outcome reflect what you have contributed to the organization” \(m=2.97\) followed by item 4 “is your outcome justified given your performance” \(m=3.19\). The highest reported mean was item 1 “does your outcome reflect the effort you have put into your work” \(m=3.39\) followed by item 2 “is your outcome appropriate for the work for the work you have completed” \(m=3.24\).

Interpersonal justice measures the amount to which people are treated fairly and appropriately, including levels of respect and dignity (Colquitt, 2001). This four item justice measure reported a mean range of 3.92 to 4.08. The lowest reported mean was item 4 “has your manager refrained from improper remarks or comments” \(m=3.92\) followed by item 1 “has your manager treated you in a polite manner” \(m=3.92\). The highest reported mean was item 2 “has your manager treated you with dignity” \(m=4.08\) followed by item 3 “has your manager treated you with respect” \(m=3.98\).

Informational justice “focuses on explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why the outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion” (p. 427, Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. & Ng, K. Y., 2001). This five item justice measure reported a mean range of 3.22 to 3.49. The lowest reported mean was item 5 “has your manager seemed to tailor his/her communications to
individuals’ specific needs” \( (m=3.22) \) followed by item 2 “has your manager explained the procedures thoroughly” \( (m=3.28) \). The highest reported mean was item 1 “has your manager been candid with his/her communications with you” \( (m=3.49) \) followed by item 3 “were your manager’s explanations regarding the procedures reasonable” \( (m=3.43) \) and item 4 “has your manager communicated details in a timely manner” \( (m=3.42) \).

Table 8

**Mean Ratings for Justice Measures \((N=90)\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you had influence over the outcome arrived at by those procedures</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have those procedures been applied consistently</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have those procedures been free of bias</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have those procedures been based on accurate information</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been able to appeal the outcome arrived at by those procedures</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have those procedures upheld ethical and moral standards</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your outcome reflect the effort you have put into your work</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your outcome appropriate for the work you have completed</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your outcome reflect what you have contributed to the organization</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your outcome justified given your performance</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Justice</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has your manager treated you in a polite manner</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your manager treated you with dignity</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your manager treated you with respect</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your manager refrained from improper remarks or comments</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informational Justice</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has your manager been candid in his/her communication with you</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your manager explained the procedures thoroughly</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were your managers explanations regarding the procedures reasonable</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your manager communicated details in a timely manner</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your manager seemed to tailor his/her communications to individuals’ specific needs</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale. 1=to a small extent – 5 to a large extent*
The overall purpose of the justice measures scale was to evaluate the employee’s perceived fairness related to a performance evaluation that was less than 12 months old. A review of the composite means within the four justice measures reveals there is disparity among the four composite scores reported. The range for the four composite means reported was 3.20 to 3.99. Distributive justice reported the lowest composite mean (\(m=3.20\)) which relates to organization’s fair and equitable distribution of resources. A review of the items within the distribution justice measure shows that the employees may not be satisfied with the fairness performance evaluation related to the outcome of the evaluation. Procedural justice, having to do with applying fair decisions, policies, and procedures during the performance evaluation experience reported a composite mean of 3.24. Three of the seven means within this measure relating to the employee’s input, communication, and appeal were 2.84, 2.69, and 2.70 respectively indicating the performance evaluation did not afford time or consideration for employee feedback. Informational justice, related to the explanation surrounding the results of the performance evaluation, reported a composite mean of 3.37. Overall fairness related to informational justice related to the employee’s perceptions seems to be satisfactory with little variations among the five informational justice measures (range: 3.22 to 3.49). Interpersonal justice reported the highest composite mean of 3.99. Interpersonal justice evaluates the level of respect, dignity, and politeness perceived by the employee during the performance evaluation process. Results within the interpersonal justice measure would suggest that employees perceive the performance evaluation processes conducted with managers treat employees with respect, dignity, and politeness.
Mean Ratings of Effective Performance Evaluation

Table 9 shows mean rating of the self-reported responses to the 7-item Effective Performance Evaluation Scale. The scale is a 4-point Likert type scale with anchors of 1=strongly disagree to 4= strongly agree. The means for the seven items reported a range of 2.44 to 3.08 indicating responses were slightly disagree to agree. The lowest mean rating was item 4, “performance evaluations allows for employees to be candid/open with discussing their performance” \( (m=2.44) \). Item 3 reported a mean of \( (m=2.63) \) “managers are open and honest in their performance evaluations. Item 6, “managers put enough time into performance evaluations \( (m=2.80) \) followed by item 5 “performance evaluations are too subjective” \( (m=2.84) \) and item 1 “I clearly understand why we do performance evaluations” reporting a mean of 3.01. The highest reported mean was item 7 “performance evaluations are conducted in a professional manner” \( (m=3.16) \) followed by item 2 “managers using performance evaluations treat employees fairly” \( (m=3.08) \).

Table 9

Mean Ratings of Effective Performance Evaluations \((N=90)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Performance Evaluations Statements</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I clearly understand why we do performance evaluations</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers using performance evaluations treat employees fairly</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers are open and honest in their performance evaluations with employees</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluations allows employees to be candid/open when discussing their performance</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluations are too subjective</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers put enough time into performance evaluations</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluations are conducted in a professional manner</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1=strongly disagree to 4=strongly agree

The purpose of employing the Effective Performance Evaluations Scale was to assess the employee’s perceived effectiveness related to a recently conducted performance evaluation. A
4-point Likert-type scale was implemented without a neutral point as the items within the scale tend to be dichotomous; the items are, or, are not related to the significance of a performance evaluation (Longenencker, et al, 1988). It is interesting to note that the lowest mean among the items on the scale was related to employee feedback and communication during the performance appraisal process which seems to be consistent with the justice measure previously reported, informational justice.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses Examined**

In this section, the results related to the five research questions are examined. The research questions and the hypotheses tested for this study were as follows:

**RQ1)** How does a manager’s IPT disposition impact an employees’ perceived fairness of performance evaluations?

H1: A manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.

**RQ2)** How does a manager’s IPT disposition impact employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations?

H2: A manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

**RQ3)** How does a manager’s (FFM) impact the perceived fairness and effectiveness of performance evaluations of their subordinates?

H3: A manager’s (FFM) Agreeableness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

H4: A manager’s (FFM) Conscientiousness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.
H5: A manager’s (FFM) Openness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

H6: A manager’s (FFM) Extraversion positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

H7: A manager’s (FFM) Neuroticism negatively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

RQ4) Controlling for a manager’s FFM, does IPT disposition explain additional differences in employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of performance evaluations?

H8: When controlling for a manager’s FFM, IPT incrementalism disposition explains additional positive differences in employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.

H9: When controlling for a manager’s FFM, IPT incrementalism disposition explains additional positive differences in employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

RQ5) Are there any differences in the perceived effectiveness or fairness based on the demographic variables?

H10: The employee’s sex has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H11: The employee’s sex has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

H12: The manager’s sex has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.
H13: The manager’s sex has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

H14: The employee’s age has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H15: The employee’s age has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

**Implicit Person Theory Disposition and Perceived Fairness**

Research question one examined “How does a manager’s IPT disposition impact an employees’ perceived fairness of performance evaluations?” was tested with hypothesis H1; A manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations. The relationship between variables was examined utilizing regression analysis.

The results regarding the relationship between a manager’s IPT disposition and employee fairness showed a statistically significant relationship with a model summary of \[ r (90) = .400, p < .000 \]. The result which are displayed in Table 11 (regression model summary) and table 12 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a moderately weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s IPT disposition and the perceived fairness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The \( p \) value was found to be statistically significant (\( p < .000 \)), however, since the \( r = .400 \), the relationship is positive and moderately weak. In this case, since the \( r \) is on the upper end of this scale, the results are interpreted as moderately weak (positive). Additionally, roughly 16% of the variance in perceived fairness (\( R^2 = .16 \)) is explained by IPT disposition. Therefore, a manager’s IPT disposition has a moderately weak yet positive impact on employees’ perceived fairness of performance evaluations.
The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between IPT disposition and perceived fairness is rejected. This determination is made since the results of this present study suggest IPT disposition could statistically (with significance) predict perceived fairness \([F(1, 89) = 16.772, p<.000]\).

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 13. The non-standardized coefficients \((B)\) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The \(B\) value for IPT disposition was .337 indicating that, given a one percent increase in IPT disposition, the prediction of perceived fairness results in approximately a33\% change. This indicates that IPT disposition has a moderate effect on perceived fairness given that other variables are held constant. Table 13 also displays the \(t\) statistic of IPT disposition = 4.095; being different from zero, this indicates that IPT disposition makes a significant contribution to the model. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 1 expressing the value of the dependent variable (fairness) as a function of the independent variable (IPT Comp) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

![Figure 1. IPT Incrementalism and Perceived Fairness](image-url)
Table 10

_Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of IPT disposition and Perceived Fairness_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPT Comp</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**  
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 11

_Regression Model Summary – IPT Disposition and Perceived Fairness_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Adj. R²</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.400a</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.63659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), IPT Comp

Table 12

_ANOVA Table for Regression Model – IPT Disposition and Perceived Fairness_

_Fit Model_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.797</td>
<td>16.772</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42.459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness  
b. Predictors: (Constant), IPT Comp

Table 13

_Regression Coefficients – IPT Disposition and Perceived Fairness_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT Comp</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness
Research question one assessed the relationship between the IPT disposition of a manager and an employee’s perceived fairness of a recently conducted performance evaluation. The hypothesis related to RQ1 predicted a manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a moderately weak yet statistically significant relationship between the IPT incrementalism disposition of a manager and the employee’s perceived fairness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.

A moderately weak relationship between the IPT incrementalism disposition of a manager and the employee’s perceived fairness of a recently conducted performance appraisal was present. This is consistent with the extant research related to a manager’s IPT incrementalism and how employees perceive their managers. As defined by Dweck (1999), IPT incrementalism is present when a manager has tendencies of a coach and counselor, improving
employee performance through training and encouragement. Employing this type of management style has been proven to be effective in facilitating employee development and performance (Heslin, VandeWalle, & Latham, 2006). Contrary to the attributes of IPT incrementalism is IPT entity. IPT entity is present when a manager believes employees’ abilities are fixed and cannot be improved with the use of training and development techniques.

The relationship between IPT incrementalism and fairness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing IPT incrementalism in the process of an employee evaluation as fairness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Evans and McShane (1988) suggest that the more the employees perceive the evaluation to be fair, it is more probable for them to endorse the system and accept its outcomes. Moreover, if a performance evaluation is perceived as unfair, this can diminish rather than enhance employee’s attitude and performance (Kay, Meyer, & French, 1965; Latham & Mann, 2006).

These findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possesses IPT incrementalism may conduct performance evaluations that are perceived more favorably related to fairness.

**Implicit Person Theory Disposition and Perceived Effectiveness**

Research question two examined “How does a manager’s IPT disposition impact an employees’ perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations?” was tested with hypothesis; H2: A manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

The relationship between variables was examined utilizing regression analysis. This strategy was deployed so that the relationship between the manager’s IPT disposition and the
employee’s perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance appraisal could be explored.

The results regarding the relationship between a manager’s IPT disposition and employee effectiveness showed a significant relationship with a model summary of \( r (90) = .435, p < .000 \). The results which are displayed in Table 15 (regression model summary) and 16 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a moderately weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s IPT disposition and the perceived effectiveness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The \( p \) value was found to be statistically significant (\( p < .000 \)), however, since the \( r \) is .435, the relationship is positive and moderately weak. In this case, since the \( r \) is on the upper end of this scale, the results are interpreted as moderately weak (positive).

Additionally, roughly 18.9% of the variance in perceived effectiveness (\( R^2 = .189 \)) is explained by IPT disposition. Therefore, a manager’s IPT incrementalism disposition has a moderate yet positive impact on employees’ perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between IPT disposition and perceived effectiveness is rejected. This determination is made since the results of this present study suggest IPT disposition could statistically (with significance) predict perceived effectiveness \( [F (1, 89) = 20.501, p < .000] \).

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 17. The non-standardized coefficients \( (B) \) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The \( B \) value for IPT disposition was .298 indicating that, given a one percent increase in IPT disposition, the prediction of perceived effectiveness results in a 29.8% change. This indicates that IPT disposition has a moderate effect on perceived effectiveness. Table 17 also displays the \( t \) statistic
of IPT disposition = 4.528; being different from zero, this indicates that IPT disposition makes a significant contribution to the model. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 2 expressing the value of the dependent variable (effectiveness) as a function of the independent variable (IPT Comp) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

**Figure 3.** IPT Incrementalism and Perceived Effectiveness

**Table 14**

*Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of IPT disposition and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPT Comp</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.435**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Table 15**

*Regression Model Summary – IPT Disposition and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Adj.$R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.435*</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.50964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), IPT Comp
Table 16

ANOVA Table for Regression Model – IPT Disposition and Perceived Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.325</td>
<td>20.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>22.857</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.459</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
b. Predictors: (Constant), IPT Comp

Table 17

Regression Coefficients – IPT Disposition and Perceived Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.679</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT Comp</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>4.528</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

Scatterplot - Curve Fit Model

Figure 4. Scatterplot with Curve Fit Model – Effectiveness and IPT Comp
Research question two assessed the relationship between the IPT disposition of a manager and an employee’s perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance evaluation. The hypothesis related to RQ2 predicted a manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a moderately weak yet statistically significant relationship between the IPT incrementalism disposition of a manager and the employee’s perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.

A moderately weak relationship between the IPT disposition of a manager and the employee’s perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance appraisal was present. This is also consistent with the extant research related a manager’s IPT incrementalism and how employees perceive their managers. It has been postulated that an effectively administered and received performance evaluation between a manager and the employee benefits all stakeholders, including the organization (Cascio, 1982). IPT incrementalism provides a channel for manager and subordinates to develop positive relationships. With the challenge of performance appraisal administration, which both parties loathe, a manager possessing IPT incrementalism may anticipate positive outcomes related to the employee’s perceived effectiveness throughout the process.

The relationship between IPT disposition and perceived effectiveness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing IPT incrementalism in the process of an employee evaluation; since effectiveness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. In researching the most significant criteria for assessing the success of performance evaluations, effectiveness has shown to be a significant issue (Balzer & Sulsky, 1990).
This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possess IPT incrementalism may conduct performance evaluations that are perceived more favorably by employees related to effectiveness.

**Five Factor Model (FFM) and Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness**

Research question three examined, “How does a manager’s five-factor model (FFM) impact the perceived fairness and effectiveness of performance evaluations of their subordinates?” The FFM is a highly useful and comprehensive tool for describing and assessing personality (Costa & Widiger, 1994). The five domains of the FFM include; agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, extraversion, and neuroticism. Each of the five hypotheses related to RQ3 investigates each of the five FFM domains against the employee’s fairness and effectiveness. Therefore, the analysis of each hypothesis was separated into two analysis. The first (a) being the specific FFM domain with fairness and the second (b) being the specific FFM domain with effectiveness.

![Figure 5. FFM and Perceived Fairness](image)

**Note:** solid lines = significant relationships; dashed lines = non-significant relationships  *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Figure 6. FFM and Perceived Effectiveness

(FFM) Agreeableness and Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness

Agreeableness is the first of the five domains within the FFM model to be explored as it relates to its relationship between a manager administering a performance evaluation and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of their subordinate. The relationships between agreeableness and fairness and effectiveness were conducted utilizing regression analysis. RQ3 was tested with hypotheses H3a and H3b:

H3a: A manager’s (FFM) Agreeableness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.

H3b: A manager’s (FFM) Agreeableness positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.
The results of H3a regarding the relationship between a manager’s agreeableness and employee’s perceived fairness showed a non-significant relationship with a model summary of \( r (90) = .155, p = .144 \). The results which are displayed in Table 19 (regression model summary) and Table 20 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s agreeableness and the perceived fairness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The \( p \) value was not found to be statistically significant (\( p = .114 \)), however, since the \( r \) is .155, the relationship is positive yet weak. Additionally, roughly 2.4% of the variance in perceived fairness (\( R^2 = .024 \)) is explained by agreeableness. Therefore, a manager’s agreeableness has a weak impact on employees’ perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between agreeableness and perceived fairness. Agreeableness was not found to be statistically significant in predicting perceived fairness \( [F (1, 89) = 2.177, p = .144] \) and therefore, this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 21. The non-standardized coefficients (\( B \)) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The \( B \) value for agreeableness was .099 indicating that a one unit increase in agreeableness is associated with a .099 increase in perceived fairness. This indicates that agreeableness has a weak yet positive effect on perceived fairness. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 3 expressing the value of the dependent variable (fairness) as a function of the independent variable (agreeableness) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.
Table 18

**Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of Agreeableness and Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 19

**Regression Model Summary – Agreeableness and Perceived Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Err. of $R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.155a</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.68617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Agreeableness

Table 20

**ANOVA Table for Regression Model – Agreeableness and Perceived Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>2.177</td>
<td>.144b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42.459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness
b. Predictors: (Constant), Agreeableness

Table 21

**Regression Coefficients – Agreeableness and Perceived Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.962</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.800</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness
Research question three assessed the relationship between the (FFM) agreeableness of a manager and an employee’s perceived fairness and perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance evaluation. The first hypothesis related to RQ3 (H3a) predicted a manager’s agreeableness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a weak, positive and non-significant relationship between the agreeableness of a manager and the employee’s perceived fairness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.

The relationship between agreeableness and fairness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing agreeableness in the process of an employee evaluation; fairness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Agreeableness considers differences in the managers being welcoming, kind, friendly, and empathetic in social situations, which assists if there is conflicts with employees.
(Kim, Shin, & Umbreit, 2006). Considering this present study and the attributes of agreeableness, it would have been anticipated that agreeableness may have had more of an influence on the employee’s perceived fairness of a recently conducted performance appraisal. This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possesses agreeableness will have a weak yet positive influence on the employee’s perceived fairness.

In addressing H3b, the results regarding the relationship between a manager’s agreeableness and perceived effectiveness showed a statistically significant relationship with a model summary of \[ r (90) = .221, p = .037 \]. The results which are displayed in Table 23 (regression model summary) and Table 24 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s agreeableness and the perceived effectiveness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The \( p \) value was found to be statistically significant \( (p = .037) \), however, because the \( r = .221 \), the relationship is positive yet weak. Additionally, roughly 4.9% of the variance in perceived effectiveness \( (R^2 = .049) \) is explained by agreeableness. Therefore, a manager’s agreeableness has a weak impact on employees’ perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between agreeableness and perceived effectiveness is rejected. Agreeableness was found to be statistically significantly in predicting perceived fairness \[ F (1, 89) = 4.508, p = .037 \].

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 25. The non-standardized coefficients \( (B) \) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The \( B \) value for agreeableness = .114 indicating that a one unit increase in agreeableness is associated with a .114
unit increase in perceived effectiveness. This indicates that agreeableness has a weak yet positive relationship related to perceived effectiveness. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 4 expressing the value of the dependent variable (effectiveness) as a function of the independent variable (agreeableness) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

Table 22

**Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of Agreeableness and Perceived Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.037*</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**b**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 23

**Regression Model Summary – Agreeableness and Perceived Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.221*</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.55194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Agreeableness

Table 24

**ANOVA Table for Regression Model – Agreeableness and Perceived Effectiveness Fit Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>4.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>26.808</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.181</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
b. Predictors: (Constant), Agreeableness
Table 25

*Regression Coefficients – Agreeableness and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.291</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

Scatterplot - Curve Fit Model

*Figure 8.* Scatterplot with Curve Fit Model – Effectiveness and Agreeableness

Research question three assessed the relationship between the (FFM) agreeableness of a manager and an employee’s perceived fairness and effectiveness of a recently conducted performance evaluation. The second hypothesis within RQ3 (H3b) predicted a manager’s agreeableness positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a weak, positive and statistically
significant relationship between the agreeableness of a manager and the employee’s perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.

The relationship between agreeableness and effectiveness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing agreeableness in the process of an employee evaluation; effectiveness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Agreeableness considers differences in the managers being welcoming, kind, friendly, and empathetic in social situations, which assists if there is conflicts with employees (Kim, Shin, & Umbreit, 2006). The results of this study indicate that a manager exuding agreeableness during the process of a performance appraisals will be perceived to be more effective by their employees. This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possesses agreeableness will have a weak yet positive influence on the employee’s perceived effectiveness.

(FFM) Conscientiousness and Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness

Research question three examined “How does a manager’s five-factor model (FFM) impact the perceived fairness and effectiveness of performance evaluations of their subordinates?” Conscientiousness is the second of the five domains within the FFM model to be explored as it relates to its relationship between a manager administering a performance evaluation and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of their subordinate. The fairness and effectiveness relationships with conscientiousness were conducted independently utilizing regression analysis. The question was tested with hypotheses H4a and H4b:

H4a: A manager’s (FFM) Conscientiousness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.
H4b: A manager’s (FFM) Conscientiousness positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

The results H4a regarding the relationship between a manager’s conscientiousness and employee perceived fairness showed a non-significant relationship with a model summary of $[r (90) = .046, p = .670]$. The results which are displayed in Table 27 (regression model summary) and Table 28 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s conscientiousness and the perceived fairness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The $p$ value was not found to be statistically significant ($p = .670$), however, since the $r = .046$, the relationship is positive yet weak. Additionally, roughly $0.2\%$ of the variance in perceived fairness ($R^2 = .002$) is explained by conscientiousness. Therefore, a manager’s conscientiousness has a weak impact on employees’ perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between conscientiousness and perceived fairness. Conscientiousness was not found to be statistically significantly in predicting perceived fairness [$F (1, 89) = 0.183, p = .670$], therefore, this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 29. The non-standardized coefficients ($B$) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The $B$ value for conscientiousness was -0.38 indicating that a one unit increase in conscientiousness is associated with a -0.38 unit increase in perceived fairness. This indicates that conscientiousness has a weak effect on perceived fairness. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 5.
expressing the value of the dependent variable (fairness) as a function of the independent variable (conscientiousness) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

Table 26

**Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of Conscientiousness and Perceived Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

Table 27

**Regression Model Summary – Conscientiousness and Perceived Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Err.of $R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Err.of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.046a</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.69389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness

Table 28

**ANOVA Table for Regression Model – Conscientiousness and Perceived Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig._</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>42.371</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.459</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness

b. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness
Table 29

Regression Coefficients – Conscientiousness and Perceived Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.660</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.380</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness

Figure 9. Scatterplot with Curve Fit Model – Fairness and Conscientiousness

H4a predicted a manager’s conscientiousness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a weak positive and non-significant relationship between the conscientiousness of a manager and the employee’s perceived fairness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.
The relationship between conscientiousness and fairness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing conscientiousness in the process of an employee evaluation; fairness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Conscientiousness is described as a manager being dependable, hardworking, highly responsible, and goal-achievement oriented (Kim, et al., 2006). Taking this into consideration, it would have been expected that the conscientiousness of the manager would have had more influence on the employee’s perceived fairness of a recently conducted performance appraisal. This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possesses conscientiousness will have a weak yet positive influence on the employee’s perceived fairness. Moreover, with $R^2 = .002$, conscientiousness has minimal impact on perceived fairness.

In addressing H4b, the results regarding the relationship between a manager’s conscientiousness and employee effectiveness showed a non-significant relationship with a model summary of $r (90) = .089, p = .402$. The results which are displayed in Table 31 (regression model summary) and Table 32 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s conscientiousness and the perceived effectiveness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The $p$ value was not found to be statistically significant ($p = .402$), however, since the $r = .008$, the relationship is assessed as positive yet weak. Additionally, roughly .8% of the variance in perceived effectiveness ($R^2 = .008$) is explained by conscientiousness. Therefore, a manager’s conscientiousness has a weak impact on employees’ perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between conscientiousness and perceived effectiveness. Conscientiousness was not found to be statistically significantly in
predicting perceived effectiveness \( F (1, 89) = 0.709, p = .402 \), therefore, this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 33. The non-standardized coefficients \( (B) \) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The \( B \) value for conscientiousness was -0.61 indicating that a one unit increase in conscientiousness is associated with a -0.61 unit increase in perceived effectiveness. This indicates that conscientiousness has a weak effect on perceived effectiveness. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 6 expressing the value of the dependent variable (effectiveness) as a function of the independent variable (conscientiousness) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

Table 30

*Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of Conscientiousness and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Pearson .089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 31

*Regression Model Summary – Conscientiousness and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimation</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Adj.( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.089a</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.56363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness
Table 32

ANOVA Table for Regression Model – Conscientiousness and Perceived Effectiveness

Fit Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig._</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.402^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>27.956</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.182</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
b. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness

Table 33

Regression Coefficients – Conscientiousness and Perceived Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.193</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.811</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.842</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
H4b predicted a manager’s conscientiousness positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a weak, positive and non-significant relationship between the conscientiousness of a manager and the employee’s perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.

The relationship between conscientiousness and effectiveness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing conscientiousness in the process of an employee evaluation; effectiveness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Conscientiousness is described as a manager being dependable, hardworking, highly responsible, and goal-achievement oriented (Kim, et al., 2006). Taking this into consideration, it would have been expected that the conscientiousness of the manager would have had more influence on the employee’s perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance appraisal. This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a
performance evaluation, a manager that possesses conscientiousness will have a weak yet positive influence on the employee’s perceived effectiveness. Moreover, with $R^2 = .008$, conscientiousness has minimal impact on effectiveness.

(FFM) Openness and Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness

Research question three examined “How does a manager’s five-factor model (FFM) impact the perceived fairness and effectiveness of performance evaluations of their subordinates?” Openness is the third of the five domains within the FFM model to be explored as it relates to its relationship between a manager administering a performance evaluation and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of their subordinate. The fairness and effectiveness relationships with openness were conducted independently utilizing regression analysis. The question was tested with hypotheses H5a and H5b:

H5a: A manager’s (FFM) Openness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.

H5b: A manager’s (FFM) Openness positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

The results of H5a regarding the relationship between a manager’s openness and employee perceived fairness showed a non-significant relationship with a model summary of $r(90) = .199, p = .060$. The results which are displayed in Table 35 (regression model summary) and Table 36 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s openness and the perceived fairness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The $p$ value was not found to be statistically significant ($p = .060$) and since the $r = .199$, the relationship is positive yet weak. Additionally, roughly 3.9% of the variance in perceived fairness ($R^2 = .039$) is explained by openness. Therefore, a manager’s
openness has a positive yet weak impact on employees’ perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between openness and perceived fairness. Openness was not found to be statistically significantly in predicting perceived fairness \( F(1, 89) = 3.618, p = .060 \), therefore, this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 37. The non-standardized coefficients \( (B) \) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The \( B \) value for openness was .105 indicating that a one unit increase in openness is associated with a .105 unit increase in perceived fairness. This indicates that openness has a weak yet positive effect on perceived fairness. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 7 expressing the value of the dependent variable (fairness) as a function of the independent variable (openness) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

Table 34

_Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of Openness and Perceived Fairness_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 35

_Regression Model Summary – Openness and Perceived Fairness_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. Err.of Adj.( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. Err.of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.199(^a)</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.68076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Openness
Table 36

ANOVA Table for Regression Model – Openness and Perceived Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>3.618</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>40.782</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.459</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37

Regression Coefficients – Openness and Perceived Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.987</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness

Scatterplot - Curve Fit Model

Figure 11. Scatterplot with Curve Fit Model – Fairness and Openness
H5a predicted a manager’s openness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a weak, positive and non-significant relationship between the openness of a manager and the employee’s perceived fairness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.

The relationship between openness and perceived fairness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing openness in the process of an employee evaluation; fairness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Openness of the manager is related to creativity, range of different interests, and intellectual capacity (Kim, et al., 2006). Although this study failed to reject the null hypothesis related to H5a, it is not surprising that the openness of the manager was not statistically significant in predicting perceived fairness of the employee related to a recently conducted performance appraisal. This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possesses openness will have a weak yet positive influence on the employee’s perceived fairness. Moreover, with a $R^2$ of .039, conscientiousness has minimal impact on fairness.

In addressing H5b, the results regarding the relationship between a manager’s openness and employee’s perceived effectiveness showed a non-significant relationship with a model summary of $r (90) = .097, p = .361$. The results which are displayed in Table 39 (regression model summary) and Table 40 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s openness and the perceived effectiveness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The $p$ value was not found to be statistically significant ($p = .361$), however, since the $r = .097$, the relationship is positive yet weak. Additionally, roughly .9% of the variance in perceived effectiveness ($R^2 = .009$) is explained by
openness. Therefore, a manager’s openness has a weak impact on employees’ perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between openness and perceived effectiveness. Openness was not found to be statistically significantly in predicting perceived effectiveness \( F (1, 89) = .842, p = .361 \), therefore, this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 41. The non-standardized coefficients \( B \) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The \( B \) value for openness was .042 indicating that a one unit increase in openness is associated with a .042 unit increase in perceived effectiveness. This indicates that openness has a weak relationship related to perceived effectiveness. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 8 expressing the value of the dependent variable (effectiveness) as a function of the independent variable (openness) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

Table 38

*Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of Openness and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 39

*Regression Model Summary – Openness and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Adj.( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.097a</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.56321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Openness
Table 40

ANOVA Table for Regression Model – Openness and Perceived Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>27.915</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.182</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Openness

Table 41

Regression Coefficients – Openness and Perceived Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.669</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

Figure 12. Scatterplot with Curve Fit Model – Effectiveness and Openness
H5b predicted a manager’s openness positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a weak positive and non-significant relationship between the openness of a manager and the employee’s perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.

The relationship between openness and perceived effectiveness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing openness in the process of an employee evaluation; effectiveness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Openness of the manager is related to creativity, range of different interests, and intellectual capacity (Kim, et al., 2006). Although this study failed to reject the null hypothesis related to H5b, it is not surprising that the openness of the manager was not statistically significant in predicting perceived effectiveness of the employee related to a recently conducted performance appraisal. This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possesses openness will have a weak yet positive influence on the employee’s perceived effectiveness. Moreover; with $R^2 = .009$, openness has minimal impact on perceived effectiveness.

**(FFM) Extraversion and Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness**

Research question three examined “How does a manager’s five-factor model (FFM) impact the perceived fairness and effectiveness of performance evaluations of their subordinates?” Extraversion is the fourth of the five domains within the FFM model to be explored as it relates to its relationship between a manager administering a performance evaluation and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of their subordinate. The fairness and effectiveness relationships with extraversion were conducted independently utilizing regression analysis. The question was tested with hypotheses H6a and H6b:
H6a: A manager’s (FFM) Extraversion positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.

H6b: A manager’s (FFM) Extraversion positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

The results of H6a regarding the relationship between a manager’s extraversion and employee’s perceived fairness showed a non-significant relationship with a model summary of $[r(90) = .183, p = .084]$. The results which are displayed in Table 43 (regression model summary) and Table 44 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s extraversion and the perceived fairness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The $p$ value was not found to be statistically significant ($p = .084$), however, since the $r = .183$, the relationship is positive yet weak. Additionally, roughly 3.3% of the variance in perceived fairness ($R^2 = .033$) is explained by extraversion. Therefore, a manager’s extraversion has a weak impact on employees’ perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between extraversion and perceived fairness. Extraversion was not found to be statistically significant in predicting perceived fairness [$F(1, 89) = 3.048, p = .084$], therefore, this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 45. The non-standardized coefficients ($B$) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The $B$ value for extraversion was .107 indicating that a one unit increase in extraversion is associated with a .107 unit increase in perceived fairness. This indicates that extraversion has a weak yet positive effect
on perceived fairness. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 9 expressing the value of the dependent variable (fairness) as a function of the independent variable (extraversion) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

Table 42

**Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of Extraversion and Perceived Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).***

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 43

**Regression Model Summary – Extraversion and Perceived Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.68288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion

Table 44

**ANOVA Table for Regression Model – Extraversion and Perceived Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>3.048</td>
<td>.084b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.459</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness
b. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion
Table 45

Regression Coefficients – Extraversion and Perceived Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. _</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.927</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>9.562</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>1.746</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness

Figure 13. Scatterplot with Curve Fit Model – Fairness and Extraversion

H6a predicted a manager’s extraversion positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a weak, positive and non-significant relationship between the extraversion of a manager and the employee’s perceived fairness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.

The relationship between extraversion and perceived fairness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing extraversion in the process of an employee evaluation;
fairness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Extraversion of the manager would pertain to personal attributes such as sociability, assertiveness and being active (Kim, et al., 2006). Although the results of this study fail to reject the null hypothesis, it is interesting to note as extraversion is a common personality attribute among hotel managers. Considering the characteristics of the hotel industry, which expects an abundance of social skills from its managers, extraversion is assumed to play an instrumental role in hotel manager’s performance (Kim et al., 2006). This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possesses extraversion will have a weak yet positive influence on the employee’s perceived fairness. Moreover; with $R^2 = .033$, extraversion has minimal impact on fairness.

In addressing H6b, the results regarding the relationship between a manager’s extraversion and employee effectiveness showed a non-significant relationship with a model summary of $[r (90) = .105, p = .325]$. The results which are displayed in Table 47 (regression model summary) and Table 48 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s extraversion and the perceived effectiveness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The $p$ value was not found to be statistically significant ($p = .325$), however, since the $r = .105$, the relationship is positive yet weak. That is, roughly 1.1% of the variance in perceived effectiveness ($R^2 = .011$) is explained by extraversion. Therefore, a manager’s extraversion has a weak impact on employees’ perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between extraversion and perceived effectiveness. Extraversion was not found to be statistically significant in predicting
perceived effectiveness \( F(1, 89) = 0.980, p = 0.325 \), therefore, this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 49. The non-standardized coefficients \( B \) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The \( B \) value for extraversion was 0.050 indicating that a one unit increase in extraversion is associated with a 0.050 unit increase in perceived effectiveness. This indicates that extraversion has a weak yet positive outcome related to perceived effectiveness. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 10 expressing the value of the dependent variable (effectiveness) as a function of the independent variable (extraversion) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

Table 46

**Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of Extraversion and Perceived Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 47

**Regression Model Summary – Extraversion and Perceived Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. Err.of Adj.( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. Err.of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.105*</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.56277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion
Table 48

ANOVA Table for Regression Model – Extraversion and Perceived Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig._</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.325(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>27.871</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
b. Predictors: (Constant), Extraversion

Table 49

Regression Coefficients – Extraversion and Perceived Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.610</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

Scatterplot - Curve Fit Model

Figure 14. Scatterplot with Curve Fit Model – Effectiveness and Extraversion
H6b predicted a manager’s extraversion positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a weak, positive and non-significant relationship between the extraversion of a manager and the employee’s perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.

The relationship between extraversion and effectiveness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing openness in the process of an employee evaluation; effectiveness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Extraversion of the manager would pertain to personal attributes such as sociability, assertiveness and being active (Kim, et al., 2006). Although the results of this study fail to reject the null hypothesis, it is interesting to note as extraversion is a common personality attribute among hotel managers. Considering the characteristics of the hotel industry, which expects an abundance of social skills from its managers, extraversion is assumed to play an instrumental role in hotel manager’s performance (Kim et al., 2006). This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possesses extraversion will have a weak yet positive influence on the employee’s perceived effectiveness. Moreover; $R^2 = .011$, extraversion has minimal impact on perceived effectiveness.

(FFM) Neuroticism and Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness

Research question three examined “How does a manager’s five-factor model (FFM) impact the perceived fairness and effectiveness of performance evaluations of their subordinates?” Neuroticism is the fifth of the five domains within the FFM model to be explored as it relates to its relationship between a manager administering a performance evaluation and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of their subordinate. The fairness and
effectiveness relationships with neuroticism were conducted independently utilizing regression analysis. The question was tested with hypotheses H7a and H7b:

H7a: A manager’s (FFM) Neuroticism negatively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.

H7b: A manager’s (FFM) Neuroticism negatively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

The results of H7a regarding the relationship between a manager’s neuroticism and employee fairness showed a non-significant relationship with a model summary of \( r (90) = .092, p = .391 \). The results which are displayed in Table 51 (regression model summary) and Table 52 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s neuroticism and the perceived fairness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The \( p \) value was not found to be statistically significant \( (p = .391) \), however, since the \( r = .092 \), the relationship is positive and weak. Additionally, roughly .8% of the variance in perceived fairness \( (R^2 = .008) \) is explained by neuroticism. Therefore, a manager’s neuroticism has a weak impact on employees’ perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between neuroticism and perceived fairness. Neuroticism was not found to be statistically significant in predicting perceived fairness \( [F (1, 89) = .744, p = .391] \), therefore, this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 53. The non-standardized coefficients \( (B) \) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The \( B \) value for neuroticism was -.061 indicating that a one unit increase in neuroticism is associated with a -.016
unit increase in perceived fairness. This indicates that neuroticism has a weak effect on perceived fairness. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 11 expressing the value of the dependent variable (fairness) as a function of the independent variable (neuroticism) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

Table 50

*Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of Neuroticism and Perceived Fairness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 90

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 51

*Regression Model Summary – Neuroticism and Perceived Fairness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Adj. R²</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.69169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Neuroticism

Table 52

*ANOVA Table for Regression Model – Neuroticism and Perceived Fairness*  
*Fit Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.391b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>41.038</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.459</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness
b. Predictors: (Constant), Neuroticism
H7a predicted a manager’s neuroticism negatively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a weak, positive and non-significant relationship between the neuroticism of a manager and the employee’s perceived fairness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.
The relationship between neuroticism and fairness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing neuroticism in the process of an employee evaluation; fairness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Neuroticism relates to the extent a manager’s personality exudes being anxious, depressed, angry and constant worrying (Kim et al., 2006) and although this study failed to reject the null hypothesis, it is interesting to note that neuroticism of the manager conducting the performance appraisal does not contribute to negative perceptions of the employee during the process. The fact that hotel managers suffer less anxiety than business managers (Worsfold, 1989), indicating hotel managers have more stability in the area of neuroticism, may provide insight into the results of this study. This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possesses neuroticism will have a weak yet positive influence on the employee’s perceived fairness. Moreover; $R^2 = .008$, neuroticism has minimal impact on perceived fairness.

In addressing H7b, the results regarding the relationship between a manager’s neuroticism and employee effectiveness showed a non-significant relationship with a model summary of $[r (90) = .029, p = .786]$. The results which are displayed in Table 55 (regression model summary) and Table 56 (ANOVA fit model) indicate a weak yet positive relationship between the manager’s neuroticism and the perceived effectiveness of the employee regarding their recently conducted performance evaluation. The $p$ value was not found to be statistically significant ($p = .786$), however, since the $r = .029$, the relationship is positive yet weak. Additionally, roughly .1% of the variance in perceived effectiveness ($R^2 = .011$) is explained by neuroticism. Therefore, a manager’s neuroticism has a weak impact on employees’ perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.
The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between neuroticism and perceived effectiveness. Neuroticism was not found to be statistically significant in predicting perceived effectiveness \(F(1, 89) = .074, p = .786\), therefore, this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

The non-standardized regression coefficients and the standardized coefficients are displayed in Table 57. The non-standardized coefficients \((B)\) were examined to explain the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The \(B\) value for neuroticism was .016 indicating that a one unit increase in neuroticism is associated with a .016 unit increase in perceived effectiveness. This indicates that neuroticism has a weak effect on perceived effectiveness. Linear regression in a curve fit model is displayed in Figure 12 expressing the value of the dependent variable (effectiveness) as a function of the independent variable (neuroticism) as the relationship is approximated by a straight line.

Table 54

*Correlation Analysis for Mean Score of Neuroticism and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 55

*Regression Model Summary – Neuroticism and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(R)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Adj. (R^2)</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.029*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.56566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), Neuroticism*
Table 56

*ANOVA Table for Regression Model – Neuroticism and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.786&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>28.158</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.182</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
b. Predictors: (Constant), Neuroticism

Table 57

*Regression Coefficients – Neuroticism and Perceived Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.791</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>11.959</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

*Figure 16. Scatterplot with Curve Fit Model – Effectiveness and Neuroticism*
H7b predicted a manager’s extraversion negatively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations. The results of this present study revealed a weak, positive and non-significant relationship between the neuroticism of a manager and the employee’s perceived effectiveness of a recently conducted performance appraisal.

The relationship between neuroticism and effectiveness was explored to understand the value of a manager possessing neuroticism in the process of an employee evaluation; effectiveness is a significant factor in conducting performance evaluations that aim to produce positive results for the employee. Neuroticism relates to the extent a manager’s personality exudes being anxious, depressed, angry and constant worrying (Kim et al., 2006) and although this study failed to reject the null hypothesis, it is interesting to note that neuroticism of the manager conducting the performance appraisal does not contribute to negative perceptions of the employee during the process. The fact that hotel managers suffer less anxiety than business managers (Worsfold, 1989), indicating hotel managers have more stability in the area of neuroticism, may provide insight into the results of this study. This present study’s findings suggest that when conducting a performance evaluation, a manager that possesses neuroticism will have a weak yet positive influence on the employee’s perceived effectiveness. Moreover; \( R^2 = .001 \), neuroticism has minimal impact on perceived effectiveness.

**Implicit Person Theory Disposition with controlled FFM**

Research question four examined “Controlling for a manager’s FFM, does IPT disposition explain additional differences in employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of performance evaluations?” The analysis of these relationships was conducted utilizing multiple regression. The question was tested with hypotheses H8 and H9:
H8: When controlling for a manager’s FFM, IPT incrementalism disposition explains additional positive differences in employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations.

H9: When controlling for a manager’s FFM, IPT incrementalism disposition explains additional positive differences in employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations.

H8 was tested using multiple regression and the first statistical output was descriptive statistical information and a correlations matrix related to the variables contained in the model which are displayed in Table 58 and Table 59 respectively. The descriptive statistics were part of the multiple regression output to assess the mean and standard deviations of the variables. The correlations matrix were part of the multiple regression output so that an assessment of the relationships between the variables could be established. Additionally, issues with multi-collinearity between the independent variables could be assessed. Multi-collinearity can contribute to instability of estimated coefficients if there is a strong linear relationship between values of the independent variables. Moreover, multi-collinearity is assessed based on the variance inflation factor (VIF) which produces an index value that measure how much the variance of the estimated regression coefficient was increased due to collinearity (Peck & Devore, 2012). Collinearity statistics related to VIF and tolerance are displayed in Table 62 indicating the absence of multi-collinearity.

Table 60 displays the model summary for the multiple regression model. The results show that the $R^2$ change reveals that 12.2% of the variance in fairness can be explained by IPT incrementalism while FFM variables are held constant. As shown in Table 61, the ANOVA table for the regression model was statistically significant [$F (6, 83) = 3.262, p = .006$].
Table 62 shows the non-standardized regression coefficients ($B$) which indicates the relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable. The $B$ value for the IPT variable when controlling for FFM was .320 indicating that, given one percent increase in IPT, the prediction of fairness results in a 32.0% change which demonstrates its effect on fairness.

The null hypothesis states that when controlling for a manager’s FFM, IPT incrementalism disposition explains no additional differences in employees’ perceived fairness of their performance appraisal. IPT incrementalism was found to be statistically significant in predicting perceived fairness [$F (6, 83) = 3.262, p = .006$], therefore, this study rejects the null hypothesis. Moreover, in reviewing the $R^2$ change statistic (.122) and the $B$ value (.320) it is evident that IPT incrementalism disposition of the manager explains additional positive differences in the perceived fairness of the employee while the personality traits of the FFM are held constant.

Figure 17. IPT Incrementalism, FFM and Perceived Fairness
Table 58

**Descriptive Statistics – IPT Comp, Fairness and FFM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>3.44678</td>
<td>.69070</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>4.87047</td>
<td>1.18572</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>3.88518</td>
<td>1.03244</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.57037</td>
<td>.82296</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>4.92037</td>
<td>1.08882</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>4.38703</td>
<td>1.30872</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT Comp</td>
<td>3.81111</td>
<td>.81983</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 59

**Correlations Table – IPT Comp, Fairness and FFM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>IPT Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT Comp</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 60

**Regression Model Summary – IPT Comp, Fairness and FFM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
<th>$R^2$ Chg.</th>
<th>$F$ Chg.</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. $F$ Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.262a</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>68610</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.437b</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>64339</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>12.523</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness*  
*b. Predictors: (Constant), Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, IPT Comp*
Table 61

ANOVA Table for Regression Model – IPT Comp, Fairness and FFM Fit Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>.298&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>39.542</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.459</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>8.101</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>3.262</td>
<td>.006&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>34.358</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.459</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness
b. Predictors: (Constant) Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness
c. Predictors: (Constant) Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, IPT Comp

Table 62

Regression Coefficients – IPT Comp, Fairness and FFM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.137</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>4.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.837</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>2.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT Comp</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness
Table 63

*Regression – excluded Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IPT Comp</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Fairness
b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness

H9 was tested using multiple regression and the first statistical output was descriptive statistical information and a correlations matrix related to the variables contained in the model which are displayed in Table 64 and Table 65 respectively. The descriptive statistics were part of the multiple regression output to assess the mean and standard deviations of the variables. The correlations matrix were part of the multiple regression output so that an assessment of the relationships between the variables could be established. Additionally, issues with multi-collinearity between the independent variables could be assessed. Multi-collinearity can contribute to instability of estimated coefficients if there is a strong linear relationship between values of the independent variables. Moreover, multi-collinearity is assessed based on the variance inflation factor (VIF) which produces an index value that measures how much the variance of the estimated regression coefficient was increased due to collinearity (Peck & Devore, 2012). Collinearity statistics related to VIF and tolerance are displayed in Table 67 indicating the absence of multi-collinearity.

Table 66 displays the model summary for the multiple regression model including $R^2$, the coefficient of determination. The results show that the $R^2$ reveals that 14.7% of the variance in fairness can be explained by IPT incrementalism while FFM variables are held constant. As shown in Table 67, the ANOVA table for the regression model was statistically significant [$F (6, 83) = 3.752, p = .002$].
Table 68 shows the non-standardized regression coefficients \((B)\) which indicates the relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable. The \(B\) value for the IPT variable were .286 indicating that, given one percent increase in IPT, the prediction of fairness results in a 28.6% change which demonstrates its effect on effectiveness.

The null hypothesis states that there is no relationship between IPT incrementalism and perceived effectiveness. IPT incrementalism was found to be statistically significant in predicting perceived effectiveness \([F (6, 83) = 3.752, p = .002]\), therefore, this study rejects the null hypothesis. Moreover, in reviewing the \(R^2\) change statistic (.147) and the \(B\) value (.286), it is evident that IPT incrementalism disposition of the manager explains additional positive differences in the perceived fairness of the employee while the personality traits of the FFM are held constant.

*Figure 18. IPT Incrementalism, FFM and Perceived Effectiveness*
Table 64

Descriptive Statistics – IPT Comp, Effectiveness and FFM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>2.85238</td>
<td>.56271</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>4.87407</td>
<td>1.18572</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>3.88518</td>
<td>1.03244</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.57037</td>
<td>.82296</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>4.92037</td>
<td>1.08882</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>4.38703</td>
<td>1.30872</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT Comp</td>
<td>3.81111</td>
<td>.81983</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 65

Correlations Table – IPT Comp, Effectiveness and FFM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>IPT Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT Comp</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 66

Regression Model Summary – IPT Comp, Effectiveness and FFM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj. $R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
<th>$R^2$ Chg.</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Chg. df1 df2 Sig. F Chg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.257&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.55975</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.189 5 84 .322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.462&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.51681</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>15.538 1 83 .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness
b. Predictors: (Constant), Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, IPT Comp
Table 67

ANOVA Table for Regression Model – IPT Comp, Effectiveness and FFM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.863</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td>.322b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>26.319</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.182</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6.013</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>3.752</td>
<td>.002c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>22.169</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.182</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
b. Predictors: (Constant) Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness
c. Predictors: (Constant) Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, IPT Comp

Table 68

Regression Coefficients – IPT Comp, Effectiveness and FFM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.463</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT Comp</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
Table 69

Regression – excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>IPT Comp</th>
<th>.417(^b)</th>
<th>3.942</th>
<th>.000</th>
<th>.397</th>
<th>.848</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Openness, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness

Demographic Variable Differences in Perceived Fairness and Perceived Effectiveness

Research question five examined “Are there any differences in the perceived fairness or perceived effectiveness based on the demographic variables?” Demographic variables examined with regard to fairness and effectiveness were sex and age.

Sex of the employees and managers was the first demographic variable to be examined with fairness and effectiveness and the question was tested with hypotheses H10, H11, H12 and H13:

H10: An employee’s sex has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H11: An employee’s sex has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

H12: A manager’s sex has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H13: A manager’s sex has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

Table 70 displays group statistics regarding employee sex for fairness and effectiveness indicating the mean for fairness is higher than the mean of effectiveness by .60 for both males and females. Additionally, these results indicate there were minimal differences in means.
between the employee’s sex and fairness as well as minimal differences in the means between the employee’s sex and effectiveness.

Levene’s Test for equality of variances was utilized and the results shown in Table 71 indicate that the population of variances are equal. Also displayed in Table 71 are the Independent Samples t-test results for employee fairness and effectiveness. The significance level for fairness (2-tailed) is greater than .05 at .916 and therefore it can be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference between the male and female employee sample related to fairness \( t(88) = .106, p = .916 \). The significance level for effectiveness (2-tailed) is greater than .05 at .614 and therefore it can be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference between the male and female employee sample related to effectiveness \( t(88) = .506, p = .614 \). Table 72 shows the 95% confidence intervals for the employee sample related to fairness and effectiveness. Zero is included in each of the confidence interval ranges indicating there is no statistical difference in the means of the sex among the employees for fairness and effectiveness.

The null hypothesis for H10 states that there is no relationship between the sex of the employee and perceived fairness. Sex of the employee was not found to be statistically significant in assessing fairness \( t(88) = .106, p = .916 \), therefore, this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

The null hypothesis for H11 states that there is no relationship between the sex of the employee and perceived effectiveness. Sex of the employee was not found to be statistically significant in assessing effectiveness \( t(88) = .506, p = .614 \), therefore this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.
Figure 19. Sex of Employee and Perceived Fairness and Perceived Effectiveness

Table 70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Group Statistics, Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emp Sex</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.45452</td>
<td>.71636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.43904</td>
<td>.67207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.82222</td>
<td>.52059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.88253</td>
<td>.60631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 71

{t-Test – Employee Independent Samples Test}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality Of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness (equal Variances assumed)</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness (equal variances not Assumed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness (equal variances assumed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness (equal variances not assumed)</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In relation to H12 and H13, sex of the managers was examined with fairness and effectiveness. Table 73 displays group statistics regarding manager sex for fairness and effectiveness indicating the mean for fairness is higher than the mean of effectiveness for both males and females. Additionally, these results indicate there were minimal differences in the means between the manager’s sex and fairness as well as minimal differences in the means between the manager’s sex and effectiveness.

Levene’s Test for equality of variances was utilized and the results shown in Table 74 indicate that the population of variances are equal. Also displayed in Table 74 are the Independent Samples t-test results for manager fairness and effectiveness. The significance level for fairness (2-tailed) is less than \(0.05 = 0.049\) and therefore it can be concluded that there is statistically significant differences between the male and female manager sample related to fairness \([t(88) = -1.99, p = 0.049]\). The significance level for effectiveness (2-tailed) is greater than \(0.05\) at \(0.077\), and therefore it can be concluded that there is no statistically significant differences between the male and female employee sample related to effectiveness \([t(88) = -1.78, p = 0.077]\). Table 75 shows the 95% confidence intervals for the manager sample related to fairness and effectiveness. Zero is not included in the fairness confidence intervals ranges indicating there is a statistically significant difference in the means of the sex for fairness. The
effectiveness confidence intervals include zero in the range indicating no statistically significant difference in the means of sex among the manager’s for effectiveness.

The null hypothesis for H12 states that there is no relationship between sex of the manager and perceived fairness. Sex of the manager was found to be statistically significant in assessing fairness \([t (88) = -1.99, p = .049]\), therefore, this study rejects the null hypothesis.

The null hypothesis for H13 states that there is no relationship between sex of the manager and perceived effectiveness. Sex of the manager was not found to be statistically significant in assessing effectiveness \([t (88) = .506, p = .614]\), therefore this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

In further investigating H12 that states that there is a statistically significant relationship between the sex of the manager conducting the performance appraisal and the perceived fairness of the employee, the findings revealed in table 73 show that the male mean related to perceived fairness was \(m = 3.33\) and the female mean related to perceived fairness was \(m = 3.63\). Table 74 displays the \(t\)-test for equality of means (2-tailed) indicating the mean differences are statistically significant \((p = .046)\). These findings would suggest that a female is perceived fairer than males while conducting a performance appraisal. It is important for researchers and practitioners to understand that sex has a statistically significant impact on employee perceptions of fairness related to a performance appraisals.
Figure 20. Sex of Manager and Perceived Fairness and Perceived Effectiveness

Table 73

Manager Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mgr. Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.33256</td>
<td>.69410</td>
<td>.09539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.62627</td>
<td>.65524</td>
<td>.11075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.76883</td>
<td>.53557</td>
<td>.07221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.98367</td>
<td>.58673</td>
<td>.09917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 74

$t$-Test – Manager Independent Samples Test

Levene’s Test for Equality Of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.29371</td>
<td>.14689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>75.61</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-.29371</td>
<td>.14500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.21484</td>
<td>.12019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>67.64</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-.21484</td>
<td>.12268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: solid lines = significant relationships; dashed lines = non-significant relationships *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Table 75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
<td>-.58563</td>
<td>-.00179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-.58253</td>
<td>-.00488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.45371</td>
<td>.02420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-.45967</td>
<td>.02999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of the employees was the second demographic variable to be examined with fairness and effectiveness. Demographic data for employee age were analyzed in the following age ranges: (1) under 30, (2) 30 – 39, (3) 40 – 49 (4) 50 – 59. Employees were selected for this demographic analysis over managers due to the significance of the employee’s perception of fairness and effectiveness in this study. In addressing the research question regarding if there are any differences in fairness and effectiveness while considering the age of the employee sample, the question was tested with hypotheses H14 and H15:

H14: An employee’s age has an impact on perceived fairness of performance evaluations.

H15: An employee’s age has an impact on perceived effectiveness of performance evaluations.

Table 76 displays the frequency table for the employee’s age in the following age ranges: (1) under 30, (2) 30 - 39, (3) 40 – 49, and (4) 50 – 59. The total number in the employee sample that was examined for all of the ranges was $n = 89$. The largest age range of the four age ranges was the under 30 age range containing 41.6% ($n = 37$) of the sample. The under 30 age range was followed by the 30 – 39 age range containing 32.6% ($n = 29$) of the sample which was followed by age range 40 – 49 containing 20.2% ($n = 18$) of the sample and lastly, the age range 50 – 59 contained 5.6% ($n = 5$) of the sample.
Figure 21. Age of Employee and Perceived Fairness and Perceived Effectiveness

Table 76

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 77 displays an ANOVA table for the different group means of the age groups and fairness. The results show that there were no statistically significant differences in the age group means \( F(3, 86) = 2.552, p = .061 \). Although there were no statistically significant differences in the age group means, a Scheffe post hoc test was examined for the four age groups as displayed in table 78. Scheffe’s post hoc test was chosen over a Tukey post hoc test due to it being a single-step multiple comparison procedure that applies to the set of estimates of all possible contrasts among the factor level means and is not restricted to pairwise differences as the sample had four age group means to consider. Displayed in Table 78 are the mean
differences among the age group comparisons with the standard error of the analysis as well as the significance level for each. The results displayed in Table 78 confirm that there are no statistically significant differences in any the age group means because all of the significance values are above .05. Additionally, Table 79 displays the confidence intervals for all of the comparisons which reveals a zero is contained in each confidence intervals for the comparison further indicating the absence of statistical significance among the age group means.

The null hypothesis for H14 states that there is no relationship between age of the employee and perceived fairness. Age of the employee was not found to be statistically significant in assessing fairness \([F (3, 86 = 2.552, p = .061)]\), therefore this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 80 displays the harmonic means for the age group samples and fairness. The harmonic mean was calculated due to the disparity in the number of samples within the four age group samples. Because there were no statistically significant differences in the age group means and a stepwise, stepdown multiple comparison was desired, a single homogeneous subset was produced. This homogeneous subset table shows a comparison of the age group means using the harmonic means of the four age groups and fairness. The harmonic mean sample size was 14.098 and the lowest age group mean was the under 30 age group \((m = 3.3134)\), followed by age group 30 – 39 (3.3480), age group 50 – 59 (3.7547) and lastly, age group 40 – 49 (3.7769).
Table 77

**ANOVA table for Regression Model – Employee Age and Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.471</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>38.988</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.459</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Predictors (Constant), age (1) under 30, (2) 30 – 39, (3) 40 – 49, (4) 50 – 59
Dependent variable: Fairness

Table 78

**Post Hoc Tests – Multiple Comparisons for Fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Emp. Age</th>
<th>(J) Emp. Age</th>
<th>Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>-.03441</td>
<td>.16699</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>-.46337</td>
<td>.19349</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>-.44115</td>
<td>.29633</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>.03441</td>
<td>.16699</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>-.42895</td>
<td>.20203</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>-.40673</td>
<td>.30197</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>.46337</td>
<td>.19349</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>.42895</td>
<td>.20203</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>.02222</td>
<td>.31740</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>.44115</td>
<td>.29663</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>.40673</td>
<td>.30197</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>-.02222</td>
<td>.31740</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 79

Multiple Comparisons - Confidence Intervals for Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Emp. Age</th>
<th>(J) Emp. Age</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>-0.51061</td>
<td>0.44177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>-1.1051</td>
<td>0.08839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>-1.2861</td>
<td>0.40388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>-0.44177</td>
<td>0.51061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>-1.0050</td>
<td>0.14718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>-1.2678</td>
<td>0.45441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>-0.08839</td>
<td>1.0151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>-0.14718</td>
<td>1.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>-0.88290</td>
<td>0.92734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>-0.40388</td>
<td>1.2861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>-0.45441</td>
<td>1.2678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>-0.92734</td>
<td>0.88290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 80

Means for Homogeneous Subsets – Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emp. Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.3480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.7769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 14.098

Table 81 displays an ANOVA table for the different group means of the age groups and effectiveness. The results show that there were no statistically significant differences in the age group means \( F(3, 86) = .078, p = .972 \). Although there were no statistically significant differences in the age group means, a Scheffe post hoc test was examined for the four age groups as displayed in table 78. Scheffe’s post hoc test was chosen over a Tukey post hoc test due to it being a single-step multiple comparison procedure that applies to the set of estimates of all
possible contrasts among the factor level means and is not restricted to pairwise differences as the sample had four age group means to consider. Displayed in Table 82 are the mean differences among the age group comparisons with the standard error of the analysis as well as the significance level for each. The results displayed in Table 82 confirm that there are no statistically significant differences in any the age group means because all of the significance values are above .05. Additionally, Table 83 displays the confidence intervals for all of the comparisons which reveals a zero is contained in each confidence intervals for the comparison further indicating the absence of statistical significance among the age group means.

The null hypothesis for H15 states that there is no relationship between age of the employee and perceived effectiveness. Age of the employee was not found to be statistically significant in assessing effectiveness \[ F (3, 86 = .078, p = .972) \], therefore this study fails to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 84 displays the harmonic means for the age group samples and fairness. The harmonic mean was calculated due to the disparity in the number of samples within the four age group samples. Because there were no statistically significant differences in the age group means and a stepwise, stepdown multiple comparison was desired, a single homogeneous subset was produced. This homogeneous subset table shows a comparison of the age group means using the harmonic means of the four age groups and fairness. The harmonic mean sample size was 14.098 and the lowest age group mean was the 30–39 age group \( m = 2.8275 \), followed by under 30 \( m = 2.8416 \), age group 50–59 \( m = 2.8809 \), and lastly, 40–49 \( m = 2.9047 \).
### Table 81

**ANOVA table for Regression Model – Employee Age and Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>28.105</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.182</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Predictors (Constant), age (1) under 30, (2) 30 – 39, (3) 40 – 49, (4) 50 – 59, (5) 60+
Dependent variable: Effectiveness

### Table 82

**Post Hoc Tests – Multiple Comparisons for Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Emp. Age</th>
<th>(J) Emp. Age</th>
<th>Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>.01411</td>
<td>.14178</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>-.06306</td>
<td>.16428</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>-.03925</td>
<td>.25159</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>-.01411</td>
<td>.14178</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 – 490</td>
<td>-.07717</td>
<td>.17153</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>-.05336</td>
<td>.25639</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>.06306</td>
<td>.16428</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>.07717</td>
<td>.17153</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>.02380</td>
<td>.26948</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>.03925</td>
<td>.25159</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>.05336</td>
<td>.25639</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>-.02380</td>
<td>.26948</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 83

*Multiple Comparisons - Confidence Intervals for Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Emp. Age</th>
<th>(J) Emp. Age</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.39019</td>
<td>.41842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.53153</td>
<td>-.39019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.75671</td>
<td>.67820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.41842</td>
<td>.39019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.56634</td>
<td>.41198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.78450</td>
<td>.67777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.40541</td>
<td>.53153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.41198</td>
<td>.56634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.74467</td>
<td>.79229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.67820</td>
<td>.75671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.67777</td>
<td>.78450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.79229</td>
<td>.74467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 84

*Means for Homogeneous Subsets – Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emp. Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.8278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.8416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.9047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes. Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 14.098*

The first area of interest in the demographic analysis for the employee and manager sample deployed in this study was sex. There were no statistically significant differences found in the means of fairness or effectiveness in the employee sample related to sex. Additionally, there were no statistically significant differences found in the means of effectiveness related to sex of the manager sample. There were significant statistical differences found in the means of the sex of managers related to fairness. The significance level for fairness (2-tailed) was less
than \( .05 = .049 \) and therefore it can be concluded that there is a statistically significant difference between male and female managers related to fairness.

The second area of interest in the demographic analysis for the employee sample deployed in this study was age. There were no statistically significant differences found in the means of the four different employee age groups and fairness. Additionally, there were no statistically significant differences found in the means of the four different employee age groups and effectiveness.
Table 85

Correlations Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proc Just</th>
<th>Dist Just</th>
<th>Intp Just</th>
<th>Info Just</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>IPT Comp</th>
<th>Extra version</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Agreeable</th>
<th>Openness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.689**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.544**</td>
<td>.812**</td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>.215*</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.209*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.573**</td>
<td>.501**</td>
<td>.853**</td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.201*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intp</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.573**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>.820**</td>
<td>.610**</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info</td>
<td>.544**</td>
<td>.501**</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.801**</td>
<td>.648**</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.244*</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>.812**</td>
<td>.853**</td>
<td>.820**</td>
<td>.801**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.699**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>.533**</td>
<td>.610**</td>
<td>.648**</td>
<td>.699**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.221*</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT</td>
<td>.215*</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra version</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.381**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.244*</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.221*</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.489**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.209*</td>
<td>.215*</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.243*</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.489**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Table 86

Correlations – Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>3.19722</td>
<td>.95803</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>3.98611</td>
<td>.87919</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice</td>
<td>3.36888</td>
<td>.83513</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>3.44678</td>
<td>.69070</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>2.85238</td>
<td>.56271</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT Comp</td>
<td>3.81111</td>
<td>.81983</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>4.87407</td>
<td>1.1857</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>3.88518</td>
<td>1.0324</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.57037</td>
<td>.82296</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>4.92037</td>
<td>1.0882</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>4.38703</td>
<td>1.3087</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study employed a quantitative approach toward data collection and analysis. Moreover, utilizing quantitative statistical methods, the relationships associated with the personality disposition of a manager and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of employees related to recent performance evaluation were explored. Paired data were collected in a resort location in the northeast United States known to be a luxury vacation destination. Findings from this present study show statistically significant results related to implicit person theory incrementalism and perceived fairness and effectiveness. The following chapter is organized in the following manner: (1) summary of findings, (2) implications of the study, (3) limitations of the study, and (4) recommendations for further research.

Summary of Findings

Descriptive Results

Three different hospitality industries participated in the study, including the following: hotels (7), restaurants (5), and private clubs (8) with a total of 20 organizations included in the study. Of the participating organizations, 49 paired samples were collected from hotels (54.4%), 25 paired samples were collected from restaurants (27.7%), and 26 paired samples from private clubs (28.8%). Mean age of the manager sample was 43 \((n=89)\) with a range of 27 to 66 years of age. Mean age of the employee sample was 34.17 \((n=90)\) with a range of 19 to 64 years of age. The manager sample was 61% male and 39% female and the employee sample was 50% male and 50% female. Participants from the manager sample had been employed with their current organization for an average of 9.88 years and the participants from the employee sample had been employed with their current organization for an average of 6.09 years. The years of
experience within the hospitality industry mean for the manager sample was 18.08 and the years of experience within the hospitality industry mean for the employee sample was 9.88.

In total, four (4) instruments were utilized in this study. Dweck’s IPT scale (1999) and Shafer’s FFM scale (1999) were utilized for the predictor variables. Colquitt’s justice measurement scale (2001) and Longenecker’s effectiveness scale (1988) were utilized for the dependent variables. Independent variable scores were tested for internal reliability using a Cronbach’s alpha value of greater than .70 (Nunnally, 1978). Cronbach’s alpha level for the IPT scale was: IPT, \( a = .88 \). Additionally, the Cronbach’s alpha for each of the five FFM domains were: extraversion, \( a = .92 \); neuroticism, \( a = .89 \); conscientiousness, \( a = .85 \); agreeableness, \( a = .91 \); openness, \( a = 88 \).

There were several findings provided by the questionnaire’s descriptive data. The mean rating for the IPT composite score was 3.81 (1 = strongly agree to 6 = strongly disagree) indicating the sample of manager’s possessed IPT incrementalism (>3.5 = incrementalism, <3.5 = entity). Moreover, the lowest mean reported on the IPT scale was 3.66 (item 3; people can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can’t really be changed) which is 1.6 above the threshold of IPT incrementalism/IPT entity. Additionally, the grand mean for the FFM domains (30 items) was 4.72 on a 7-point Likert-type scale (utilizing trait term pairs) indicating positive outcomes within all domains. The mean range for the five FFM domains was 1.71 with the low being neuroticism (3.86) and the high being conscientiousness (5.57).

**IPT Disposition and Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness**

Regression analysis was conducted to examine whether a relationship existed between IPT disposition and perceived fairness and perceived effectiveness. Dweck’s (1999) eight item IPT disposition scale assessed the IPT disposition of the managers. Twenty items from
Colquitt’s justice measures survey were utilized to assess the perceived fairness of employees including: procedural justice (7), distributive justice (4), interpersonal justice (4), informational justice (5). Employee perceived effectiveness was assessed utilizing Longenecker’s eight item effective performance appraisal scale.

Testing the alternative hypothesis, *A manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness of their performance evaluations*, was accepted because the finding revealed a statistically significant, positive yet weak relationship indicated by the findings between IPT disposition and perceived fairness: \[ r (90) = .400, p<.000 \]. Moreover, an \( R^2 = .16 \) was revealed in the analysis indicating that 16% of the variance in perceived fairness is explained by IPT disposition. Testing the second alternative hypothesis, *A manager’s IPT incrementalism positively impacts employees’ perceived effectiveness of their performance evaluations*, was accepted because the findings revealed effectiveness and IPT disposition were found to have a statistically significant positive yet moderate relationship: \[ r (90) = .435, p<.000 \]. Additionally, the relationship between the variables showed an \( R^2 = .189 \) indicating 18.9% of the variance in perceived effectiveness is explained by IPT disposition.

**(FFM) Agreeableness; Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness**

Regression analysis was conducted to examine whether a relationship existed between each of the five domains of the FFM model and perceived fairness and effectiveness. The first domain of FFM examined with fairness and effectiveness was agreeableness and this was tested with the alternative hypothesis; *A manager’s agreeableness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations*. Agreeableness and fairness were found to have a non-significant, positive yet weak relationship \[ r (90) = .155, p = .144 \] and therefore the alternative hypothesis is rejected in favor of the null hypothesis.
Agreeableness and effectiveness were found to have a statistically significant positive yet weak relationship \( r (90) = .221, p = .037 \) and therefore the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis.

**FFM** Conscientiousness; Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness

The second domain of FFM examined with fairness and effectiveness was conscientiousness and this was tested with the alternative hypothesis; *A manager’s conscientiousness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.* Conscientiousness and fairness were found to have a non-statistically significant, positive yet weak relationship \( r (90) = .046, p = .670 \) and therefore the alternative hypothesis is rejected in favor of the null hypothesis. Additionally, conscientiousness and effectiveness were found to have a non-statistically significant, positive yet weak relationship \( r (90) = .089, p = .402 \) and therefore the alternative hypothesis in favor of the null hypothesis.

**FFM** Openness; Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness

The third domain of FFM examined with fairness and effectiveness was openness and this was tested with the alternative hypothesis, *A manager’s conscientiousness positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations.* Openness and fairness were found to have a non-statistically significant, positive yet weak relationship \( r (90) = .199, p = .060 \) and therefore the alternative hypothesis is rejected in favor of the null hypothesis. Additionally, openness and effectiveness were found to have a non-significant, positive yet weak relationship \( r (90) = .097, p = .361 \) and therefore the alternative hypothesis is rejected in favor of the null hypothesis.
(FFM) Extraversion; Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness

The fourth domain of FFM examined with fairness and effectiveness was extraversion and this was tested with the alternative hypothesis, *A manager’s extraversion positively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations*. Extraversion and fairness were found to have a non-statistically significant, positive yet weak relationship $[r(90) = .183, p = .084]$ and therefore the alternative hypothesis is rejected in favor of the null hypothesis. Additionally, extraversion and effectiveness were found to have a non-statistically significant, positive yet weak relationship $[r(90) = .105, p = .325]$ and therefore the alternative hypothesis is rejected in favor of the null hypothesis.

(FFM) Neuroticism; Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness

The fifth domain of FFM examined with fairness and effectiveness was neuroticism and this was tested with the alternative hypothesis, *A manager’s neuroticism negatively impacts employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of their performance evaluations*. Neuroticism and fairness were found to have a non-statistically significant, positive yet weak relationship $[r(90) = .092, p = .391]$ and therefore the alternative hypothesis is rejected in favor of the null hypothesis. Additionally, neuroticism and effectiveness were found to have a non-statistically significant, positive yet weak relationship $[r(90) = .029, p = .786]$ and therefore the alternative hypothesis is rejected in favor of the null hypothesis.

Implicit Person Theory and Five-factor Model

Multiple regression was utilized to test H8 and H9 by holding the FFM predictor variables constant to assess any additional effect IPT may have on the dependent variables, fairness and effectiveness.
In evaluating H8; when FFM was controlled for, the results show that $R^2 = .122$. These results indicate that an additional 12.2% of the variance in fairness is explained by IPT incrementalism while FFM variables are held constant. The null hypothesis, *There are no additional positive differences in employees’ perceived fairness from IPT incrementalism while controlling for managers’ FFM* is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. The alternative hypothesis, *There are additional positive differences in employees’ perceived fairness from IPT incrementalism when controlling for managers’ FFM* is accepted [$F(6, 83) = 3.262, p = .006$]. The results are statistically significant ($p < .05$) and $R^2 = .122$ indicates IPT incrementalism has an impact on fairness when the FFM variables are held constant.

In evaluating H9; when FFM was controlled for, the results show that $R^2 = .147$. These results indicate that an additional 14.7% of the variance in fairness is explained by IPT incrementalism while FFM variables are held constant. The null hypothesis, *There are no additional positive differences in employees’ perceived effectiveness from IPT incrementalism while controlling for managers’ FFM* is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. The alternative hypothesis, *There are additional positive differences in employees’ perceived effectiveness from IPT incrementalism when controlling for managers’ FFM* is accepted [$F(6, 83) = 3.752, p = .002$]. The results are statistically significant ($p < .05$) and $R^2 = .147$ indicates IPT incrementalism has an impact on fairness when the FFM variables are held constant.

**Demographic Differences in Perceived Fairness and Effectiveness**

The demographic variables analyzed related to perceived fairness and effectiveness were sex and age. Sex differences for fairness and effectiveness were analyzed for the employee sample and the manager sample. Age group means were analyzed for fairness and effectiveness for the employee sample.
There were no statistically significant differences found in the means of fairness or effectiveness in the employee sample related to sex. Additionally, there were no statistically significant differences found in the means of effectiveness related to sex for the employee sample; however, there were statistically significant differences in the manager sample found in the means of the sex related to fairness. The significance level for fairness (2-tailed) was less than .05 at .049 and therefore it can be concluded that there is statistically significant differences between the male and female managers and fairness.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to compare the means of the four age groups and there were no statistical differences found among the means within the employee sample. Two areas of concern were observed. First, the disparity among the age group sample size was large. Second, the sample size for the age groups was small in the analyses.

With the exception of the sex of the manager sample related to fairness, the findings suggest that there are no statistically significant differences related to fairness and effectiveness among sex within this study. Additionally, the findings suggest that there are no significant differences related to fairness or effectiveness among the different four different employee age groups that were examined. Therefore, when evaluating RQ5, “Are there any Demographic Differences in the Perceived Effectiveness or Fairness based on Demographic Variables”; (1) the findings suggest there are no significant differences based on age of the employee and fairness and effectiveness, (2) the findings suggest there are no significant differences based on the employees’ sex related to fairness and effectiveness, and (3) the findings suggest there are statistically significant differences among the manager sample related to fairness and no significant differences among the manager sample related to effectiveness.
Implications of the Study

Practical Implications

There are many practical implications related to this study. This study falls under the overarching umbrella of human resources within the hospitality industry and provides insight for practitioner’s to understand the implications of certain processes related to performance evaluations. The performance evaluation process is utilized throughout the hospitality industry and serves many functions. Performance evaluation systems are central to a cross section of management functions, such as determining employee compensation and rewards, providing developmental feedback, documenting administrative decisions, succession planning, and reinforcing organizational norms (Cascio & Aguinis, 2005). Performance evaluations are valuable tools for hospitality organizations to utilize in efforts to improve employee performance and performance management in general. Because how performance appraisals are perceived by the employee is paramount to the outcome, this study researched the perceived fairness and effectiveness of the employee to provide insight into this specific area of the performance appraisal process.

An organization’s performance evaluations system can be a practical tool for employee motivation and development when employees perceive their performance evaluations to be fair and accurate (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979). This study illuminates the areas of perceived fairness and effectiveness and the impact the manager’s personality disposition has on the process which raises the question; should the manager’s personality disposition be taken into consideration before the performance evaluation process begins with their subordinates? If performance evaluations are perceived as unfair, they can diminish rather than enhance employee’s attitude and performance (Latham & Mann, 2006). Since leadership styles, personalities, and personal dispositions can cause fluctuations in the effectiveness of
performance evaluations (Neck, Stewart, & Manz, 1995), this study assists in making the critical connection between managers’ personality disposition and employees’ perceived fairness and effectiveness of the performance evaluation process. Practitioners may find Dweck’s IPT scale helpful in assessing the incrementalism or entity personality disposition of their managers which may be beneficial for all stakeholders. Utilizing this personality assessment may assist with manager preparation and positive employee perceptions which may lead to a myriad of organizational benefits.

With the implementation of an effective and well organized performance evaluation system, practitioners are making a prudent investment in human capital management and specifically, performance management. Moreover, hospitality is an industry that remains highly labor-intensive where payroll typically the largest expense. (Brien & Smallman, 2011). While enhancing the understanding of how a manager’s personality disposition affects the execution of effective performance evaluations, practitioners may increase their organization’s return on investment by improving their performance evaluation systems.

Practitioners may use this study to assist with the ongoing efforts to assess and improve their performance evaluation procedures. The success of organizations within the hospitality industry is often dictated by the performance of their employees. This study attempted to look beyond the results of a performance evaluation and focus on perceived outcomes. The performance evaluation outcomes themselves can have an important influence on employees’ reactions toward their work, their managers, and the establishment they work for (Thurston & McNall, 2009). Performance evaluation repercussions reverberate throughout all areas within hospitality organizations and this study illuminates areas that are in need of additional attention. Moreover, given performance evaluation’s established relationship with increased motivation,
commitment, and performance, understanding its antecedents is important for researchers and practitioners (Cook & Crossman, 2004; Jawahar, 2006; Pearce & Porter, 1986).

**Research Implications**

Findings of this study contain three distinct contributions to the scholarship and body of knowledge on hospitality performance evaluation systems. First, research regarding the use of and the procedures surrounding performance evaluation systems utilized by organizations has been extensive. The areas of instrumentation application, frequency analysis, as well as many other fundamental performance appraisal procedural attributes have been analyzed and thus have received much research attention. This study analyzed an area of the performance evaluation process relating to the perceptions produced that are directly related to personality disposition. Employees’ perceptions toward the appraisal process have been shown to affect the efficacy of the appraisal system, which in turn influences organizational productivity and profitability (Langan-Fox, Bell, McDonald, & Morizzi, 1996). Utilizing the IPT and the FFM personality assessments, this study has provided empirical research in its attempt to associate the personality disposition of the manager and the relationship this has on producing certain effects on employee perceptions of performance appraisals.

Secondly, the findings from this study may assist in illuminating this neglected area of performance evaluation research in the hospitality industry. Moreover, this study suggests that it may be helpful for hospitality organizations to evaluate the IPT disposition of managers conducting performance evaluations. Prior research has established that managers possess either an entity or incrementalism IPT disposition. IPT posits managers hold assumptions about the plasticity of personal attributes, such as ability and personality (Heslin & VandeWalle, 2011). Managers possessing an incremental IPT disposition would coach and counsel their employees
rather than reprimand or punish, as they believe employees can improve their performance through training and development (Dweck, 1999). Although at present, there are no known applications of IPT disposition ratings of managers in the hospitality industry, this study provides empirical evidence that in doing so, it may assist in producing positive employee performance evaluation outcomes. Furthermore, it may also assist with improving employee performance which would enhance the return on the investment related to performance evaluation system investments for hospitality organizations.

Lastly, this study utilized paper questionnaires that were hand delivered. The researcher met hospitality representatives in person to explain the intentions and purposes of this study. In doing so, the researcher was able to achieve a response rate 87%. This is well above the return rate for online questionnaire and mailed survey data collection efforts. Moreover, the process of in-person meetings assisted in cultivating professional relationships between practitioners and academia which may lead to narrowing the gap in collaboration between these two disparate groups. Additionally, this process of data collection is consistent with previous research (Brown & Arendt, 2011) suggesting that while initiating the data collection process, meeting with industry professionals and making personal contact with industry participants significantly enhances response rates and may increase the likelihood of future research participation.

**Limitations of the Study**

This section will discuss four limitations contained in this study: (1) sampling process, (2) lack of equity among the participating hospitality organizations, (3) self-administered surveys, and (4) generalizability limitations.

First, the selection process for the sample was not conducted using a random sampling method which negates the possibility of this study being categorized this study as a true
experiment. Not employing a true random sample design in data collection prevents any causal interpretations to be made related to the outcomes of the analysis contained within this study. A less desirable sample known as a nonprobability sample or convenience sample was utilized that employs a strategy whereby participants are recruited based on their accessibility (Babbie, 1990).

Secondly, the participating hospitality organizations were from three different hospitality segments. This study focused on the employee perceptions of a recently conducted performance evaluations and it is expected that these three hospitality segments differed in their systems and processes related to administering performance evaluations. The sample participation within this study is represented by a disparate number among the three segments of the hospitality industry. Combining paired data lacking equitable representation from hotels (49 dyads), restaurants (25 dyads), and private clubs (26 dyads) may have affected the results of this study.

Third, this study relied on multiple instruments in the form of self-administered questionnaires for managers and employees. The researcher had no control regarding the conditions of how the questionnaires were completed and it is expected the conditions of which the self-administered surveys were completed varied. Moreover, the researcher was unable to assess if the conditions for all participants were appropriate.

Lastly, the participating organizations, along with their managers and employees who engaged this study, were from a specific geographical location in the northeast region of the United States. Because this study was limited to the geographical area of the participation in this study, generalizing the results to other parts of the United States is not possible.
Recommendations for Further Research

In expanding upon this present research, there are many opportunities including: (1) replication of the study in another geographical location, (2) introduce a qualitative approach, and (3) analyze the data involving the generational influences.

First, there is an opportunity to expand the present study with replication models in various parts of the United States that could then be compared and incorporated with this present study. This would assist with additional validation of the current findings and the supplemental studies would add breadth and depth to the current study. Additionally, recognizing that the paired sample size of ninety was adequate, augmenting the current study with study replications would increase the sample size while reaching alternative geographical locations. Moreover, having multiple studies that are replicated in various geographical locations may assist in bridging the gap between research and academia with practice and application. Concerns about the gap between science and practice are longstanding (Wandersman, Duffy, Flaspohler, Noonan, Keri, Lindsay, Morris, Dunville, & Janet, 2008). This expanded research would be useful for both academia and industry and exist for the betterment of these disparate groups.

Secondly, as the current study researched perceptions which are individualized and subjective, incorporating the same line of analysis from a qualitative approach would assist in expanding and developing this current research. Implementing a mixed-use approach while using this current study as a foundation would enrich this research with the use of open-ended questions and assist in the discovery of valuable data that parallels this current study. Moreover, the use of triangulation related to future research in this area would expand the current research. One method of research doesn’t adequately assess a phenomenon, using multiple methods assists in facilitating deeper understanding (Angen, 2000; Creswell, 1998). While assessing the
perceptions from this current sample, utilizing triangulation in future research would complement the current research by illuminating blind spots in the interpretation of data (Denzin, 1978; Patton, 1999).

Lastly, perceptions of experiences differ from generation to generation. Contained in the current study, four different generations participated using the same assessment instruments. An opportunity to expand this current study involving segmentation of generational responses would be an opportunity and an area for growth related to the current research. Application of this research approach across diverse generations while segmenting responses would identify commonalities and differences which would further establish this research as an applied tool for practitioners to utilize. By understanding each generation, leaders are able to increase employee production, morale, and reduce employee attrition (Kogan, 2007). Managers are realizing that age has just as much to do with employees’ hopes, learning styles and expectations as do culture, gender and other characteristics (Gursoy, Maier, & Chi, 2008).
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Implicit Person Theory Rating Scale: Manager Instrument

The managers will be informed that the purpose of this study is to evaluate how different managers evaluate an employee’s work performance. Informed consent and demographic information including sex, age, hospitality industry, and experience (years) will be collected at time of survey.

Respondents will indicate their agreement with these statements on a 6-point Likert rating scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 6 (strongly disagree). To score this questionnaire, the scores from the 8 items are averaged to form an overall implicit theory score, with a higher score indicating a stronger incremental theory.

Participants are classified as entity theorists if their overall implicit theory score is 3.0 or below and classified as incremental if their overall score is 4.0 or above.

1. Everyone is a kind of person, and there is not much that they can do to really change that.
2. The kind of person someone is is something basic about them, and it can’t be changed very much.
3. People can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can’t really be changed.
4. As much as I hate to admit it, you can’t teach an old dog new tricks. People can’t really change their deepest attributes.
5. People can change even their most basic qualities.
6. Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic characteristics.
7. People can substantially change the kind of person who they are.
8. No matter what kind of person someone is, they can always change very much.

(Dweck, 1999)
APPENDIX C: FIVE-FACTOR MODEL SCALE

FFM Measure Items – Manager Instrument

The instrument will be administered using a 7-point semantic differential scale with the following trait term pairs for each of the five sections of the FFM. Instructions ask participants to mark on the scale between each trait term pair in which they recognize the best area that describes themselves in general.

1. Extraversion
   Shy - Outgoing
   Quiet – Outgoing
   Introverted – Extraverted
   Retiring – Sociable
   Reserved – Friendly
   Loner – Joiner

2. Neuroticism
   At Ease – Nervous
   Un-agitated – Tense
   Calm – Anxious
   Unworried – Fearful
   Self-assured – Worrying
   Hardy – Vulnerable

3. Conscientiousness
   Lazy – Hard-working
   Un-responsible – Responsible
   Weak Willed – Self-disciplined
   Quitting – Persevering
   Careless – Thorough
   Unorganized – Orderly

4. Agreeableness
   Headstrong – Gentle
   Vengeful – Forgiving
   Disagreeable – Agreeable
   Stubborn – Flexible
   Antagonistic – Acquiescent
   Critical – Lenient

5. Openness
   Uncreative – Creative
   Unartistic – Artistic
   Down to Earth – Imaginative
   Conventional – Original
   Uninquisitive – Curious
   Realistic – Philosophical

(Shafer, 1999)
APPENDIX D: JUSTICE MEASURES SCALE

Justice Measure Items – Employee Instrument

Procedural justice

The following items refer to the procedures used to arrive at your (outcome).

To what extent:

1. Have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures?  
   Thibaut & Walker (1975)
2. Have you had influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?  
   Thibaut & Walker (1975)
3. Have those procedures been applied consistently?  
   Leventhal (1980)
4. Have those procedures been free of bias?  
   Leventhal (1980)
5. Have those procedures been based on accurate information?  
   Leventhal (1980)
6. Have you been able to appeal the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?  
   Leventhal (1980)
7. Have those procedures upheld ethical and moral standards?  
   Leventhal (1980)

Distributive justice

The following items refer to your (outcome).

To what extent:

1. Does your (outcome) reflect the effort you have put into your work?  
   Leventhal (1986)
2. Is your (outcome) appropriate for the work you have completed?  
   Leventhal (1986)
3. Does your (outcome) reflect what you have contributed to the organization?  
   Leventhal (1986)
4. Is your (outcome) justified, given your performance?  
   Leventhal (1986)

Interpersonal justice

The following items refer to (the authority figure who enacted the procedure).

To what extent: Mur

1. Has (he/she) treated you in a polite manner?  
   Bies & Moag (1986)
2. Has (he/she) treated you with dignity?  
   Bies & Moag (1986)
3. Has (he/she) treated you with respect?
Bies & Moag (1986)
4. Has (he/she) refrained from improper remarks or comments?

Bies & Moag (1986)

**Informational justice**
The following items refer to (the authority figure who enacted the procedure).
To what extent:

1. Has (he/she) been candid in (his/her) communications with you?

Bies & Moag (1986)
2. Has (he/she) explained the procedures thoroughly?

Bies & Moag (1986)
3. Were (his/her) explanations regarding the procedures reasonable?

Shapiro et al. (1994)
4. Has (he/she) communicated details in a timely manner?

Shapiro et al. (1994)
5. Has (he/she) seemed to tailor (his/her) communications to individuals’ specific needs?

Shapiro et al. (1994)

Note. All items use a 5-point scale with anchors of 1 = to a small extent and 5 = to a large extent. Citations reflect the source of the concepts measured by the scale items.

(Colquitt, 2001)
APPENDIX E: EFFECTIVENESS SCALE

Effective Performance Appraisal Items: Employee Instrument

This instrument utilizes a four-point scale ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (4) Strongly Agree and a neutral point employed was not employed as the appraisal issues measured are either contribute to the effectiveness of the performance appraisal or not, neutral ground in this investigation is not a viable option. This is a 7-item instrument consisting of the following:

1. I clearly understand why we do performance appraisals
2. Managers conducting performance appraisals treat employees fairly
3. Managers are open and honest in their performance appraisals with employees
4. The performance appraisal procedure allows for the employees to be candid and open when discussing their performance
5. Performance appraisals are too subjective
6. Managers put enough time into the performance appraisals
7. Performance appraisals are conducted in a professional manner

(Longenecker, Liverpool, & Wilson, 1988)
APPENDIX F: MANAGER SURVEY PACKET

Background introduction for participants:

Hello! Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Jim Storey and I spent many years working in the hospitality industry right here on Nantucket. After a rewarding and fulfilling career, I decided to pursue a PhD in Hospitality Management at Iowa State University. Part of my degree requirements include conducting research project and that is why I am contacting you.

Thank you for considering participation in this research study involving performance appraisals in the hospitality industry. This packet provides some basic background information regarding the procedures of the research and what you can expect from your participation.

First of all, all communication and information shared between the you, the participant, and the researcher will be kept completely confidential so you do not have to be concerned or worried about your participation and the comments you make as a participant. The participants within this research study should feel relaxed and comfortable regarding their participation before, during, and after the research study.

Secondly, participants should know that their participation is voluntary and that they may stop participation at any time. In addition, there is no compensation or incentives that will be provided to the participants. The participants should know that the researcher will not be receiving compensation for this study.

Your participation should take approximately 15 – 20 minutes of your time in order to read and sign the informed consent, and fill out three short surveys. Once you are finished, please place the survey packet in the envelope provided, seal the envelope, and return it to your designated organization representative.

Should you desire a copy of the final research regarding this study, the researcher will provide you with a copy of the results. Your participation will help hospitality industry professionals better understand the nature and dynamics performance appraisals and hopefully contribute ways to make the procedures more effective.

Thank you again for being a participant in this research study, should you have further questions, please contact the researcher using the below information.

Researcher: James Storey, 508-680-2071 or jstorey@iastate.edu
Informed Consent Document

Title of Study: Assessing hospitality employee perception of performance appraisals.

This form describes a research project. It has information to help you decide whether or not you wish to participate. Research studies include only people who choose to take part and your participation is completely voluntary. Please discuss any questions you have about the study or about this form with the researcher, James Storey, before deciding to participate.

Introduction

The purpose of this proposed study is to attempt to understand the perceptions of organizational justice (fairness) and effectiveness relating to the procedures of recently conducted performance appraisals on employees working in the hospitality industry. You are being invited to participate in this study because you are working in either a hotel/resort, restaurant or private club and your response will help improve the evaluation process for the hospitality industry.

Description of Procedures

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete written questionnaires. There is no time limit but expected average time to complete the questionnaires is estimated to be 15 minutes. Please take your time and give your answers considerable thought and attention. If there is a question you are not comfortable with, it is asked that you try to answer but if you are not able to, please skip that question and move on to the next question. If you have any questions during the process, please contact the researcher immediately via email or cell phone.

Risks or Discomforts

While participating in this study, you may experience minor risks. There is a potential for minor psychological or social risks related to this proposed study since you may be asked to evaluate your direct supervisor on aspects related to fairness and effectiveness regarding your recent performance appraisal procedures. In addition, if the interview information is exposed to others, which the researchers will do everything in their power to ensure the data remains confidential, there is a minor chance of embarrassment, retribution, and/or disruption in relationships. If you feel psychologically stressed due to the questions, for these reasons, you can take a break or you can choose to end your participation in the study at any time.

Benefits

If you decide to participate in this study, the information gained in this study will contribute to the benefit of hospitality employees and managers by providing information to improve the quality of performance appraisals in the hospitality industry and help evaluators of the performance appraisals improve their evaluation protocols.

Costs and Compensation

There will not be any costs associated with participating in this study and there will not be any compensation offered.
Participant Rights

Participating in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part in the study or to stop participating at any time, for any reason, without penalty or negative consequences. You can skip any questions that you do not wish to answer.

If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office for Responsible Research, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

Confidentiality

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies, auditing departments of Iowa State University, and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or study records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information.

To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: participants will be assigned random identification numbers and these numbers will not be linked to other forms of data. The researcher of this study, James Storey, will have access to study records, and they will be kept confidential on the university server in a secure folder (Cybox).

Questions

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information about the study, contact:

- James Storey at 508-680-2071 or via email at jstorey@iastate.edu.

Consent and Authorization Provisions

Your signature below indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the documents, and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered.

Participant’s Name (printed) ________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Participant’s Signature Date
Performance Evaluation Study

Participant’s Demographic Information Form

1. Name: ____________________________________________

2. Age: ____________________________________________

3. Name of organization you work for: ________________

4. Number of years working for this organization: _______

5. The organization you work for is (please circle the one that applies):
   hotel/resort          or          restaurant          or          private club

6. Current job title: ________________________________

7. Years of experience in the hospitality industry: _______

8. Please circle one, I am a:       MALE       or       FEMALE

9. Level of education (circle one):
   high school       some college       college degree       advanced college degree

Thank you for answering the questions above as your participation is appreciated.

Researchers use only – confidential:  ___________________________ Date:________

Participant (circle one): Manager or Employee
Assigned research number for Manager: __M-____________________
Assigned research number for Employee: __E-___________________
Survey #1: 8 questions: Please circle the number that best describes how you agree or disagree with the question that is asked ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

1. Everyone is a kind of person, and there is not much that they can do to really change that.
   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly agree   Strongly disagree

2. The kind of person someone is is something basic about them, and it can’t be changed very much.
   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly agree   Strongly disagree

3. People can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can’t really be changed.
   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly agree   Strongly disagree

4. As much as I hate to admit it, you can’t teach an old dog new tricks. People can’t really change their deepest attributes.
   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly agree   Strongly disagree

5. People can change even their most basic qualities.
   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly agree   Strongly disagree

6. Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic characteristics.
   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly agree   Strongly disagree

7. People can substantially change the kind of person who they are.
   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly agree   Strongly disagree

8. No matter what kind of person someone is, they can always change very much.
   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Strongly agree   Strongly disagree
**Survey #2: 30 questions:** Please put a mark on the scale between each trait term pairs that best describes you in general.

**I am:**

<p>|               | Shy          | Quiet         | Introverted  | Retiring     | Reserved     | Loner        | At Ease      | Un-agitated  | Calm         | Unworried    | Self-assured | Hardy        | Lazy         | Outgoing     | Extraverted | Sociable | Friendly | Joiner | Nervous | Tense | Anxious | Fearful | Worrying | Vulnerable | Hard-working |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|----------|---------|--------|--------|-------|--------|---------|---------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------|-------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Un-responsible</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak Willed</td>
<td>Self-disciplined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitting</td>
<td>Persevering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless</td>
<td>Thorough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unorganized</td>
<td>Orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headstrong</td>
<td>Gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vengeful</td>
<td>Forgiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeable</td>
<td>Agreeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antagonistic</td>
<td>Acquiescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Lenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncreative</td>
<td>Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unartistic</td>
<td>Artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down to Earth</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for your participation in this study.

Please place the completed survey packet in the envelope provided, seal the envelope, and return it to your designated organization representative.

Should you desire further information about this study, please contact James Storey at jstorey@iastate.edu
APPENDIX G: EMPLOYEE SURVEY PACKET

Background introduction for participants:

Hello! Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Jim Storey and I spent many years working in the hospitality industry right here on Nantucket. After a rewarding and fulfilling career, I decided to pursue a PhD in Hospitality Management at Iowa State University. Part of my degree requirements include conducting research project and that is why I am contacting you.

Thank you for considering participation in this research study involving performance appraisals in the hospitality industry. This packet provides some basic background information regarding the procedures of the research and what you can expect from your participation.

First of all, all communication and information shared between the you, the participant, and the researcher will be kept completely confidential so you do not have to be concerned or worried about your participation and the comments you make as a participant. The participants within this research study should feel relaxed and comfortable regarding their participation before, during, and after the research study.

Secondly, participants should know that their participation is voluntary and that they may stop participation at any time. In addition, there is no compensation or incentives that will be provided to the participants. The participants should know that the researcher will not be receiving compensation for this study.

Your participation should take approximately 15 – 20 minutes of your time in order to read and sign the informed consent, and fill out three short surveys. Once you are finished, please place the survey packet in the envelope provided, seal the envelope, and return it to your designated organization representative.

Should you desire a copy of the final research regarding this study, the researcher will provide you with a copy of the results. Your participation will help hospitality industry professionals better understand the nature and dynamics performance appraisals and hopefully contribute ways to make the procedures more effective.

Thank you again for being a participant in this research study, should you have further questions, please contact the researcher using the below information.

Researcher: James Storey, 508-680-2071 or jstorey@iastate.edu
Informed Consent Document

Title of Study: Assessing hospitality employee perception of performance appraisals.

This form describes a research project. It has information to help you decide whether or not you wish to participate. Research studies include only people who choose to take part and your participation is completely voluntary. Please discuss any questions you have about the study or about this form with the researcher, James Storey, before deciding to participate.

Introduction

The purpose of this proposed study is to attempt to understand the perceptions of organizational justice (fairness) and effectiveness relating to the procedures of recently conducted performance appraisals on employees working in the hospitality industry. You are being invited to participate in this study because you are working in either a hotel/resort, restaurant or private club and your response will help improve the evaluation process for the hospitality industry.

Description of Procedures

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete written questionnaires. There is no time limit but expected average time to complete the questionnaires is estimated to be 15 minutes. Please take your time and give your answers considerable thought and attention. If there is a question you are not comfortable with, it is asked that you try to answer but if you are not able to, please skip that question and move on to the next question. If you have any questions during the process, please contact the researcher immediately via email or cell phone.

Risks or Discomforts

While participating in this study, you may experience minor risks. There is a potential for minor psychological or social risks related to this proposed study since you may asked to evaluate your direct supervisor on aspects related to fairness and effectiveness regarding your recent performance appraisal procedures. In addition, if the interview information is exposed to others, which the researchers will do everything in their power to ensure the data remains confidential, there is a minor chance of embarrassment, retribution, and/or disruption in relationships. If you feel psychologically stressed due to the questions, for these reasons, you can take a break or you can choose to end your participation in the study at any time.

Benefits

If you decide to participate in this study, the information gained in this study will contribute to the benefit of hospitality employees and managers by providing information to improve the quality of performance appraisals in the hospitality industry and help evaluators of the performance appraisals improve their evaluation protocols.

Costs and Compensation

There will not be any costs associated with participating in this study and there will not be any compensation offered.
Participant Rights

Participating in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part in the study or to stop participating at any time, for any reason, without penalty or negative consequences. You can skip any questions that you do not wish to answer.

If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office for Responsible Research, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

Confidentiality

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies, auditing departments of Iowa State University, and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or study records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information.

To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: participants will be assigned random identification numbers and these numbers will not be linked to other forms of data. The researcher of this study, James Storey, will have access to study records, and they will be kept confidential on the university server in a secure folder (Cybox).

Questions

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information about the study, contact:

- James Storey at 508-680-2071 or via email at jstorey@iastate.edu.

Consent and Authorization Provisions

Your signature below indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the documents, and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered.

Participant’s Name (printed) __________________________________________

___________________________________________   _______________________
Participant’s Signature                  Date
Performance Evaluation Study
Participant’s Demographic Information Form

1. Name: ____________________________________________

2. Age: ____________________________________________

3. Name of organization you work for: __________________

4. Number of years working for this organization: __________

5. The organization you work for is (please circle the one that applies):
   hotel/resort or restaurant or private club

6. Current job title:_____________________________________

7. Years of experience in the hospitality industry: __________

8. Please circle one, I am a: MALE or FEMALE

9. Level of education (circle one):
   high school some college college degree advanced college degree

Thank you for answering the questions above as your participation is appreciated.

Researchers use only – confidential: _____________________

Participant (circle one): Manager or Employee
Assigned research number for Manager: _M-_________________
Assigned research number for Employee: _E-_________________
Survey #1, 20 questions: Please circle the number that best describes how you would evaluate your experience as it relates to your most recently conducted performance appraisal that you have received. Responses range from a small extent (1) to a large extent (5).

1. Have you been able to express your views and feelings during the performance appraisal procedures?
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Small extent Large extent

2. Have you had influence over the outcome arrived at by those procedures?
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Small extent Large extent

3. Have those procedures been applied consistently?
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Small extent Large extent

4. Have those procedures been free of bias?
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Small extent Large extent

5. Have those procedures been based on accurate information?
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Small extent Large extent

6. Have you been able to appeal the outcome arrived at by those procedures?
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Small extent Large extent

7. Have those procedures upheld ethical and moral standards?
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Small extent Large extent

8. Does the outcome reflect the effort you have put into your work?
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Small extent Large extent

9. Is the outcome appropriate for the work you have completed?
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Small extent Large extent

10. Does your outcome reflect what you have contributed to the organization?
    
    1 2 3 4 5
11. Is your outcome justified, given your performance?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Small extent  Large extent

12. Has your manager treated you in a polite manner?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Small extent  Large extent

13. Has your manager treated you with dignity?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Small extent  Large extent

14. Has your manager treated you with respect?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Small extent  Large extent

15. Has your manager refrained from improper remarks or comments?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Small extent  Large extent

16. Has your manager been candid in (his/her) communications with you?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Small extent  Large extent

17. Has your manager explained the procedures thoroughly?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Small extent  Large extent

18. Were your manager explanations regarding the procedures reasonable?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Small extent  Large extent

19. Has your manager communicated details in a timely manner?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Small extent  Large extent

20. Has your manager seemed to tailor (his/her) communications to individuals' specific needs?
   1  2  3  4  5
   Small extent  Large extent
Survey #2, 7 questions: Please answer the questions below by circling the appropriate number below the question.

1. I clearly understand why we do performance appraisals.

   1  2  3  4
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

2. Managers conducting performance appraisals treat employees fairly.

   1  2  3  4
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

3. Managers are open and honest in their performance appraisals with employees.

   1  2  3  4
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

4. The performance appraisal procedure allows the employees to be candid and open when discussing their performance.

   1  2  3  4
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

5. Performance appraisals are too subjective.

   1  2  3  4
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

6. Managers put enough time into the performance appraisals.

   1  2  3  4
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

7. Performance appraisals are conducted in a professional manner.

   1  2  3  4
   Strongly disagree Strongly agree

Thank you for your participation in this study. Please place the completed survey packet in the envelope provided, seal the envelope, and return it to your designated organization representative. Should you desire further information about this study, please contact James Storey at jstorey@iastate.edu
Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that James Storey successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants".

Date of completion: 05/09/2016.

Certification Number: 2071210.