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It has already been discussed in the foregoing chapter how intricately the effectiveness of a supervisor is interwoven with his personality traits, aptitudes, and attitudes. Before delving into the methodological or technical aspects of the study, it would be desirable if one arrives at semantic clarification of the concepts involved in the study namely - personality, aptitude, attitude, and supervisory effectiveness.

Personality

Most thoughtful people have asked the question, "what is personality"? but few agree on an answer. The term "personality" has many definitions, but no single meaning is accepted universally (Mischel, 1976). Sucar (1949) aptly remarks, "The field of personality is one of the most popular, challenging, important and confused in contemporary psychology. The main obstacle to the clarification of the concept of personality is the lack of agreement about a definition of personality."

Psychologists have defined personality in a variety of ways, emphasizing one aspect or another and this has created a good deal of confusion. Allport (1937) too says, "Personality has dozens of different meanings: legal, grammatical, ethical, religious, economic and psychological,". There have been different approaches to the study and understanding of personality
i.e., philosophical, psychological, sociological, physiological, and psychiatric, within the field of psychology, psychologists have had varied approaches to personality i.e., psychoanalytical, behaviouristic, humanistic and existential. But there is a growing realization among the thinkers of these various disciplines that for the clear understanding of personality there has to be an interdisciplinary approach. The present trend is to regard the individual himself as a major focus of interest. Thorpe and Schmular (1965) say "An adequate definition of personality needs to emphasize the point that the individual is a human being enmeshed in a social order - and symbolic culture - which influences his every action." This emphasis on the individual has brought with it a need for a clear understanding of the nature of personality. In an attempt to find an operational definition of personality a few definitions need analysis.

In reviewing the theories of personality, Hall and Lindzey (1964) concluded that no substantive definition of personality can be applied with any generality. It means that the way in which a given individual defines personality will depend completely upon his particular theoretical preference. They provided a very general definition, "Personality consists concretely of a set of values or descriptive terms which are used to describe the individual being studied according to the variables or dimensions which occupy a central position within the particular theory described."

Cattell (1956) emphasized the predictive part of the personality. He says, "Personality is that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation...."
Personality is concerned with all the behaviour of the individual both overt and under the skin." Recently Ivancevich et al. (1977) defined Personality as "the combination of human characteristics or variables, we employ to define, classify or type a person. ... Personality classifications are only useful to the extent that they can predict behaviour."

The term personality and its relevance to administrative action is evident when it is defined as "... a stable set of characteristics and tendencies that determines those commonalities and differences in the psychological behaviour (thoughts, feelings, and actions) of people that have continuity in time." (Maddi, 1968).

The definition can be further clarified by using Bonner's (1961) propositions. The propositions spell out areas of interest for managers in that they provide needed insight into the personality concept.

1. Human behaviour consists of acts - In responding to a managerial directive or request for a more productive workday the individual responds. In attempting to comply with these requests the person acts.

2. Personality conceived in a whole actualizes itself in a determining environment - The gist of the proposition is that an employee cannot be understood, apart from his environment. The employee is part of a work unit and groups, and these affiliations interact with the total organization atmosphere to influence his personality.
3. Personality is characterized by self-consistency - The normal personality is in a state of dynamic equilibrium. It is flexible but it maintains a consistency.

4. Personality is goal-directed behaviour - The employee, through his personality seeks to achieve objectives or ends. The objectives are dictated by their contribution to the maintenance of self-stability.

5. Personality is a time-integrating structure - Man is a product of conditioned responses, habits learned through previous experiences. Man is also future oriented.

6. Personality is a process of becoming - As Bonner aptly states "... Personality is an organization of potentialities striving to actualize themselves." The concept of actualizing is important in most theories of motivation.

These propositions illustrate that personality represents a total complex individual network of factors, knowledge of which is very important for the managers concerned about effectiveness of the supervisors.

Eysenck (1960) defined personality, "... as more or less stable and enduring organization of a person's character, temperament, intellect and physique which determines his unique adjustment to the environment." He distinguished four sectors of personality: (1) A cognitive sector (intelligence) (2) A conative sector (character) (3) An affective sector (temperament) (4) A somatic sector (constitution).
Eysenck's view of personality seems to be particularly congruent with that of Allport (1937). Allport has championed and elaborated a thesis that rests firmly on the foundation of individuality, uniqueness the personal experience of the single individual and adjustment as the most meaningful subject matter for the explanation of the personality. He made an extensive survey of the literature, extracted about 50 definitions, classified them into a number of broad categories and finally formulated his own definition. His definition runs as follows, "Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment (Allport 1937)."

For the present study, for the measurement of directly measurable aspects of personality, this has been accepted as a working definition of personality. Allport's definition, to be sure is eclectic, comprehensive, functional, personalistic, and humanistic as well as holistic. It is most thorough doing in its stress upon the importance of giving a full consideration to the individuality by using the term "unique adjustment."

The approach is humanistic as it demands full recognition of all aspects of man's being, including this potential for becoming more than he is. His approach is personalistic in the sense that its goal is to understand and predict the development of the concrete, individual person. It also seems to be more appropriate because:

(i) It recognizes the dynamic nature of personality, i.e., becoming.

(ii) It emphasizes the integration of inner psychological
system and support that this integration is unique in each individual.

(iii) It takes into consideration the response of the individual to the challenge of the environment.

(iv) It provides a basis for the social stimulus value of the personality.

(v) It stresses both analytical as well as synthetic point of view.

(vi) It also provides a useful basis for making group comparisons.

Personality has been studied by the researchers from different viewpoints having different assumptions. These viewpoints represent the major conceptual emphases of contemporary Psychology, each with its own methods, procedures and assumptions. They are: the biological viewpoint, the experimental viewpoint, the social viewpoint, and the psychometric trait viewpoint, so far as the aims and methods of the present study are concerned, it involves psychometric trait viewpoint. The central assertion of this viewpoint is that "The behaviour of individuals is best understood in terms of attributes which reflect underlying trait organizations." (Wiggins, et al, 1971).

Then there is a problem of assessing personality. One of the most enduring approach to personality measurement seeks to label and classify people according to their psychological characteristics. In looking for a model for describing the personality organization, one finds two claimants in the field, namely, the concepts of "type" and "trait."
Eysenck (1960) views type, "... as a group of correlated" traits just as a trait was defined as a group of behavioural acts or action tendencies. According to this view, the difference between the concepts of trait and type lies not in continuity or lack of continuity of the hypothesized variable, not in its form of distribution but in the greater inclusiveness, of the type concept." The relationship between the two concepts is presented diagrammatically as follows:

Type level  Introversion
Trait level  Persistence, rigidity and shyness.
Habitual Response level.
Specific Response level.

Type is a higher order concept and trait is the second order concept. Traits are the building stones of higher order concepts in the analysis of personality. A personality trait can be defined as an "enduring attribute of a person that appears consistently in a variety of situations." (Kimble, Garmezy and Zigler, 1968). In combination, such traits distinguish one personality from another. One of the pioneer of trait theory is Allport (1937) who regards trait to be, "... a generalized and focalized neuropsychic system (peculiar to the individual), with the capacity to render many stimuli functionally equivalent, and to initiate and guide consistent (equivalent) forms of adaptive and expressive behaviour." Comparing the concept of trait and type and favouring the former he says "Type includes more than is in the individual. Traits on the contrary, are considered wholly within the compass of
the individual ... . Many kinds of typology flourish ... .
Whatever the kind, a typology is always a device for exalting its author's special interest at the expense of individuality of the life which he ruthlessly dismembers... . All typologies place boundaries, where boundaries do not belong. They are artificial categories." (Allport, 1937). He is of the view that even if some information is to be gained by fitting a person to one typology or another, it will be much more significant if his traits are analyzed. Thorpe and Schmuller (1965) consider trait as "... a legitimate structure of personality which can provide us with insight into the dynamics of individual behaviour... . Traits are, it follows, independent modes of behaviour manifested in the framework of what we call personality. They have acquired motive force with which to set other modes of behaviour in action."

Overall, the trait theories seem to make more sense than the type theories. The type theories unrealistically attempt to place personalities into discrete, discontinuous categories. The trait theories, on the other hand, give recognition to the continuity of personalities. The trait theorists have also contributed personality tests and factor-analysis techniques to the behavioural sciences. The major drawback of these theories is that they are very descriptive rather than analytical and are a long way from being comprehensive theories of personality. Strangely enough, many psychologists have vehemently criticized the attempts to analyze personality into traits for special investigation. The ground for the objection is that personality is an organized whole and that any form of analysis changes its
quality. But in the words of Stagner (1961) "This objection is invalid, since it is based on false analogy. Psychological traits are not substances, such as water, which can be analyzed into its components, hydrogen and oxygen, only by destroying the material analyzed."

Personality in terms of traits has been measured by various inventories and tests. In the last few decades many psychologists like Hathaway and McKinley (1951), Guilford - Zimmerman (1949), Lovell (1945), Leary (1956) and Cattell (1957) to mention a few, have constructed omnibus personality inventories, aiming at measuring different traits of personality. Reviewing the multiphasic inventories, it was clear that personality traits are numerous and assessment has to be selective.

Aptitude

Aptitude refers to the relatively stable, long-term individual characteristics that represent the individual's currently developed power to perform. In everyday life one usually comes across the individuals who under similar circumstances excel the other persons in acquiring certain knowledge or skills and prove themselves more suitable and efficient in certain specific jobs. Such persons are said to possess certain specific abilities, or aptitudes, which help them in achieving success in some specific occupations or activities.

The term aptitude has received different emphasis by different writers. Some have stressed latent ability while others
present ability. Some have accounted for it mainly through heredity, while others emphasized the influence of training and past experiences. Some investigators have regarded it as a stable ability, while others conceived of it as subject to change. However, for a clear understanding of the term aptitude, a few definitions given by different psychologists may be considered.

English and English (1958) defined an aptitude as "the capacity to acquire proficiency with a given amount of training, formal or informal." The definition given by Bingham (1937) suggests that aptitude connotes more than potential ability and performance. He states that "Aptitude then, is a condition symptomatic of a person's relative fitness, of which one essential aspect is his readiness to acquire proficiency - his potential ability - and another is his readiness to develop an interest in exercising that ability."

Traveller's (1957) interpretation of an aptitude emphasizes the predictive function of its presence, as he defined an aptitude as "... as a condition, a quality or a set of qualities in an individual which is indicative of the probable extent to which he will be able to acquire under suitable training, some knowledge, skill or composite of knowledge, understanding and skill, such as ability to contribute to art or music, mechanical ability, mathematical ability or ability to read and speak a foreign language." Somewhat similar viewpoint has been posed by Freeman (1971) that "An aptitude is a combination of characteristics indicative of an individual's capacity to acquire (with training)
some specific knowledge, skill or set of organised responses, such as the ability to speak and language, to become a musician, to do mechanical work." All the above definitions reveal the predictive nature of aptitudes.

Porter and Lawler (1968) say that "Abilities put a current upper limit on the performance resulting from applications of effort. If additional training resulted in improved abilities, for example, then a new upper limit would be placed on performance possibilities. A person who has no dancing ability will never be a great dancer, no matter how much efforts and practice he puts into the task of mastering the dancing. Likewise, a manager who has relatively low intellectual power or capacity (i.e., a low I.Q.) will be quite unlikely to be able to deal effectively with decisions that require highly abstracted thought processes. This is not to say that a person with limited ability in a given area e.g., intelligence, cannot compensate a great deal for his lack of broad capacity. However, it does imply that given two individuals who put forth equivalent effort in a given area of endeavor, the one possessing a greater amount of the relevant trait or ability will accomplish more - he will achieve a higher level of performance.

In the practice of aptitude testing certain basic assumptions, somewhat similar to assumptions in most testing, are necessary. These assumptions provide the basic foundation for the development of aptitude tests and the planning of a testing program. Super (1942) has set forth three basic
assumptions in practice in aptitude testing. The first of these is that individuals differ in the extent to which they possess a given aptitude. A second assumption is that there are a number of special aptitudes. Thirdly it is assumed that there are important differences in the amount of these aptitudes possessed by a given individual.

Measures of aptitudes are provided by common psychometric devices. An aptitude test is designed to measure a sample of performance and upon the basis of this, to predict possible future success. Some tests of special aptitudes are of the pencil and paper variety while others require actual manipulation of the test materials. Many jobs require a certain group of aptitudes or aptitudinal factors.

English and English (1958) talked of special aptitudes and general aptitude. According to them "SPECIAL APTITUDE does not necessarily mean very high aptitude but rather aptitude of a special kind; e.g., aptitude for mechanics, GENERAL APTITUDE means the capacity to acquire proficiency in many activities." They viewed an intelligence test as a test of one's general aptitude. Gray (1961) classified the aptitude tests, in terms of the kinds of ability the tests attempts to measure, as (A) General aptitude tests which includes (1) General intelligence tests, (2) Mechanical aptitude tests and (3) Social intelligence tests, and (B) Special aptitude tests which include (1) Physical tests, (2) Motor tests, (3) Sensory tests and (4) Tests of other special mental functions.

Foregoing discussion implies that it is useful to include one
general intelligence test along with other special aptitude tests in the test battery to have a complete picture about the aptitude requirement for any specific job.

To summarize, in considering effectiveness one must take into account the role of the relatively enduring characteristics i.e., aptitudes of individuals that remain largely unaffected by momentary changes in their environmental situation.

Attitude

Attitudes traditionally have been of interest to psychologists because they can provide important insight into human cognitive processes, and ultimately, because they can contribute to the understanding and prediction of human behaviour.

Attitudes, have been defined in a variety of ways. Each of the traditional definitions contains a slightly different conception of what an attitude is or emphasizes a somewhat different aspect of it. Allport (1935) proposed that, "an attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related." This definition reveals the three facts concerning attitude - (a) Attitude is a mental or neural state of readiness, (b) Attitude influences the reactions of the individual, (c) Attitude changes the reactions of the individual. Young (1951) says, "An attitude may be defined as a learned and more or less generalised and affective tendency or predisposition to respond
in a rather persistent and characteristic manner, usually positively or negatively (for or against) in reference to some situation idea, value, material object or class of such objects or person or group of persons." This definition introduces the following two elements omitted by Allport - (a) attitude is generally negative or positive, (b) attitude is a learned or acquired affective tendency.

On the other hand, Doob (1947) defined an attitude as, "an implicit, drive-producing response considered socially significant in the individual's society." He emphasized what an attitude is rather than its implications - his statement did not include overt behaviour, although it contained a clear assumption that an attitude would affect how an individual acts. This definition was derived from a learning or stimulus - response tradition, and it conceptualized an attitude as simply another response, albeit an implicit rather than explicit one.

Maier (1955) defines an attitude as "... a kind of mental set. It represents a disposition to form certain opinions." To put it another way, it is a frame of reference that influences the individual's views or opinions on various topics and that influences his behaviour. English and English (1958) view that "Attitudes include all learned predispositions to react to an object or class of objects." Haire (1964) points that "An attitude is a characteristic of the way in which a person sees things...." Tannenbaum (1960) hypothesized that an attitude towards an object is a multiplicative function of the strength of personality and the relevance of the object to the expression of these trends.
According to Freedman, Carlsmith and Sears (1974), "An attitude towards any given object, idea, or person is an enduring system with a cognitive component, a feeling component, and an action tendency. The cognitive component consists of beliefs about the attitude object; the feeling component is equivalent to Doob's affective component, which is to say that there is some emotional feeling connected with the beliefs; and the action tendency is what Allport referred to as the readiness to respond in a particular way." For example, a student's attitude towards Mr X might include the knowledge that he is a man, a leader of the Rolling Stones, a musician, and an actor; feelings of attraction and liking; and the behavioural tendencies to buy all his records, see his movies and go to his concerts."

Employee possesses attitudes towards his boss, subordinates, peers, pay, work, the company and the management. Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnelly (1973) write that "... attitudes are activities, thoughts, and experiences that are antecedent to the present behaviour." A number of things are implied in this interpretation of attitudes. Firstly, attitudes must be viewed in terms of expressions. This is why it is related to the personality and perception factors. Secondly attitudes have continuity. There are no breaks or interruptions in employee behaviour; behaviour is a continuous process. Because of this emphasis on continuity one must think of goal-directed behaviour in dynamic rather than in static terms. Thirdly, attitude should never be considered apart from learning. An experience with a superior on a company policy in the past that is, recalled now is said to be remembered or learned. When this past experience gives direction to present
Reviewing large number of definitions given by various psychologists, Vasudeva (1976) defined attitudes as "an enduring organization of evaluative beliefs and a learned tendency to react positively or negatively varying in degree, to certain class of objects, which determine the actual and potential responses of an individual. As individual grows, his cognitions, feelings and action-tendencies with respect to various objects in his psychological world become organized into an enduring system, called attitudes."

Green (1954) mentions about various dimensions of attitudes namely (a) favourableness (b) intensity (c) salience (d) generality. There are cognitive, behavioural, and affective components in attitudes (Krejčí et al., 1962; Secord and Bachman, 1964). Each of the three components of an attitude may vary in valence and in degree of multiplexity.

To use the concept of attitude in understanding and predicting action, one needs reliable and valid measures. In order to rank individual with respect to attitudes, various techniques of measurement of attitudes have been devised. Following the taxonomy of Cook and Selltiz (1964), five general categories of attitude measures can be distinguished. Inferences regarding attitudes can be drawn from (1) self report of beliefs, behaviours etc., (2) observation of ongoing behaviour in a natural setting, (3) individual's reactions or interpretation of partially structured stimuli, (4) performance of objective tasks, and
(5) physiological reactions to the attitudinal object or representation of it. Green (1954) distinguished three kinds of attitude universe to represent three different classes of individual responses to sets of social objects or situations. These are: (1) elicited verbal attitudes, (2) spontaneous verbal attitudes, (3) action attitudes. The present study is concerned with the first kind of attitude universe i.e., elicited verbal attitudes. Written questionnaire is used as a means of obtaining information about supervisor attitudes. Assumptions which underlie the use of written questionnaires are that words can be taken at their face value and that answers written by employees (on a form prepared for massed distribution) accurately correspond to what individual writers actually feel and think. An obvious advantage of the written questionnaire method over interviewing is that it is less expensive (in time and therefore in money), it requires fewer trained personnel, and is not subject to such drawbacks as personal bias of the interviewer (Figgers and Myers, 1973).

In the present study attention was focussed upon a particular set of job attitudes because of its probable relevance to supervisory effectiveness.

Supervisory Effectiveness

For a long time industrial psychologists had been using the term productivity. But, of late the term 'effectiveness' rather than 'productivity' has been adopted in order to avoid the somewhat narrow connotation implied in the latter word, when
it is used to describe output of an employee which is concrete and easily quantifiable.

Supervisory effectiveness refers as to how much successful role behaviour is accomplished by a supervisor. When the style of a supervisor is appropriate in terms of the goals of the organization, it is termed as 'effective'. When his style is inappropriate in context of organizational goal, it is termed ineffective. Raddin (1973), defines the managerial effectiveness "as the output of managers job i.e., achievement attained by him." However, Ganguli (1961) says, "An effective worker, not simply an efficient one, is a person who not only does his immediate job well but also carries out the other roles he plays in society, appropriately." This is an extension of the concept of efficiency to the larger social environment. In simple words one can say effectiveness is that aspect of an employee's behaviour which organizations are most desirous of measuring and influencing, and it is the end result of the application of efforts.

For the present study the term job effectiveness is considered to be made up of a broad range of more specific behaviours and characteristics. However, it must be kept in mind that the term is being used only with reference to types of behaviour associated with organizationally relevant tasks. Effectiveness does not mean behaviour in general.

Basically, two types of measures of performance are possible. One type of measure of performance involves objective,
verifiable indices. Depending on the type of job a person has, such measures might include rate of output from a machine a person is operating, amount of sales over a given period of time, the production of a group of employees reporting to a supervisor and so forth. This type of measure has all the advantages associated with quantification. It has the danger that the objective measure may be the result of factors other than the individual's efforts. For example, one supervisor may produce higher than the other, not because he tries hard or is a better supervisor, but rather because his workers are superior. Also, it is important to keep in mind that certain aspects of performance that might be quite quantifiable may not be very important in the long run to the organization. The number of letters a typist turns out in a day may not be as important as the quality of those letters and the typist's ability to correct poor grammar—which is much less quantifiable aspect of behaviour.

A second type of measure of performance involves ratings of individuals. A rating is a record of opinion about an employee. Tiffin and McCormick (1960) say that "Merit rating is a systematic evaluation of an employee by his superior or some other qualified person who is familiar with the employee's performance on the job." According to Heyel (1963), performance appraisal or merit rating is "...the process of evaluating the performance and quantifications of the employees in terms of the requirements of the job for which he is employed, for purposes of administration, including placement, selection or promotion providing financial rewards and other actions which require differential treatment"
among the members of a group as distinguished from actions affecting all members equally." Rowland (1970) observes, "Appraisals are, of course, valuable in deciding on promotions and raises, and even on occasions for deciding who will be kept on the pay roll and who will be dismissed. But, they are not conducted primarily for any of these reasons. The primary purpose is to help each man handle his current job better." Ivancevich, Szilagyi and Wallace (1977) say that, "Performance appraisal is used to pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of individuals, groups and organizations." Borman (1978) went on to saying that, "Performance ratings are often the only means available for providing criterion scores, against which to validate selection, promotion or other personnel decisions made in organizations."

The ratings may be made by immediate superiors, high-level superiors, peers, subordinates, self or any one else who comes into contact with the person being rated and has some sort of opportunity to observe his performance in the tasks that comprise his job. Cummings and Schwab (1973) point out that there are five possible sources of performance appraisal; (1) Supervisors; (2) Peers; (3) The appraisee himself or herself; (4) Subordinates of the person to be appraised; and (5) People outside the immediate organization such as clients. Borman (1974) has noted that raters (superiors) at different levels probably observe different facets of the ratee's job performance, and the ratings ought to reflect these differences. As pointed out above, objective measures may be of aspects of performance that are not very crucial to the organization, whereas ratings may
take into account less tangible aspects of performance that are quite important to the success of the organization.

Cummings and Schwab (1973) point out that "who is the best person to make the appraisal depends upon the purpose of the appraisal and the level of criteria being evaluated (immediate behaviour versus intermediate and ultimate outcomes)." Most performance appraisals are made by the individual's immediate superior. This is particularly true when the major purpose of the appraisal is for evaluation rather than employee development. In order to overcome problems of stress and perceived threat, some companies have tried to introduce evaluation by peers and self-evaluation. These two methods work best under conditions of high interpersonal trust, highly specialized skills, high visibility among peers, and when development rather than evaluation is the major purpose to be served by the appraisal.

Most commonly, merit rating takes the form of a boss rating his subordinates. Such ratings may be on the informal basis - a boss tells his own superior that employee A is better than employee B, or it may be on quite a formal basis where the ratings are written down with elaborated commentaries and explanations. Also, rating may be on a global, overall basis, where the rater tries to consider all the relevant aspects of an individual's performance and then give him a summary rating; or they may be on the basis where specific aspects or characteristics of performance are considered. In any event, the rating or ratings that emerge are subjective, however, it does not necessarily mean they are inferior to objective measure.
Unfortunately, performance ratings almost inevitably contain various forms of rater errors (e.g., halo, leniency). Cowan (1975) commented that "A performance review is person to person and no matter how hard management tries, appraisals can't be made totally objective or computerized without a serious dehumanizing effect. The supervisor and employees being appraised can benefit from meaningful personal relationships. A computer can be objective, but a supervisor cannot - especially when he has worked with an employee for sometime. When the relationship is close, a supervisor develops strong feelings - both for and against the individual - that will affect his appraisal results."

Firstly, some raters tend to rate all of their rates consistently high or low. There is also a tendency for 'halo' effect, in which, for example, a friendly subordinate might be evaluated favourably in all areas regardless of his actual performance. In addition, there is some tendency for supervisors to rate all their subordinates within a narrow range, such as between 3 or 5 on a seven-point scale (central tendency error). Questions have been raised about the reliability of the performance appraisal. The evidence suggests that self-ratings are more lenient than either superior or peer ratings, (Holzbach, 1978; Klimoski and London, 1974; Parker, Taylor, Barrett and Martens, 1959; Prien and Liske, 1962; Thornton, 1968), while superior and peer ratings do not differ appreciably (Klimoski and London, 1974). Ratings by superiors consistently exhibit greater halo effect than self-ratings (Heneman, 1974; Lawler, 1967; Parker et al., 1959; Klimoski and London, 1974; Prien and Liske, 1962). Peer ratings tend to show comparable halo effect to superior ratings.
(Dickinson and Tice, 1973; Lawler, 1967), although Klimoski and London (1974) found that the halo effect for peer ratings was greater than for superior ratings. The problems inherent in subordinate ratings of superiors include the fear of reprisal and possible incompatibility between organizational and subordinates' goals. Thus, subordinates may view their supervisors more on the basis of how they serve their (the subordinate's) personal needs - such as for affiliation - than on the extent to which the supervisor contributes to company goals (Barrett, 1966).

Borman (1978) classified the causes of these problems with performance ratings into four general categories, (1) Raters having little opportunity to observe ratees at work may be asked to evaluate them, or raters who have knowledge of ratee behaviour related only to a subset of the performance scales are sometimes required to provide ratings for all scales (Borman, 1974). Either of these conditions can contribute to errors in rating, (2) Sometimes raters do not have enough experience with performance evaluation or though experienced, they have not been trained to avoid various rating errors such as leniency, halo, restriction or range etc, and they continue to make poor evaluations because of their ignorance about these errors and how to reduce them, (3) Often, a rating format causes problems because it does not allow raters to translate the work-related behaviour they observe in rater to a specific level on the performance scales. This problem may be caused by a number of things, among them rater's not understanding thoroughly the meanings of scales and the
scales not having benchmarks relevant to persons the raters are evaluating (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick, 1970), (4) Organizational constraints on raters to provide performance evaluations different from their best estimates of raters true performance will clearly introduce error into performance effectiveness ratings.

Some research work dealing with influences of ratee and rater characteristics on ratings have shown that, the better the supervisor, the more likely he is to discriminate between good and poor employees and less likely he is to be subject to the leniency effect (Kirchner and Reisberg, 1962), the higher the intelligence of the rater, the better his ratings (Bayroff, Haggerty, and Rundgwist, 1954; Mandell, 1956), and the more the rater engages in analytical thinking as opposed to global, the more likely he is to differentiate others (Gruenfeld and Arbuthnot, 1969). Further more it has been found that individuals who exhibit good behaviour are more likely to be rated accurately than those who exhibit poor behaviour (Gordon, 1970), Jones (1964) observed that the higher the self-esteem of the person being evaluated, the more likely he is to try to ingratiate himself with the evaluator and secure a favourable rating. Kipnis (1960) and Rothaus, Morton, and Hanson, (1960) found that the greater the propinquity between the evaluator and the evaluated, the higher the ratings. Thus in any study, before using the ratings, relative merit of any rating scale should be first inferred.

To sum up, effectiveness refers to a person's
successfulness on tasks that comprise his job. It can be evaluated by objective measure such as physical output or by relatively subjective measure such as ratings made by others or self.