Of all the resources of an organisation, the human resource is probably the most critical and important. Only those organisations can progress that have the ability to utilise the human resource to the maximum potential. It could be stated that the success or failure of any organisation primarily depends upon its human resource. Thus, human efficiency and integrity are key elements of any organisation. Manpower and organisational behaviour are the major factors responsible for work output and performance. Every organisation has heterogeneous groups of employees with different levels of their output. What should be the yardstick to classify their performance? It is a common experience that employees perform differently with the same job description. Among employees, there may be some who are devoted workers and sincere in their work but their performance may not be up to the mark, some may be efficient whereas some may not be that efficient. There may be others whose performance remains much below the expected output.

Every job has its own requirements and demands that needs to be filled and accomplished by the employee or the person who has been assigned that job. Therefore every organisation must adopt some performance appraisal method and should evaluate
each aspect of jobs qualitatively and quantitatively for effective management of its human resources. A job dimension that fails to measure important aspects of job performance would be viewed as deficient (Anthony et al., 1993).

Before research process is initiated, certain terms used in this study are required to be defined and understood, which are given below:

1.1. Job performance Assessment

For effective management of its human resources, every organisation devises means to know the output of its employees. The output is measured using certain norms and standards. Performance of the employees may be evaluated using various methods, such as performance appraisal, job performance, merit rating performance management, job appraisal, employees assessment, character roll and annual confidential reports etc. These terms have been interchangeably used in the present study. Performance management is a new term being used in American business. It gives two meanings namely (i) Performance appraisal or evaluation process and (ii) behaviour analysis in organisational settings (Slottje, 2000). It may be concluded that performance evaluation or performance appraisal or performance assessment are the common terms used to measure employee’s performance.
1.2. Evaluation and Measurement Standard

Evaluation is often done comparing the performance with some set standards or norms. Depending upon the job description, some standards are required to be set up for work measurement. Performance standards are defined as means of measuring the quantity of work produced by a person working at a normal pace under normal conditions (Dougherty and Heinrts, 1966). Performance evaluation is a method for formally measuring the output of an employee against a pre-established set of criteria, whether these criteria are dictated by a supervisor or are mutually agreed upon by the supervisor and the employee (Kroll, 1983).

The process deals with evaluating the performance and skills of the employee in terms of requirement of the job for which he / she is employed.

It has to be worked out with objectivity as to how much time a particular job would take to be completed successfully. Evaluator/observer must have clear vision regarding rate at which a worker having necessary physical and mental attribute and skill would satisfactorily carry out the task under observation (Lockyer, 1974).

A good performance standard describes, what an employee should have produced or accomplished or achieved by working for a specific period and in a particular situation (Anthony et al., 1993). For setting such standards, each job has to be thoroughly analysed. Job evaluation or appraisal follows after the work analysis is completed.
1.3. Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal is an important tool of management and is an interesting and provocative topic. Various scholars in the field of management have written emphatically about the pros and cons on the performance appraisal question (McGregor, 1957). One new system of appraisal was developed at United Air Force Lines based on three years study. The study concluded that personnel appraisal is capable of being used successfully as a supervisory tool. It is considered a “tool of control” instead of a ‘measuring stick’. The performance evaluation system is equally helpful to the employer as well as to the employees.

Every individual is an integral part of the organisation, therefore, he should be evaluated by the degree to which he accomplishes specific results contributing to the departmental and organisational achievement (Gagne, 1962). It helps in planning and directing employees to perform the job assigned to them.

In the context of library management, Kroll (1983) concludes that performance evaluation program has been an effective tool for future planning provided the people involved are aware and anxious of achieving better results. We believe assisting an employee to maintain satisfactory performance on his present job is a worthwhile objective in itself, and have other program for administering salary and appraisal potential (Richards, 1959). Further, without such evaluation, salary and promotion policies can not be administered sensibly (McGregor, 1957). There is remarkably little evidence that this
highly touted, widely used and much researched process actually improves performance (Semke, 1991). This process is liked much neither by the manager nor by the subordinate. Appraisal report, the way it is communicated, may cause both positive and negative effects on employees morale. Even then neither of them can help escaping it. Some managers feel odd when they are put in the position of 'Playing God' over their subordinates. However, its potential benefits can only be derived if this system of job performance evaluation is logically designed and implemented. Every organisation, small or large, applies some or the other system of performance evaluation as means to get maximum output from its employees. According to McGregor (1957) formal appraisal serves three needs of an organisation and of an individual which are given below:-

(a) It provides systematic judgment to support salary increase, promotion, transfer and some times demotions & termination etc.

(b) Performance Appraisal is a means of telling a subordinate how he is doing and accordingly suggests needed changes in behaviour, attribute, skills or job knowledge. It also lets the employee know where he/she stands in the eyes of boss.

(c) The Performance Appraisals are being increasingly used as a basis for the coaching and counseling of an individual employee by his superior.

According to Dick Grote (1996), there are only two fundamental expectations for a performance appraisal system namely,
1. That it will substantially aid managers in short term by improving employees
   performance and over the long term by contributing to employees development
2. That it will serve as an effective and efficient bookkeeping system for compensation
   and industrial relations departments.

Basic and fundamental objective of any kind of evaluation is to improve the
performance. This is also used as a tool to assess the level of achievement of employees to
various purposes like reward, punishment, remedial methods to improve upon the
performance. How far this objective is achieved is an unanswered question. One of those
wonderfully simple obvious questions that the literature does not address, says David
L.De Vries, former Vice President of Center for Creative Leadership. How far this system
has been successful in improving the performance? (Zemke, 1991).

In practice, there would a few organisations that could take its benefits. In fact, one
might almost say that every body talks and writes about it, but nobody has done any real
scientific testing of it. This statement of Meyer et al. (1965) made as early as in 1965, still
holds good even today, in spite of the fact that some employees make some interesting
observations as reproduced by Wendell L. French (1977).

"My boss rates us all excellent so he does not have to explain poor rating to any
one". "Why should I work harder than others when we are all rated the same"?
Some makes such observation as “my boss gives us all low rating. I bet he thinks that motivates us to work harder.”

“My boss and I are fraternity brothers. As long as I cooperate with him during the year, I get excellent”.

It should be noted that an effective appraisal system provides management with information that can be used to take decision on the employee’s training, promotion, transfer, pay, discipline and discharge (Martey, 2002).

1.4. Split Role and Controversy

Therefore, performance appraisal is a major subject of controversy in management circle. In spite of continuous research on the topic particularly in business and management fields, benefits of performance appraisal is yet to be fully achieved. Goodson (1997) has identified certain criteria to design Performance Appraisal System which can withstand many challenges being faced in its implementation. Even the best designed system of appraisal is likely to fail if it is not implemented well. DeCotiis (1977) had remarked that investigation of most of the possible types of rating formats has probably been pushed to the limits of its usefulness, while study of organisational factors surrounding the appraisal process is still rudimentary. This statement made during 70’s is also true in 21 century also. It is quite rare that one comes across managers who are very comfortable and happy
with performance appraisal. In such circumstances, why one should continue with it? Because it is also not quite happy situation, if it is discontinued.

There are qualitative jobs to be performed which cannot be easily measured. Performance Appraisal System should be capable of measuring both qualitative as well as quantitative jobs which seems to be quite difficult. Management theorists have a divided opinion on Performance Appraisal. Some believe that it does not give any benefit and its objectives are hardly achieved due to its inherited weaknesses. Eminent management consultant like Deming (1982) argues that performance evaluation is generally harmful to the organisations. He has given his arguments against evaluation as:

_Basically what is wrong is that the PA or merit rating focuses on the end product, at the end of the stream, not on leadership to help people. This is a way to avoid the problems of people. A manager becomes, in effect, the manager of defects....the idea of a merit rating is alluring. The sound of the words captivates the imagination: pay for what you get; get what you pay for; motivate people to do their best, for their own good. The effect is exactly the opposite of what the words promise. Every one propels himself forward, or tries to, for his own good, on his own life preserver. The organisation is the loser._

Nevertheless, there are thinkers who support performance appraisal system and oppose the ideas of Deming. Johnson (2004) states that Deming’s answer is typically terse;
eliminate work standard, eliminate MBO, eliminate management by numbers or numerical goals, substitute leadership.

According to Berkner (1979) performance appraisal is applied for a variety of goals:

- to improve performance in the present job,
- to provide a basis for recommending promotion, salary increases, or dismissal,
- to give the employee a chance to “know where he or she stands”. In the supervisor’s estimation,
- to develop an inventory of human resources for the use of management- a record of the available talents and potential among the present staff,
- to provide a method of counseling and encouraging staff members to grow and to plan for future development.

There are some managers (supervisors) who express their resistance to the system even while admitting its merits. McGregor (1957) has attributed the following causes behind the resistance:

- A normal dislike of criticising of a subordinate (and perhaps having to argue about it).
- Lack of skill needed to handle interviews.
- Dislike of a new procedure with its accompanying changes in the ways of operating.
- Mistrust of the validity of appraisal instrument.

Serious objection to this process is subjective approach of the supervisor while evaluating his subordinates. McGregor suggests shifting responsibility to the subordinate for setting goals and appraising his own progress towards them. The boss ceases to play God and becomes a counselor, advising the subordinate on the validity of his goals and his appraisal in terms of the facts of organisation life as superior sees them (Whisler, 1958). Unfortunately, when man was substituted for God in the evaluation process, doubt was built in. Man is fallible- the evaluations are open to question (Whisler, 1958). About seventy five years ago, a formal appraisal plan instituted in the civil service system of New York City was abandoned because it was found in effective. This experience has been repeated continuously in American management practice since then Whisler (1958) performance appraisals inherently threaten employment, even as they are intended to improve performance, upward performance appraisal can similarly be threatening to employees as well as manager (Turrentine et al., 2004). These authors feel that this process is mostly used as developmental tool rather than performance or compensation evaluation.

1.5. Job Analysis

Before evaluation process begins, the requirement of the every job to be performed must be identified and described. Every job has its own requirement of Knowledge, Skill
and Ability (KSA) which should be laid down. It is considered as a cornerstone to every administrative and employment decision. In depth study of Job analysis provides base for job description and proves helpful aid in staff structuring as well as allocation of work. In fact, it is the procedure through which you determine the duties of these positions and the characteristics of the people who should be hired for them. It covers duties, responsibilities, description of work to be performed and also personal requirements of a particular job. Data has to be collected on exactly what is expected to be performed on a specific job. Job analysts is to apply qualitative as well as quantitative methods to analyse library operations and services. Following steps in conducting Job Analysis has been suggested (Anthony et al., 1993):

- **Step 1** Determine the purpose for conducting JA
- **Step 2** Identify the jobs to be analysed
- **Step 3** Explain the process to employees
- **Step 4** Determine Data collection method
- **Step 5** Process the JA information
- **Step 6** Review and update frequently
Jones and Jordan (1987) have identified the following stages of Staff Management in relation to library work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Appraisal (Evaluation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6. Job Description

A job description is a written statement of what the job holder actually does, how he or she does it, and under what conditions the job is performed (Dessler, 1997). It covers job identifications, job summary, relationship, responsibilities, and duties, authority of incumbent, standards of performance, working conditions and job specifications. Formats are to be developed under these headings to cover all the activities associated with the job. Livy (1975) has rightly observed that job description or job information-sheet constitutes the fundamental starting point. Hodge (1983) had reiterated that Performance Appraisal System should be devised using analysis and enumeration of critical elements defined in terms of job descriptions performance standards or requirements for both critical elements and other important job aspects are set, either separately or within position descriptions.
The objectives of each library is to increase efficiency in technical processing of documents and improve the services to the utmost satisfaction of its readers. This presupposes proper job description and evaluation. No system of routine, however carefully prescribed, will produce desired results, unless its details are faithfully performed by the staff (Ranganathan, 1959). Therefore, in view of the objectives of the institutions, every detail of the work to be performed has to be well listed so that accountability and responsibility could be fixed on the under-performer of the tasks. Since library scenario has been changing fast and will undergo further changes, therefore, it becomes essential to modify the job from time to time. All functions to be performed by the staff are to be fully analysed and divided among different sections or divisions. There would be very small number of libraries that have analysed their functions in detail with proper assignment of every work to be performed by the individual employee or group of employees. Many jobs remain unassigned to any one. So it is important that job responsibilities must be recorded and communicated to the employee. If the employee is not fully aware as to what is expected of him, one can not expect much from him.

Job description may also serve as important instrument to match qualities, abilities and skills of individual with the job requirement. Mismatch of knowledge, skills, personality traits and other requirements of the job with the individual may affect upon the performance.
Every organisation has objectives and targets to achieve. It is its manpower, which is solely responsible for low or high output. Ultimate aim remains high productivity through high performance. The process of performance evaluation is carried out in all types of organisations irrespective of their nature of profit-making or non-profit. Basics of performance appraisal / evaluation remain the same. However, there can not be single instrument for the purpose due to difference in job description and knowledge required to perform the assigned duties. Nevertheless, model of performance evaluation could be the same with difference in job description, responsibilities of the job etc. needless to elaborate further that the project has interdisciplinary relevance.

The present study aims at evaluating the job performances of various library personnel in university library system with a view to suggest suitable and effective performance evaluation methods so that efficiency of these libraries could be improved and human resources could be appropriately utilised.

Many methods of performance appraisal have been experimented all over the world with different approaches. It has also been observed that what significantly matters is not the method but the top management which executes the method. Many rating errors can be avoided if rater is well qualified and trained. It is believed that rater without any training
having the potential of doing more harm than good (Nathan Winstanley, 1972). More commonly used methods are:

1.8.1. **Graphic Rating Scale:** This method is one of the conventional rating methods. Printed format is used to evaluate the performance of the employees. The characteristics related to the job are included but unrelated characteristics with the job like “loyalty” respectability, cooperativeness are normally excluded from evaluation and are looked upon unfavorably in management. However, trait measures continue to be most widely used appraisal method (Friedman and Cornelius III, 1976) A variety of traits may be used in these types of rating devices, the most common being the quantity and quality of work. The rating scales can also be adapted according to the nature of the job. Level of performance could be included in this method.

1.8.2. **Behaviorally Anchored rating Scales (BARS)** are descriptions of various degrees of behavior relating to an aspect of performance dimension. The performance dimensions are derived and described from an analysis of job content and work behavior.

1.8.3. **Trait Appraisal:** Individual traits include several distinguishing characteristics firmly anchored in human behavior as described by (Ratnam and Srivastava, 1997). These traits are listed below:
| Ability for sustained hard work | Drive |
| Acceptance of responsibility | Effort |
| Adaptability | Efficiency |
| Analytical ability | Honesty |
| Appearance | Industrious |
| Attendance | Initiative |
| Attitude towards criticism | Integrity |
| Capacity to train | Intelligence |
| Commitment to task | Judgment |
| Communication | Leadership |
| Conduct | Loyalty |
| Confidence | Planning |
| Courtesy | Punctuality |
| Creativity | Resourcefulness |
| Crisis Management | Self Control |
| Decision-making | Sense of responsibility |
| Delegation | Tactfulness |

1.8.4. **Weighted Checklists:** A checklist represents a set of objective or descriptive statements about employee and his behavior. If the rater believes strongly that the employee possesses a particular listed trait, he checks the item, otherwise, he leaves the item blank. A more recent, variation of the checklist is weighted list. The following are sample questions which may be in the checklist:

- Is the employee really interested in task assigned?
- Is he respected by his colleagues?
- Does he follow instructions properly?
- Does he give respect to his superiors?
- Does he make mistakes frequently?
- Can he expected to complete the work on time?
- Reluctant to ever work over time?
- Does not accept positive criticism?
Each statement in the check list receives a weighted value on the basis of its importance. The precaution to be taken in this method is that statements in the check list must be relevant to the job assigned to the employee.

1.8.5. Essay Evaluation: Under this method, the appraiser writes essay describing the subordinate’s performance under various categories like overall performance, employees strength and weaknesses, need for training, behavior. This technique is normally used with combination of the graphic rating scale, because the rater can elaborately present the scale by substantiating an explanation for his rating. The supervisor may consider the following factors in addition to the above:

i) Job knowledge and potential of the employee.

ii) Employee’s understanding of the organisation’s programs policies, objective, etc.

iii) The employee’s general planning, organising and controlling ability.

iv) The employee’s relations with co-workers and superiors.

v) The attitudes and perceptions of the worker.

1.8.6. Critical Incidents: The manager records the statements of very effective, ineffective, usually favorable or unfavorable occurrences of an employee. These critical incidents or events represent the outstanding as well as poor behavior of employees. Manager prepares records of the critical incidents of the worker’s behavior. At the end of the rating period, the recorded critical incidents are used in the evaluation of the worker’s performance. This method was developed by (Flanagan, 1954).
1.8.7. Ranking Techniques: Ranking techniques encourage superior or peers to rank-order all their subordinates or peers as the case may be. This is a form of comparative measurement. Supervisor normally ranks all his employees in some order like from better to the poorest or some other similar scale. Three major techniques are:

1.8.71. Simple or straight ranking: This technique provides for an ordinal scoring; first, second, third and so on. This technique requires the rater to rank from the best to the poorest all the subordinates in the same work unit doing the same job.

1.8.72. Forced distribution ranking: In this technique the raters are required to allocate a certain percentage of ratees to certain categories e.g. superior above average, average etc. or percentiles, e.g., top 10%, bottom 20%, etc. Both the number of categories and percentage of employees to be allotted to each category are a function of the performance appraisal design and format.

1.8.73. Forced choice method: It was developed to eliminate bias and the preponderance of high ratings that might occur in some organisations. Its primary purpose is the correct tendency of a rater to give consistently high or low ratings to all the employees.

1.8.74. Paired-comparison: This technique requires the rater to appraise which of the two employee is superior, instead of having to rank-order all the employee in the same work unit doing the same job.
1.8.8. **Confidential Report:** This is a traditional form of Performance Appraisal. A confidential report is a report on the subordinate by the immediate superior and covers a limited range of aspects like the candidate's strengths, weaknesses, achievements, failure and behavioral aspects. This system is usually a descriptive one and permits a lot of subjectivity.

1.8.9. **Appraisal by Clientele:** The appraisal by the clientele or the end users, for whom the services are being provided. Their satisfaction or feeding should be paramount and guiding factors to assess the quality of service. The customers know better whether they are being served properly or not, keeping in view the objectives of the organisation and expectations of the users. The appraisal seems to be more rationale and realistic.

1.8.10. **Self Assessment:** Various variables can be framed and listed in the Proforma, which should be completed by the employee himself. Questions pertaining to innovations, improvements, achievements, output, skills professional growth, publications, refresher courses attended, seminars and conferences attended, lectures delivered and similar other landmarks in the preceding year can be asked. This would help the employee to know for himself about his good or weak points.

1.8.11. **Management by Objective:** It is a modern method of evaluating the performance of personnel. The concept of MBO is actually the outcome of the pioneering work of Drucker, McGreger and Odioine in management science. MBO can be described as a process whereby superior and subordinate manager of an organisation jointly identify its common goals,
define each individual’s major areas of operations, responsibility and use these measures as a guide for operating the unit and assessing the contributions of each of its members. The idea behind this is that the performance, which is expected from an organisation, must be derived from the performance goals of the business, and the results must be measured by the contribution that the employees make to the success of enterprise. The manager must know the goals of the organisation and the employers must be told about the expectations from them. In fact MBO is a process whereby the superiors and subordinates of an organisation jointly identify its goals, defines each individual’s major area of responsibility in terms of results expected. MBO is a process that converts organisational objectives into individual objectives. It consists four steps; *Goal setting, Action planning, Self control, Periodic review.*

**1.8.12. Result-oriented performance appraisal system:** Result oriented performances appraisal system is an extension of the principle of “Management by Objectives” operates in the broader context of organisational, management milieu to the areas of appraisal of individual performance, more in a participative spirit and collaboration style personality traits that help or hinder the attainment of sectoral or corporate goals.