Journal of Research Administration
Society of Research Administrators International

ENHANCING PRODUCTIVITY: EXPLORING EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION THROUGH PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN BANKING SECTOR

Suman
Research Scholar, School of Commerce and Management, (HRM), OM Sterling Global University, Hisar (Haryana)

Dr. Shilpa Goyal
Assistant Professor, School of Commerce and Management, OM Sterling Global University, Hisar (Haryana)

ABSTRACT
The study of motivation is regarded as a very important subject of research within management on a global scale by both practitioners and academics in the field of management. It's possible that the private sector and the public sector may both benefit from some additional motivation. The performance evaluation of an employee may be used as a source of motivation and encouragement for the person to raise their productivity, providing a win-win situation. When the performance of an employee is compared to the goals and objectives that have been set, a need that may be identified about the future ways of motivating employees may be found. This need can be discovered by comparing the performance of the employee to the goals and objectives that have been established. The term "performance appraisal" refers to the assessment of an employee's performance as it was performed within a specified time frame. The term "appraisal" relates to the evaluation of worth, quality, or merit; hence, "performance appraisal" refers to the review of an employee's performance.
Keywords: - Employee's, Banking, Performance, Motivation

INTRODUCTION
A person's level of motivation is the consequence of a complex interaction of internal and environmental variables, and tackling this issue requires a strategy that incorporates a variety of different approaches. One of the most important aspects that has a direct bearing on an employee's level of motivation is the performance review that they get. The results of workers' performance evaluations have a significant bearing on the level of motivation they feel toward their jobs. The aspects of an employee's performance that are taken into account during performance evaluations are also important contributors to that employee's overall level of performance.
The modern workplace is undergoing a significant transformation as a result of a number of causes, including but not limited to globalization, expanding economies, and advances in technology(Bach, S. (2000). These factors, which are continually posing new challenges for the employees as well as generating new opportunities for them, are causing the transformation to take place. As a direct result of these advancements, the perspectives that employees have on their jobs are also undergoing significant transformations. In today's grow-or-die economy, the staff of any

particular company is the single most significant element in deciding whether or not that company will prosper. [1]

The term "performance" does not refer to the characteristics, personal traits, or competencies of the worker; rather, it refers to a collection of results created throughout a particular period of their working time. Performance is not related to the features, personal attributes, or competencies of the worker. The evaluation of the performance of an employee throws light on the contribution that a person has made toward the achievement of the goals of the business. People are unable to learn anything new unless they are given feedback on the activities they participate in and the results of those actions. Feedback needs to be provided on a regular basis in order for corrective actions to be done, and this feedback needs to include both the accomplishments and the mistakes that have occurred. Because of this, the staff are pumped up and ready to give their best performance.

The primary objective of this merit rating is to ascertain whether or not an individual is qualified to advance in their current position. On the other hand, performance assessment is a more inclusive term for these kinds of activities since its usage extends beyond only determining whether or not an employee is qualified for promotion. This makes it a more appropriate phrase to use when referring to these kinds of activities. Because of this, it is a more accurate phrase to use when referring to the actions that are in dispute. These kinds of activities may include promotions, but they also may include other kinds of actions like training and development, wage increases, transfers, discharges, and other similar kinds of actions. [2]

The following is an example of a formal definition of performance appraisal: "It (performance appraisal) is the process of evaluating the performance and qualifications of the employees in terms of the requirements of the job for which he is. employed, for the purposes of administration including placement, selection for promotion, providing financial rewards and other actions which require differential treatment among the members of a group as distinguished from actions which do not require differential treatment among the members of a group as distinguished from actions which do not require differential treatment among the members of a group

Consequently, a performance review is a rigorous and objective method of establishing the relative worth or competence of an employee within the framework of the setting in which the employee is responsible for carrying out his assignment. This is because the review takes into account the context in which the employee is responsible for carrying out his task. It focuses on two unique aspects, namely the overall objective and the component parts of the problem that are systematized. It is feasible to claim that the evaluation is systematic if it assesses all performances in the same way and makes use of the same ways for the goal of guaranteeing that assessments of various people can be compared to one another. In other words, a systematic evaluation examines all performances in the same way and uses the same approaches. This aspect of the review is not left up to chance; rather, it is carried out on a consistent basis in accordance with the plan. As a consequence of this, both the raters and the ratees of the performance that is being reviewed are aware with the process of performance review, as well as the timeliness of its many components. Evaluating anything is in and of itself a rather objective procedure. The primary characteristic that sets this approach apart from others is the fact that, in order to acquire a correct evaluation, it makes an effort to eliminate the inherent biases and prejudices that are associated with human beings. This is the major factor that differentiates this approach from others.[3]

Before we get into a discussion on how performance appraisals compare to merit ratings, let's take a quick look at how the idea of assessment has evolved and shifted over the course of time. This will help set the stage for our discussion. First, before we go on to that topic, let's take a short look at the history of assessment and how it has changed throughout the course of human history. The practice of appraisal, ever since it was first introduced in a more formal manner in the 1920s, has seen a great transformation in terms of both the goals it strives to achieve and the method that it utilizes in order to accomplish those goals. [4]

BANKING SYSTEM IN INDIA

It is possible to pinpoint the final decade of the eighteenth century as the time when banking institutions first emerged in India. The General Bank of India, which was established in 1786, and the Bank of Hindustan, which functioned from 1772 until 1820, were the two most significant banks in India. The Bank of Hindustan operated from 1772 until 1820. The State Bank of India (SBI) was established in 1955, and it is now the largest bank that is still in existence. However, its history can be traced all the way back to June 1806, when it was known as the bank of Calcutta, and it eventually transformed into the Bank of Bengal. The three administrative banks were the State Bank of India (SBI), the Bank of Bombay, and the Bank of Madras. The State Bank of India (SBI) was the largest of the three. Other significant financial organizations in India are the Bank of Bombay and the Bank of Madras. Both of these banks are located in the state of Maharashtra. [5]

The British East India Company (BEC) was responsible for granting charters to each of the three firms, which served as the basis for their first operations. In 1921, these three financial institutions merged to become what is now known as the Imperial bank of India. Before the Reserve Bank of India was established in 1935, the tasks of a central bank were handled by the Presidency banks. This changed in 1935 when the RBI was founded. Imperial Bank of India was the sole financial institution operating at the time, and it was wholly controlled by the government. The market has already stopped trading. The Reserve Bank of India, often known as the RBI, was established with the intention of performing the duties of the central bank of India. Imperial Bank now has 480 locations throughout the globe that it actively manages and operates as branches. The name of the bank, which had previously been known as the Imperial Bank, was changed to the State Bank of India in order to represent a stronger commitment to supporting the country's rural areas. In 1969, the government assumed control of 14 large commercial banks; in 1980, an additional 6 banks were nationalized by the government. When banks belonging to the private sector were eventually given permission to conduct business in India, this defining moment occurred. When private companies like ICICI joined the market, it ratcheted up the level of competition already present in the industry. As a result of gradual improvements, the rate of technical progress in public sector banks gradually caught up to that of private sector banks. Kotak Mahindra Account Ltd. became the first non-bank financial company (NBFC) to be turned into a bank in 2003 when it was awarded a financial license by the Reserve Bank of India (RBI). The Banking Cash Transaction Tax, which had been imposed in 2005 and was eventually removed by the government in 2009, marked yet another substantial advancement in the sector. I

1. The Period Just Prior to Declaring Independence

During the second half of the 18th century, the establishment of banks that acted as entities to finance industry was limited to a relatively small number of institutions. Despite this, the great majority of the banks were unable to make it through the crisis because they had such a large exposure to speculative operations. As a result, the financial system was severely shaken. The customers who deposited money were unable to retrieve their funds as a direct result of this issue. At the turn of the 20th century, India's economy was doing rather well for itself and was relatively stable. Developments in industry and infrastructure were contributing to an improvement in the economy's degree of predictability. [6] During that era, the financial institutions that served the smaller towns and villages were frequently run and operated on a local level. The "Presidency Banks," which included The Bank of Bombay, The Bank of Bengal, and The Bank of Madras, were accountable for the regulation of the banking sector in India as well as its overall governance. After some time, these three financial institutions merged to become what is now known as The Imperial Bank of India. At that time, the principal purpose of the bank was to offer aid to the leaders in the process of amassing riches for the purpose of expanding the empire. This was the bank's primary mission. During this same span of time, a variety of distinct joint stock banks came into existence. The banks of the presidency that merged together to become the Imperial Bank of India were later rebranded as the "State Bank of India." In the year 1935, the Reserve Bank of India and the Central Bank of India were established as separate entities. II.

2. Post - Independence Period

When India first gained its independence from British rule, the administration, regulation, and governance of the country's financial sector were all somewhat slack. During that time period, there were over six hundred commercial banks that were operational over the entirety of the Indian subcontinent. However, four of the banks had a colonial history, and in order to maximize their profits, they gave priority to making short-term loans to larger corporations rather than lending money to small and medium-sized enterprises. This was done to avoid the risk of defaulting on their loans. Because of this, further businesses were not eligible to get loans. These institutions in the private sector made no attempt at all to take into account the socioeconomic concerns of the state. According to Cygnus (2004), in 1955 the Indian government nationalized the Imperial Bank and renamed it the State Bank of India in order to "enable more coverage of banking needs and to concentrate on the rural sector." In spite of the growth that took place between the years 1950 and 1960, it was realized that the SBI formation was unable to satisfy the needs and desires of small scale industries and the agricultural sector. As a consequence of this, financial institutions were instructed to adjust their activities and concentrate their resources on sectors that would significantly contribute to the development of the economy. The policy of social control over banks was created with the purpose of bringing about a change in the administration of commercial banks and imposing some degree of control over the distribution of credit. The policy of social control over banks was developed with the intention of bringing about a change in the administration of commercial banks. [7]

3. The Initial Steps Towards Nationalization

Private banks in the past would only provide their financial services to major industrial organizations, and they would entirely ignore the need for funding in the agricultural and small-scale manufacturing sectors. In the past, private banks only offered financial services to large industrial companies. The decision of the Indian government to nationalize significant banks was taken so that it could provide these impoverished regions with the required credit capacity for their continued economic development. On July 19, 1969, the government took control of 14 major banks, and in 1980, it took control of another six banks. In total, the government had seized control of 20 banks at that time. The fundamental objective of nationalization was to make satisfying the credit requirements of underdeveloped industries a higher priority than other goals. It was anticipated that the credit facility would be made available at interest rates that were quite reasonable for the consumer. The bank was nationalized, which resulted in a rise in all elements of its operations, including the number of branches, deposits, credit disbursements, assets, and jobs.

In addition, the bank was given more government oversight. Both profitability and competitiveness have taken a back seat during the duration of this exercise. 2011 publication of Chaudhary Ved Tandon's. The Reserve Bank of India was nationalized in the year 1948, while the Imperial Bank was nationalized in the year 1955. Both of these events took place in India.

After that, the name of the bank was changed to the State Bank of India, and it was given authorization to act as a principal agent for the Reserve Bank of India. In the beginning, SBI was responsible for managing financial transactions on behalf of both the national government and individual state governments. To ensure that financial assistance was dispersed across all industries in line with each industries' specific needs and requirements, 84 percent of the total banks had been nationalized by the end of the year 1969. This was accomplished in order to guarantee that all industries received the same amount of support.

The nationalization of banks was carried out with the intention of satisfying the requirements for the expansion of the economy in conformity with the policies of the country. The Indian government mandated that the country's banks allocate a specific percentage of the total credit they issued to priority industries. This requirement was placed on the nation's banks by the Indian government. The term "priority sector lending" refers to financial assistance provided to particular industries and subsectors, such as agricultural and associated activities, micro and small-scale industries, impoverished individuals for housing, etc. The government put social control on banks, which resulted in constraints being placed on loans made by banking businesses. These restrictions were set in order to guarantee that bank advances were not only granted to large-scale industries and large business houses, but were also directed to other vital sectors (Tannan, 2004). The government did this in order to ensure that the bank advances were not given to large-scale enterprises and large business houses solely. The government put social supervision on banks so as to make certain that bank advances would not be granted exclusively to large-scale businesses and major commercial establishments. Smaller enterprises and the agriculture sector were both given access to credit choices that were previously unavailable to them. During that time period, the key focuses of attention were placed on the development of additional banking facilities, the equitable distribution of credit, and the organization of deposit flows. As a consequence of all of these measures, banking in India ended up being an enormously successful endeavor, and it eventually extended over the entirety of the country. The nation of India as a whole saw the opening of about 55,000 new branches, the majority of which were located in India's rural areas.

4. The Period of Time That Followed the Liberalization

The landscape of the country's banking industry underwent a thorough overhaul as a direct result of the liberalization program that was carried out in the year 1991. When the mixed economy system was put into place, the private sector was given the opportunity to take an active role in the economy. In accordance with the new economic policy, the door was opened to private actors despite the fact that the banking system was predominantly under the control of the government.

The report that was compiled by the Narsimham Committee in 1991 served as the blueprint for the modifications that were made to the banking sector in India.

These modifications were put into effect. In November of 1991, the Narsimham Committee concluded its work and delivered its findings to the appropriate parties. It offered a number of significant suggestions for making fundamental reforms to the present financial system, which were incorporated in the document. A deterioration in the operational and financial stability of the banking system was seen prior to the committee issuing its recommendations. As a consequence of this, the committee suggested taking a variety of remedial actions in order to retain the confidence of depositors while also protecting the interests of depositors. (RBI, 1991). It suggested a variety of corrective actions, such as the implementation of trustworthy accounting procedures by banks, the establishment of an Asset Reconstruction Fund (ARF), the authorization of the establishment of branches of foreign banks in India, the enhancement of the internal organization, the adoption of technology, and numerous other recommendations concerning the setting of SLR, interest rates, income recognition, and asset classification. In addition, it outlined numerous other recommendations concerning the setting of SLR, interest rates, income recognition, and asset classification.[8]

5. The Banking Sector in India Is Doing Increasingly Well in Recent Times

The Reserve Bank of India (RBI) asserts that India's financial sector is appropriately fostered and effectively managed. The nation's budgetary and financial situations are incomparably superior to those of any other nation everywhere on the face of the earth. According to the findings of research into credit, market, and liquidity risk, Indian banks are generally adaptable and have fared well throughout the international recession. In recent years, the Indian financial sector has witnessed the emergence of novel financial models, such as those utilized by payments and small financing institutions. It is possible that the latest actions taken by the RBI may go a long way toward assisting in the reconstruction of the domestic banking system. The digital payments system in India developed the most among 25 nations with India's Prompt Installment Administration (IMPS) being the main framework at level 5 Faster Payments Innovation Index (FPII).

- During the period covering the Financial Years 2007-2018, total deposits increased at a compound annual growth rate of 11.66 percent, while total loans increased at a compound annual growth rate of 10.94 percent. The retail credit market in India is the fourth largest among the nations that are still growing. From INR 10.66 lakh crore in December 2014, it increased all the way up to INR 18.12 lakh crore in December of 2017.
- As of the third quarter of the fiscal year 2019 (April–September 2018), the total credit extended by business banks reached Rs 90.81 lakh crore, while deposits increased to Rs 120 lakh crore. During the 2018 fiscal year, the total assets of public sector banks was

108.82 crore rupees. The provisional coverage ratio of banks reportedly hit its greatest level in seven years, as stated in the Union Budget for 2019-2020.

OBJECTIVES

1. To check the performance of employees in organisation.
2. To find effect of performance appraisal and work motivation on employees in banking sector.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

- Tools Used

Statistical methods such as Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlations, and ANOVA, and others have been utilized to tabulate and compute the basic data.

Sample design

Table 1 Sample Design

Sl. No.	Type of Banks			
	Public Sector	Sample Size	Private Sector	Sample size
1	Andhra Bank(AB)	200		
2	Canara Bank(CB)	200		
3			City Union Bank(CUB)	200
4			Karnataka Bank(KB)	200
Total		400		400
Grand Total				800

- **Sampling Method**

The stratified random sampling approach has been used to collect data from four banks: the public sector's Andhra Bank and Canara Bank, and the private sector's City Union Bank and Karnataka Bank. Notwithstanding their differences in size, 200 officers from each bank were selected at random as all of the bank's branches employ the same standard performance evaluation processes. Consequently, 200 officers from each bank are included in the 800-person sample size.
The sample consisted of 25% of all bank branch officers in all categories (rural, semi-urban, urban, and RO/CO/metros).

- **Data Collection**

Data was collected from 200 samples of the public sector banks of Andhra Bank, City Bank, and the private sector banks of CUB and KB utilizing a structured questionnaire in order to attain the 800 sample size. A systematic survey has been used to collect data. It is believed that the questionnaire's five sections (A through E) are crucial elements of a successful evaluation system. We only use the F-section for demographic data.

- **Section-A: Performance appraisal policy**

Section B: Procedure for administering performance appraisals Section-C: Process for reviewing performance appraisals
Section-D: Reward and career links for performance ratings Section-E: Organizational growth through the performance assessment system

DATA ANALYSIS

Performance Appraisal's Impact On The Banking Sector

Enhancing performance: When it comes to providing employees with information on how their work performance measures up to business requirements, well-designed PAs may be helpful tools. Companies find it advantageous to match the performance and objectives of individual workers with those of the business; several studies have established a positive association between HRM practices at the corporate level and improvements in both individual and organizational performance (6). PAs provide a platform for discussion in order to work together on these personal and organizational objectives. Cooperation may also be advantageous if it results in employee acceptance and satisfaction with assessment results.[9]

Demographic Profile

Understanding demographic factors is necessary for analyzing socioeconomic circumstances. Since gathering all of the available data would be difficult, key demographic characteristics ought to be selected. The objective is to assess the socioeconomic vulnerability of individuals in the priority system. The number of people living in the priority system is only the starting point; other factors that impact the well-being of the population are the land tenure system, the rate of population growth (such as trends in fertility and death rates), the age distribution (e.g., "How many working-aged people?"), and how the population is distributed throughout the area (e.g., how many hectares per farm household or how urbanized the area is). "What is the dependency ratio?," the work force in relation to unemployment rates, characteristics of health, and the level of education attained by men and women.

The gender distribution is one of the most important components of the respondents' demographic profile. It's also essential to use deals and bookings. The gender breakdown of the participants is shown in Table .1.

Table .2 Gender Distribution of The Respondents for demographic profile

Gender	Type of the Bank					
	Public Sector Bank			Private Sector Bank		
Male	138	139	277	136	141	277
	69.0%	69.5%	69.3%	68.0%	70.5%	69.3%
Female	62	61	123	64	59	123
	31.0%	30.5%	30.8%	32.0%	29.5%	30.8%
Total	200	200	400	200	200	400
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

277 respondents (69.3%) in public sector banks are male, according to the data in the table. These respondents include 138 workers at Andhra Bank (69%), 139 employees in CB (69.5%), and 277 employees in private sector banks (69.3%), which include 141 employees at KB (70.5%) and 136 employees at CUB (68%). Less than 50% of employees at commercial and public banks are women, however. In private sector banks, there are 123 females (30.8%), with 64 in CUB (32%), and 59 in KB (29.5 %). In public sector banks, there are 61 in CB and 62 in AB. The results show that 69.3% of males and 30.8% of women work in commercial and public banks, respectively, with a gender ratio of less than 50%.[10]

Guidelines

Education reform is essential to the development of society. It provides the capacity for analysis and wisdom to thinking and decision-making processes. Both formal and informal education boost the need for improved living conditions and positive motivations for socioeconomic advancement. It influences a family's financial future and sets rules for people's attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. The participants' level of education is shown in Table .2.

Table .3 The status of the respondents' education

Sl. No.	Educational qualification	Type of the bank					
		Public Sector Bank			Private Sector Bank		
1	Graduate	74	102	176	87	103	190
		37.0%	51.0%	44.0%	43.5%	51.5%	47.5%
2	Post Graduate	85	57	142	77	64	141
		42.5%	28.5%	34.5%	38.5%	32.0%	34.3%
3	CAIIB and others	41	41	82	36	33	69
		20.5%	20.5%	20.5%	18.0%	16.5%	17.3%
Total		200	200	400	200	200	400
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The data indicates that 176 respondents work for public sector banks. Of those who have graduated, 176 are from CB (102, or 51%) and AB (74, or 37%). 85 (42.5%) of them graduated from AB, and 57 (28.5%) from CB. There are 142 post-graduates among them. Additionally, 82 respondents have CAIIB, and 41 respondents each from AB and CB (20.4%) are other respondents. Similarly, graduates from private second banks make up 190 respondents, or 103 in KB (51.5%) and 87 in KB (37%). Postgraduates make up 141 of them, 64 in KB (42.5%) and 77 in CUB (38.5%). In addition, 69 responders have CAIIB, while the remaining responses are split between 36 from CUB (18%) and 33 from KB (16.5%). The findings indicate that graduates are more prevalent in public sector banks' CB and KB branches, whereas Pos graduates are more prevalent in their AB and CUB branches. Furthermore, respondents from public sector banks are more likely than those from private sector banks to have CAIIB and other credentials.[11]

Policy for Appropriation Performance Appraisal

Details on respondents' opinions of the caliber of public and private sector banks' performance appraisal policies are acquired; they are displayed in table.3.

Table.4 Policy for Performance Appraisals

Having good Performance Appraisal Policy	Type of the bank						
	Public Sector Bank			Private Sector Bank			Grand Total
	AB	CB	Total	CUB	KB	Total	

Yes	162	173	335	181	173	354	689
	81.0%	86.5%	83.8%	90.5%	86.5%	88.5%	86.125 %
No	38	27	65	19	27	46	111
	19.0%	13.5%	16.3%	9.5%	13.5%	11.5%	13.875 %
Total	200	200	400	200	200	400	800
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The graph indicates that 689 respondents (86.125%) found the banks' performance evaluation policy to be acceptable. Of these, 335 (83.8%) and 354 (88.5%) came from public sector banks and private sector banks, respectively. Within the private sector, the banks' performance assessment policy was deemed satisfactory by 181 respondents (90.5%) in CUB and 173 respondents (86.5%) in KB. Within the public sector, 162 respondents (81%) at AB and 173 respondents (86.5%) at City Bank agreed. In contrast, 111 respondents (13.875%) thought that the banks' performance evaluation technique was insufficient. Of them, 65 were from public sector banks (16.3%) and 45 were from private sector banks (11.5%). Within the banking industry, 19 respondents (9.5%) in CUB and 27 respondents (13.5%) in KB expressed dissatisfaction with the banks' performance assessment policy. Of the public sector banks, the same was perceived by 27 respondents from City Bank (13.5%) and 38 respondents from AB (19%). It is found that whereas 111 respondents (13.875%) believed the program was flawed, 689 respondents (86.125%) said the banks' performance evaluation policy was good.

Table 5 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis: An Overview of ANOVA

R Square value 0.530					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value
Regression	231.067	3	77.022	299.724**	0.000
Residual	204.554	796	.257		
Total	434.621	799			

Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlations has been computed for the following processes: Administration, Review, Linkage to Rewards/Career, and Organization development through PA. The results are displayed in Table 5.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis have the sum of Squares are 231.067 and df value is 3 , Mean Square 77.022 , f value 299.724** , and p value 0.000 , Residual 204.554 , df value is 796 and Mean Square .257 .

Table 6 Analysis of Correlation for All Banks

Overall		Administration process of PA	Review process of PA	Linkage to Rewards/ Career	Organization growth by PA
Administration process of PA	Pearson Correlation	1	.577(**)	.539(**)	.537(**)
	p-value		.000	.000	.000
	N	800	800	800	800
Review process of PA	Pearson Correlation	.577(**)	1	.504(**)	.456(**)
	p-value	.000		.000	.000
	N	800	800	800	800
Linkage to Rewards/Career	Pearson Correlation	.539(**)	.504(**)	1	.702(**)
	p-value	.000	.000		.000
	N	800	800	800	800
Organisation growth by PA	Pearson Correlation	.537(**)	.456(**)	.702(**)	1
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	
	N	800	800	800	800

** There is a connection at the 2-tailed 0.01 significance level.

The table shows that the PA administration process and the review process (0.577), the PA administration process and the linkage to rewards/career (0.539), and the PA administration process and organization growth (0.537) have an average correlation that is significant at the 1%

level. In contrast, the PA review process and organization growth by PA, the PA administration process and the PA review process and linkage to rewards/career had an average correlation of 0.577, 0.539, and 0.456. At the 1% level, these associations are significant. At 0.7.2, it is shown

that the two variables with the greatest and most significant associations are Organization growth by PA and Linkage to Rewards/Career. Multiple Linear Regression[12]
After calculating the ANOVA for multiple linear regression analysis, table 5 displays the ANOVA summary for multiple linear regression analysis.

CONCLUSION

A performance assessment, often referred to as a performance appraisal (PA), is a systematic, ongoing process that gauges an employee's output and performance at work in relation to established benchmarks and organizational objectives. Individual employee attributes are also considered, such as accomplishments, potential for improvement, organizational citizenship behavior, strengths and weaknesses, etc. Three main methods are used to collect PA data: subjective evaluation, objective production, and people. Of all the evaluation approaches available, judgemental evaluations are the ones that are used the most often. Typically, a PA is completed once a year. Some potential purposes for the interview include "giving feedback to employees, counseling and developing employees, and conveying and discussing compensation, job status, or disciplinary decisions." PA is commonly integrated into performance management systems. Performance management systems are used "to manage and align" all of an organization's resources in order to achieve the highest potential performance.An organization's internal performance management system has a significant impact on its success or failure. Therefore, improving PA for everybody should become increasingly important to modern enterprises.

REFERENCES

[1] Armstrong, M. (2000),Performance Management (2nd Ed) London, Kogan Page.

[2] Armstrong, M. and Baron, A. (2005),Managing Performance, Performance Management in Action. London, CIPD.

[3] Armstrong, M. and Murlis, H. (1998),Reward Management (4th Ed).London, Kogan Page.

[4] Cygnus (2004), Performance Management, New York, McGraw Hill.

[5] RBI, 1991 Five domains of high performance, survey report. Institute for Corporate Productivity (2011), Pay for Performance, Survey report.

[6] Bach, S. (2000),Personnel Management: A comprehensive guide to theory and practice, London, Blackwell

[7] Boyle, M. (2001), Performance Reviews: Perilous curves ahead,Fortune 143, pp.187-188.

[8] Bracken, D.W., Timmereck, C.W. and Church, A.H. (2001a).The handbook of multisource feedback, San Francisco,Jossey-Bass.

[9] Bretz,R.D. and Milkovich,G.T.(1989), Performance appraisal in large organizations:practice and research implications, (working paper# 89-17), School of Industrial Relations Magazine, Cornell University.