

## Sociological Perspective of Performance Appraisal: An Overview

Ab. Aziz Yusof  
Juhary Ali

*In today's competitive global market, managing employees is becoming more challenging and complex. There is a great demand for an effective managerial style as employees' expectations towards work are more diversified than before. It requires managers to acquire better knowledge and skills in understanding employee's behaviour at work. As employees are the key players in an organisation, they play a vital role in determining the success and the survival of the organisation. Employees can accept or reject any rule, procedure and regulation in the organisation. Managers should understand that when employees come to work they are not only contributing their knowledge, skills and abilities but also their emotions, creativity and personalities. So, in appraising their performance all the above factors should be taken into consideration because they affect employees' overall performance. Furthermore, the workers who come to work do not only aim for recognition and rewards but also for status, social acceptance, and power. Thus, every employee from all hierarchies will put great concern and interest on performance appraisal issues as they influence his/her future career development in the organisation. Employees have realised that the outcomes of performance appraisal affect their rewards, determine their future career and give an impact on social relationships among them. Besides, the performance appraisal acts as one of the determinant factors in work motivation, commitment and loyalty. To ensure the success of performance appraisal, a new approach in evaluating employees that is totally different from evaluating other factors of production is needed. This paper highlights performance appraisal issues and determines how far the contributions of performance appraisal are being recognised, valued, and respected by the organisation.*

*Key words: appraisal outcomes, employee attitudes, human resource management, performance appraisal, sociological perspective*

*Dalam pasaran global yang kompetitif pada hari ini, pengurusan pekerja menjadi semakin mencabar dan rumit. Satu gaya pengurusan yang berkesan diperlukan memandangkan harapan pekerja tentang kerja menjadi lebih pelbagai. Pengurus perlu memperoleh*

pengetahuan dan kemahiran untuk memahami gelagat di tempat kerja. Oleh kerana pekerja merupakan pemain utama dalam sesebuah organisasi, mereka berperanan menentukan kejayaan dan penakatan organisasi. Ini adalah kerana pekerja boleh menerima atau menolak sebarang bentuk undang-undang, prosedur atau peraturan dalam organisasi. Pengurus perlu memahami bahawa pekerja bukan sahaja menyumbang pengetahuan, kemahiran atau kebolehan mereka semasa bekerja, tetapi juga emosi, kreativiti dan personaliti. Jadi, semasa menilai prestasi, pengurus perlu mengambil kira kesemua faktor ini kerana ia dapat memberi kesan kepada seluruh prestasi pekerja. Tambahan pula, pekerja bukan sahaja mengharapkan pengiktirafan dan ganjaran tetapi pada masa yang sama berkehendakkan status, penerimaan sosial, dan kuasa. Oleh itu, setiap pekerja di setiap peringkat organisasi mengambil berat tentang isu penilaian prestasi memandangkan ia mempengaruhi pembangunan kerjaya masa hadapan mereka. Pekerja menyedari bahawa hasil penilaian prestasi memberi kesan kepada ganjaran yang mereka terima, menentukan kerjaya masa hadapan mereka, dan memberi kesan kepada hubungan sosial sesama mereka. Di samping itu, penilaian prestasi merupakan satu faktor penentu dalam motivasi kerja, komitmen dan kesetiaan. Bagi memastikan kejayaan penilaian prestasi, satu pendekatan penilaian pekerja yang berbeza sama sekali dengan penilaian tentang faktor pengeluaran lain diperlukan. Kertas ini menonjolkan isu penilaian prestasi dan menggariskan besar atau kecil sumbangan penilaian prestasi diiktiraf, dihargai dan dihormati oleh organisasi.

*Kata kunci: penilaian prestasi, perspektif sosiologi, sikap pekerja, hasil penilaian, pengurusan sumber manusia*

It has been universally accepted that appraising others is not an easy task for managers. Managers have to face dilemmas, uncertainties and risks in whatever decision they take during the appraisal process. If they evaluate leniently, subordinates tend not to take the performance appraisal issues seriously. On the other hand, if managers evaluate strictly, this will frustrate subordinates who would assume that performance appraisal is used as a control mechanism. As a result, it will develop fears and uncertainties among raters and ratees.

It has been suggested that there are psychological as well as sociological problems arising from the existing performance appraisal system. The current system invites problems and difficulties to both managers who implement the system and employees upon whom the system is implemented. It deteriorates the existing manager-employee relationship arising from prejudices and differences

in expectations. Even worse, the existing performance appraisal system fosters an atmosphere that will lead toward conflict and rivalries among members in the organisation. The outcome of these situations will then ignite an environment of fear, frustration, alienation and develop a sense of inferiority among those who are being victimised. To avoid these situations, members in the organisation find ways and means to ensure that they will be evaluated and gain higher ratings than their counterparts. Thus, there is a tendency among the ratees to politicise and manipulate the performance appraisal issues in order to fulfil their hopes, needs and wants either implicitly or explicitly.

As performance appraisal has multiple roles, functions and multifaceted meanings, it therefore provides different meanings, expectations and hopes to different people at different organisational hierarchies. As a result, it causes difficulties for the organisation to design, develop, implement and evaluate the system that can cater to the multiple interests of the stakeholders. The problems become more serious when every member in the organisation tries to gain maximum benefits from the implemented system. In attempting to gain their personal interests, some employees will exercise their power, politicise the system and manipulate the performance appraisal. In the end, there will be an opportunist who will gain from and an apathetic who will be victimised by the system implemented.

The sociological impact of performance appraisal is further explained.

#### Sociological Dimensions of Performance Appraisal

Traditionally, psychologists have played an active role in developing and highlighting performance appraisal issues. But recently, with the effect of rapid expansion in the use of performance appraisal, sociologists, too, have taken part in discussing performance appraisal issues. Their involvement enables a new contribution of ideas to fill the existing sociological vacuum in the implementation of performance appraisal. Sociologists have managed to raise the impact of performance appraisal on the organisational political climate, social interaction and individual expectations as a result of implementing the appraisal system.

The sociologists' point of departure is towards the establishment of a social structure among members in the organisation that involves sustaining consensus, conformity and role behaviour. Therefore, the sociological dimension in management will provide an opportunity for us to understand the behavioural, social and political interaction among members in the organisation. This understanding will enable us to see how various functional groups in multiple organisational hierarchies bind the various orientations that they derive from their

respective occupational reference groups. The organisation should realise that member orientation and their mode of conduct may be differentiated according to their skills, qualifications, departments and working environment to which their activities are linked. The sociological approach will tie all these differences in order to understand why different people in the organisation see things differently that cause them to act or behave differently (Bennett, 1981).

According to Joseph (1989), the sociological approach towards management is important in four aspects, as follows:

- a. It alerts managers and subordinates to the common assumptions they make.
- b. The concentration will be made on the similarities and differences that exist among them.
- c. It helps to show what really goes on rather than what managers try to analyse and rationalise.
- d. It shows different viewpoints on what is going on. What is good to one group may be bad to another group.

These four situations will lead towards eradication of individualism, egoism and group fanaticism. Everyone needs to respect the ideas of others, and develop a questioning and critical view, that in the long run, improves the quality of decision making. Thus managers need to encourage open discussion and freedom of expression at the workplace.

According to Murphy and Cleveland (1995), the sociological approach will provide answers to questions of, first, the role of the social climate and norms of the organisation in the process of the appraisal, and second, of the role of socialisation in the development of the performance norms and standards.

#### *Reed's Sociological Dimension of Management*

In order to understand the sociological approach in management, it is important for us to look at Reed's (1989) contributions. He had identified three major analytical perspectives that had shaped sociological research and analysis of the management. The three perspectives that he referred to are the technical perspective, the political perspective and the critical perspective.

#### *The Technical Perspective*

According to Reed, the technical perspective views management as a tool that is designed to gain systematic co-ordination of the social action among members of the organisation. This perspective also recognises the organisation as an institution that enables to develop and protect the interests of various groups to ensure order, effective co-ordination and control over their social interaction.

The establishment of certain rules, procedures and policies is to enable members in the organisation to diagnose and remedy pitfalls, maladjustment and weaknesses that may occur during their interaction. In other words, the technical perspective will provide a guideline for members to behave and act in the organisation. Apart from this, it will also provide an opportunity for the management to identify those who have deviated from the organisational goals.

#### *The Political Perspective*

The political perspective views management as a social process that will mobilise conflict among various groups in the organisation. It is characterised by structures of interest, goals, power and status, which are inherently unstable and subject to change. As different interest groups have different rationale, their interest and power within the management need to be balanced because of the implication they have on the agenda of the decision making.

According to Reed (1989), the political perspective recognises managers as knowledgeable human agents who are responsible for the organisational means and outcomes. The organisational structure such as hierarchies, rules and procedures are subjected to renegotiating, and are open to periodic reappraisal and reconstruction. These can be achieved through discussion, negotiation and compromise among members of the organisation.

#### *The Critical Perspective*

This perspective views management as a control mechanism to protect the economic, social and political interest of the establishment groups in the organisation. According to managers, subordinates (workers) are considered a cost to be minimised and a constraint to be handled (Goodman, 1984) to enable them to achieve guaranteed levels of profit and be permanently at the top. This perspective also views the organisation as an agent or bearer (Reed, 1989) which enhances the economic development that justifies it to control and direct the workforce. Employees are means of production that need to be closely supervised to achieve the organisational goals.

The Reed's perspective provides a wide understanding of the behaviour of people at work. These behaviours will influence the social interactions of the subordinates in performing their work and at the same time give an impact on the performance appraisal system. The perspective is also at a different level of analysis from the usual psychological perspective, which focuses on the individual's behaviour. Reed's sociological dimensions, on the other hand, focus

more on the collective behaviour among members in the organisation. The sociological approach in management provides us with a broad understanding of human behaviour at work. As members' behaviours vary according to predetermined roles, they will have an impact on the social relationships in executing work and in determining work effectiveness. Therefore, it is important to analyse the effect of members' behaviours on their performance through a sociological dimension.

#### *Sociological Dimension on Human Assessment of Other People*

The sociological dimension in performance appraisal systems enables subordinates, superiors and management to understand their respective goals, aspirations and expectations towards work. The approach also involves the judgement of individual members in the organisation make that is greatly influenced by their experience, learning, values, cognitive strength and their ability to solve problems. Managers, for example, tend to develop a unique perception towards people and tend to make a conclusion on their behaviour at work (Eiser, 1978).

Eiser argued that the way an individual behaves towards other people depends to a large extent on the impressions he/she forms of them, his/her interpretation of their past and present actions, and his/her predictions of what they will do in future. It is easy to see, therefore, why social psychologists are so concerned with the judgements people make about one another, since an understanding of social behaviour must depend, in part at least, on an understanding of social perceptions.

In line with the above, Waddell (1991) identified four basic belief systems that regulate how people see the world, and each has a substantial effect on the way people operate at work. Waddell further suggests that managers need to use different strategies in conducting their performance evaluation since different people have different working perspectives. These four basic belief systems are:

- a. People view the world through an absolute frame of reference.
- b. People look at others with suspicion.
- c. People are recognised by their interpersonal skills.
- d. People tend to evaluate others without bias.

#### *Performance Appraisal and Its Sociological Implications*

Prediction is part of management job (Parker, Brown, Child, & Smith, 1981). Thus, managers have to predict and anticipate how employees will react towards the establishment of the performance appraisal system. Will employees improve

their performances significantly and/or will they protest towards the system? With this prediction in mind, managers can reduce uncertainties and problems of social integration between them and the employees. Managers should realise that the employees tend to search and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the system implemented. The result of their search will have sociological implications on their work.

#### *Sociological Outcomes of Performance Appraisal*

The rater's evaluation will influence the ratee's attitudes and expectations towards work, confidence towards the appraisers and commitment to the organisation. In addition, the evaluation will also create a win-win, a win-lose or a lose-lose situation between the rater and the ratee depending on how the evaluation is conducted (Mullins, 1993). Four main outcomes have been identified that will affect employees if their performances are not properly managed. They are alienation, conflict, motivation (Randell, Packard, & Slater, 1990) and workplace fear (Suarez, 1994).

#### *Alienation*

Blauner (1964) explains that alienation exists when workers are unable to control their immediate work processes, and are unable to connect the purpose of their jobs to the overall organisational functions. In such a case, according to Randell, Packard and Slater (1990), the employees will be switched off and even estrange themselves or become strangers to their real selves (Haralambos, 1989).

Hirszowicz (1981) claims that the alienated employees tend to deny themselves, have feelings of misery, and do not maximise mental and physical capabilities. Instead they tend to be physically exhausted and mentally debased. For example, employees who work under close supervision for the sake of fulfilling physiological and security needs for themselves and their families will lose their sense of importance, trust and autonomy.

The alienated employees are forced to separate themselves from fulfilling their basic rights such as freedom of speech and association. They will spend their time of service in organisational captivity. They are discontented, oppressed and unfulfilled. Even worse, they are not aware of the causes of their condition. In other words, their light of consciousness is systematically diminished, disillusioned and distorted.

Alienation also results from the advancement of technology and automation. According to Braverman (1974), the effect of increasing automation caused employees to be victims of the managers' use of technology that results in deskilling, boredom, loneliness and repetitiveness. With the use of technology,

employees feel that they are being controlled and lack job meaningfulness. When this happens, their work performances and interpersonal relationships will be deteriorated. The outcome of this situation will result in employee frustration or hostility towards the management, the supervisors and their peer group members.

Hirszowicz (1981) further stressed that in alienating situations employees will regard their managers as enemies rather than legitimate leaders. Employees will disobey their managers' instructions and deny their managerial roles. Employees will feel that they are being exploited, and treated as unimportant because their potential is not fully explored.

Therefore, in order to rectify the situation, managers need to balance between their prerogative right of evaluating and their level of tolerance while appraising the employees. Their failure to carefully handle the situation will encourage the alienated employees to turn to informal leaders or their unions to express their dissatisfaction towards the appraisal system. Blauner (1964) had identified four consequences of alienation, i.e., powerlessness, meaningfulness, isolation and self-estrangement.

*Powerlessness.* Employees are considered powerless when they are treated as objects to be controlled and manipulated by others who are either their supervisors, peers or the organisational system. The powerless employees are also unable to determine work-related outcomes that affect their need for autonomy and control (Kanungo, 1982). They are being directed and dominated rather than being self-determinant.

In terms of performance appraisal, the powerless employees wholly depend on the system that is designed by others. They are given the opportunity to influence or to get involved in planning, designing and evaluating the appraisal system. Employees need to react rather than to act towards the appraisal system. As a result, the powerless employees cannot assert themselves or change their conditions (Joseph, 1989). Therefore, the powerless employees are subjected to being hired and fired by managers.

The powerless employees will develop a sense of fatalistic attitude and a sense of resignation, which will then translate, into absenteeism from work, poor performance, or loyalty shift towards other organisations or trade unions. The organisation should realise that the employees' collective voice of discontentment may lead to devious attempts of revenge, such as sabotage, fraud, rumours and character assassinations.

*Meaninglessness.* Seeman (1959) in Kanungo (1982) stated that meaninglessness exists when the individual is unclear as to what he/she ought to believe when the individual's minimal standard for clarity in decision making is not met. Due to this, there is a tendency towards employee meaninglessness that arises when the evaluation process is made totally on managerial discretion.

Employees tend to lose their roles, sense of purpose, pride and self-esteem in the assigned work.

This situation will cause them to withdraw from the moral rules, laws and dogma of the appraisal system. When this happens, the employees will start questioning the true purpose of the existence of the appraisal system in the first place (Eldridge, 1986). As a result, those who lack goal clarity tend not to integrate themselves with the system as they experience the feelings of emptiness, hollowness and purposelessness. This situation occurs when employees are unable to understand the complex system of the goals in the organisation and its relation to their work (Blauner, 1964). Thus, this type of employees no longer feel the importance of the performance appraisal because the system will add little value or no value to the development of their self-identity and social appreciation in the organisation.

Meaninglessness among employees may kill employee initiatives, competence and creativity at the workplace. It will deteriorate their social relationships because they are unable to predict the social situation and the outcomes of their own and others performances.

*Isolation.* Isolation of employees arises when employees do not feel a sense of belonging to the appraisal system because of their continuous frustration. For them, the performance appraisal is just a tool for managerial control. Thus, it creates a sense of remoteness and a feeling of distance between employees and organisation.

The employees no longer share the ownership of the system with the management because they have made the assumption that the system is ineffective and unjust. Thus, their distrust of the system forces them to develop their own norms in order to defend themselves from being victimised by the system. For example, when the performance appraisal is made based on the forced distribution method, employees feel that they are being isolated since the management has already predetermined their performance result.

*Self-estrangement.* Self-estrangement arises when there is a loophole in implementing the performance appraisal. Blauner (1964) expressed that the nature of the job that encouraged self-estrangement does not provide the opportunity for the employees to show their unique abilities, potentials, or personality. In this situation, employees perform their work not based on self-expression and self-actualisation. Employees' contribution toward the organisation is not voluntary but coerced. They are not maximising their potential and ability when doing work because they realise that the evaluation of their work does not necessarily reflect their actual performance. The consequences from this situation will cause boredom and monotony, discourage personal growth and be a threat to a self-approved occupational identity (Blauner, 1964).

So, without proper management of the performance appraisal, both the management and employees will lose and suffer. While management cannot fully utilise the employee potentials, employees will be committed to their work.

### *Conflict*

The feeling of alienation will lead to a clash of interest, opinion and expectation between the employees and the management. The conflict arises when employees desire to conform to a positive self-image in the hope of obtaining rewards in terms of pay or promotion, whereas the management wants them to accept the negative information about themselves.

Milkovick and Boudream (1991) found that there is a potential conflict between the organisation's goals and the individual's goals, which resulted from two different purposes in the performance appraisal. These include allocating rewards and opportunities, providing feedback and counselling. The conflict exists because the performance appraisal system designed to improve individual's performance may not be suitable for salary administration purposes. The salary increment of a low performer, such as newcomer who is in the process of learning, will not be equal to that of a high performer. In other words, according to Beer (1981), there is a conflict between the individual and the organisation goals.

### *Motivation*

Traditionally, it is psychologists who put a great concern for employee motivation but recently, sociologists have taken part in the discussion also. The sociologists have realised that the level of employee motivation will affect the social interaction among members in the organisation. According to Randell, Packard, and Slater (1990), employees can only be motivated when there is a balance between what is inside and what is required from them by the organisation. Motivation will initiate employees to work beyond their specified jobs and responsibilities and simultaneously make them more co-operative and more productive (Hirzowicz, 1981).

In order to maximise employee motivation, it is necessary to perceive the amount of their effort, time, creativity and skills that are invested which will lead to a favourable return from the appraisal process. However, the absence of these variables will lead to unfavourable situations or lower the employee motivation at work. This is due to the following differences in performance-expected result between employees and managers:

- a. Interference of non-job related elements such as physical appearance and stereotyping in getting the job done.
- b. Insufficient resources because of lack of support from the senior management.

- c. Gaining encouragement for undesirable behaviour.
- d. Lack of knowledge or skills in getting the job done.

Longenecker, Sim, and Gioia (1987) pointed out that accuracy is not the main concern of the practising executives in appraising subordinates but their main concern is how to use the appraisal process best to motivate and reward subordinates. As a result, managers tend to use their discretion in evaluating subordinates to ensure that the level of employee motivation increases or is maintained as a result of the appraisal process.

According to Harris (1994), the level of manager motivation in evaluating subordinates appraisal will be determined by three factors: (a) their perception of the possibility of gaining extrinsic reward such as raises in pay and promotions, and intrinsic rewards such as recognition, (b) the avoidance of negative consequences such as damage to subordinate-supervisor relationship, demoralisation of employees, criticism from the rater's subordinate, criticism from the rater's supervisor, and interference with other tasks, and (c) their perception of impression management which is either self-impression or managing impressions of others.

### *Workplace Fears*

Another sociological outcome that will affect employees if their performance is not properly managed is the developing fears among employees at the workplace. Fears at the workplace act as a distracting force that will rob employees and organisations of their potential. It affects both organisational effectiveness and the quality of their work life.

Employee appraisal, either good or bad, develops fear among them. If the result of their appraisal is bad, employees fear losing their status, position, authority, reward and power. On the other hand, if their performance is excellent, employees fear that it will deteriorate the relationship with their peers, develop jealousy, place very high expectations, boycotting, create new enemies or be forced to move out from their regular cliques. For example, if they were to be promoted they would be scared of having to face new bosses, be worried about being accepted by the new work groups and be unsure of the co-operation from new subordinates.

According to Suarez (1994), the end-product of fears towards performance appraisal will generate employees who tend to constantly please the boss, avoid risk taking by 'just doing my job' and resist from taking new or extra responsibilities. Besides, the individual employees will be more defensive with a "yes-man" attitude, be apathetic and sceptic to avoid fears.

## Performance Appraisal: Issues and Problems

Management should also realise that formal policies and systems are not the sole determinant of an effective appraisal system but its success greatly depends on sound interpersonal relationship among members in an organisation. The element of mutual benefit should replace individual interest. This can be done if the organisation sets up policies and systems of performance appraisal, which are parallel with the interpersonal needs of the members in the organisation. It is not an easy task to achieve total commitment from members of different hierarchies but this approach recognises that employees and management form an integral part of the profit-making force of an organisation (Ellis, Thompson, Pratt, & Barraclough, 1967).

Therefore, performance appraisal should not only be considered as a tool in controlling employees at work but it should also be a platform for members of the organisation to evaluate their own performance. In order to enable this approach to be successfully implemented, the traditional approach of performance appraisal should be changed from judgmental appraisal to one of feedback for improvement and development purposes, which is supported by rewards.

It should be stressed that performance management is a continuous process that should be shared by the managers and the employees. However, the question of how to establish the agreed framework, and if a point of agreement is met, how can it be implemented should be answered. Performance management is even more difficult to handle since both parties have different perspectives or even conflicting expectations over what is meant by good work performance.

It has been recognised that performance appraisal is the most controversial and stressful practice in an organisation. Most people dislike it but at the same time recognise its importance. So, in implementing the performance appraisal, the organisation should ensure that system is technically sound and encourage the stakeholders such as the unions, and the employees to participate in developing, evaluating and revising the organisation's appraisal system.

## Conclusion and Summary

This paper has drawn attention to the role sociology plays in performance appraisal. It is not an easy task to implement performance appraisal based on a sociological dimension because of the obstacles that have to be faced. The sociological dimension is not an alternative to the psychological dimension of performance appraisal but it acts as a complement in rectifying the existing weaknesses that exist in the latter approach. The sociological dimension can make important contributions to the establishment of a just and equitable performance

appraisal system. Thus, it is the role of HRM researchers and practitioners to undertake further research so that a strong foundation of sociological dimension in performance appraisal can be developed as a basis for implementing a sound performance appraisal system.

## References

- Armstrong, M. (1993). *Managing reward systems*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Beer, M. (1981). Performance appraisal: Dilemmas and possibilities. *Organisational Dynamics*, Winter, 24-37.
- Bennett, R. (1981). *Managing personnel and performance: An alternative approach*. London: Business Books.
- Blauner, R. (1964). *Alienation and freedom: The factory worker and his industry*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labour and monopoly capital: The degradation of work in the twentieth century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Carrel, M. R., Elbert, N. G., & Hatfield, R. D. (1995). *Human resource management global strategies for managing a diverse workforce* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Cowling, A. (1990). The appraisal and development of managers. In A. Cowling & C. Mailer (Eds.), *Managing human resources* (pp. 75-98) (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- Eiser, J. R. (1978). Interpersonal attributions. In H. Tajfel & C. Fraser (Eds.), *Introducing social psychology*. London: Penguin.
- Eldridge, J. E. (1986). *Industrial disputes*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ellis, C. D., Thompson, F. F., Pratt, F. F., & Barraclough, G. S. (1967). Learning and human resources revolution. *Personnel*, 1, 24-27.
- Goodman, J. (1984). *Employment relation in industrial society*. London: Philip Allan.
- Haralambos, M. (1989). *Sociology: Themes and perspectives*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Harris, M. (1994). Raters' motivation in the performance appraisal context: A theoretical framework. *Journal of Management*, 20, 737-756.
- Hirszowicz, M. (1981). *Industrial sociology: An introduction*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Jackson, S. E. (1983). Participation in decision-making as a strategy of reducing job-related strain. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 3-19.
- Joseph, M. (1989). *Sociology for business*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). *Work alienation: An integrative approach*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Kenneth, T. (1992). Conflict and conflict management: Reflections a update. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 13, 265-274.

Leap, T. L., & Crino, M. D. (1993). *Personnel/human resource management* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Milkovich, G. T., & Boudream, J. W. (1991). *Human resource management*. (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Homewood: Richard Irwin.

Mullins, L. J. (1993). *Management and organisational behaviour* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). London: Pitman Publishing.

Murphy, K. N., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organisational, and goal-based perspectives*. London: Sage Publications.

Parker, S. R, Brown, R. K., Child, J., & Smith, M. A. (1981). *The sociology of industry*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Randell, G., Packard, P., & Slater, J. (1990). *Staff appraisal: A first step to effective leadership*. London: Institute of Personnel Management.

Reed, M. I. (1989). *The sociology of management*. New York: Harvest Wheatshaaf.

Suarez, G. J. (1994). Managing fear in the workplace. *Journal for Quality and Participation*, December, 24-29.

Torrington, D., Hall, L., Haylor, I., & Myers, J. (1992). *Employing resourcing*. London: Institute of Personnel Management.

Townley, B. (1994). *Reframing human resource management: Power ethics and the subject at work*. London: Sage Publications.

Twomey, D. F., & Quazi, H. A. (1994). Triangular typology approach to studying performance management systems in high-tech firms. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 15, 561-573.

Waddell, J. R. (1991). Why can't they see things my way? *Supervision*, 52, 5-7.

Ab. Aziz Yusof  
School of Management  
Universiti Utara Malaysia  
06010 Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia.  
e-mail: [abaziz@webmail.uum.edu.my](mailto:abaziz@webmail.uum.edu.my)

Juhary Ali, PhD  
School of Management  
Universiti Utara Malaysia  
06010 Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia.  
e-mail: [juhary@webmail.uum.edu.my](mailto:juhary@webmail.uum.edu.my)