Abstract
This study examined the accuracy of performance ratings provided by participant raters with and without a consensus requirement. Participants in three conditions, discussion, consensus, and control, were given a scenario and asked to rate three ratees on two constructs: job dimensions and communication behaviors. The focus of this study is on the justification for use of multiple raters reaching consensus in organizational performance appraisal situations.

Results
The performance evaluation process must become more adaptable in response to increasingly complex jobs, greater incumbent interaction and collaboration, and shifting organizational objectives.

Discussion
The present research study attempts to provide insight into the extent to which a consensus-driven performance rating model may improve the accuracy of performance ratings in the context of two relevant organizational factors, multiple raters and multiple job-specific performance dimensions.