

An Empirical Study on Work Performance Appraisal of the Employees in an Industry at Karur

Dr. S. Rajeswari¹; Dr. K. Maheswari²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, Jamal Mohamed College (Autonomous), Tiruchirappalli, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, Bharathidasan University, Khajamalai Campus, Tiruchirappalli, India

E-mail: rajiswkhema@gmail.com, maheshranjith06@yahoo.co.in

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v8i5.2651>

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to investigate the performance appraisal processes among employees in the textile industry, specifically within Atlas Textile Private Limited. The research focuses on understanding how performance appraisals influence employee engagement, productivity, and overall professional growth.

Methodology: The study adopts a systematic random sampling method to select a sample of 100 employees from a population of 200 employees at Atlas Textile Private Limited. Data collection was conducted using a self-prepared questionnaire that gathered insights on employee perceptions of performance appraisals. The study emphasizes the importance of systematic data gathering for evaluating employee performance effectively.

Findings: The study reveals that a significant majority of employees (62%) report having a high level of satisfaction with the performance appraisal system. The findings highlight that regular feedback and clear communication contribute to enhanced employee engagement. Furthermore, the study suggests that initiatives like face-to-face interaction, on-the-job training, and recreational tours can improve employee well-being, thereby contributing to better performance and higher productivity.

Originality/Value: This research contributes to the body of knowledge by providing insights into the impact of performance appraisals in the textile industry, a sector that often receives less academic attention in terms of human resource management practices. The findings and suggestions provide valuable information for organizations seeking to optimize their performance appraisal processes and improve employee satisfaction and productivity.

Keywords: *Work Performance; Appraisal; Positive Work Environment*

Introduction

Organizations use work performance appraisal, a methodical process, to assess and record an employee's contributions and job performance over a given time frame. Usually conducted once a year or once every six months, this assessment has several functions, such as giving feedback, directing professional growth, and assisting in the decision-making process for promotions, pay increases, and layoffs. A crucial practice in businesses, performance reviews fulfill a number of vital roles that support both organizational success and employee growth. Employees receive formal feedback regarding their job performance through performance appraisals. Both professional and personal growth are facilitated by this feedback, which highlights opportunities for improvement as well as strengths. Workers can improve their abilities and boost their motivation and job happiness by using this knowledge. Setting specific, quantifiable goals for the future is a common part of appraisals. Employees can better align their efforts with organizational goals by understanding what is expected of them thanks to this procedure. It establishes a development and accountability path. Making educated decisions on promotions, pay raises, and other employment-related issues requires performance reviews. Open communication between managers and staff is encouraged by the appraisal process, which makes it possible to talk about performance standards and career goals. Within teams, this conversation improves cooperation and fosters trust. Legal compliance in certain industries requires regular performance reviews. Organizations can maintain fair hiring practices and comply with legislation by conducting these assessments.

Performance reviews assist in coordinating individual worker goals with the organization's overarching aims. The performance of the company as a whole is improved by this alignment, which guarantees that all workers are pursuing the same objectives. Employees' training and development requirements can be determined by organizations through performance reviews. This knowledge enables the development of focused training initiatives to close skill gaps and raise workforce competency levels. A consistent appraisal procedure reduces subjectivity and prejudice in assessments, creating a more positive work environment. Objective evaluations might lessen disputes amongst coworkers over partiality or unfair treatment. When resolving performance difficulties or for future evaluations, performance appraisals provide a documented history of employee performance throughout time. This documentation helps management make well-informed decisions. Employee engagement can be raised by providing regular feedback through performance reviews, which help them feel appreciated and acknowledged for their efforts. Employees that are engaged at work tend to be more dedicated and productive.

Review of Literature

Recent studies on employee performance appraisal emphasize the importance of organizational success and employee motivation. Performance appraisal serves as a foundation for various HR decisions including salary increases, training, and poor performance identification particularly administrative and developmental, remain a focus in recent research (Lameque *et al.*, 2023). Some studies also show a positive association between performance appraisal and employee performance, others cast doubt on this relationship (Zerfu *et al.*, 2021) and the effectiveness of performance appraisal systems for working mothers can be improved through human resource functions and by addressing both organizational structures and processes (Muriuki, 2021). Various methods are used for performance evaluation, including optimization algorithms and fuzzy comprehensive methods (Habibi & Manurung, 2023). Studies have examined the impact of performance appraisal systems in different sectors, such as telecom, and across various cultural contexts (Sahay and Kaur, 2021). Performance appraisal plays a crucial role in employee productivity and organizational success in the textile industry. Studies have shown that human resource management (HRM) practices, including performance appraisal, significantly impact employee performance (Hassan, 2016). Performance appraisal serves as a tool for evaluating workers' performance while also highlighting organizational objectives and values (Jeseni and Mahesh, 2022). It provides

opportunities for increased productivity through motivation and self-realization. In the textile sector of developing countries, factors such as GDP, exchange rates, labor, capital, and technology have been found to positively influence export performance (Yoganandan, 2015). Kalaiselvan and Maheswari (2014) found that age and experience contribute to better functioning in an organization. Research conducted in Pakistan's textile industry demonstrated that HRM practices like compensation, career planning, performance appraisal, training, and employee involvement positively impact employee performance (Wright & Hassan, 2016). These findings underscore the importance of implementing effective performance appraisal systems in textile industries to enhance employee productivity and overall organizational efficiency.

Methodology

The aim and objectives of the study were 1.) to study the socio-demographic characteristics of the employees in the industry. 2.) to assess the work performance appraisal of the employees in the industry. 3.) to provide suitable suggestions to enhance the work performance of the employees in the industry. In this study, a descriptive research design was used. One hundred individuals were chosen as respondents using a systematic random selection technique out of the 200 employees in the industry that made up the study's universe. In order to get information from the respondents about their socio-demographic traits, the researcher utilized a self-prepared questionnaire. Additionally, the researcher used a self-made questionnaire to evaluate the employees' work performance responses and the scale's split-half reliability coefficient is 0.817. The SPSS package was used to analyze the data.

Results

The data presented in table 1 showed that nearly one-fifth (20 percentage) of the respondents are under 25 years old, more than one-third (42 percentage) of the respondents are between 26 and 35 years old, and more than one-third (38 percentage) of the respondents are over 36 years old. In terms of gender, over one-third (32 percentage) of the respondents are female, and over two-thirds (68 percentage) are male. There are about three-fourths (72 percentage) of the respondents who are married, and over one-fourth (28 percentage) who are not married. About half (42 percentage) of the respondents have completed high school, nearly one-third (30 percentage) have completed upper secondary education, and nearly one-fourth (28 percent) have completed a degree.

The data indicated that about two-thirds (60 percentage) of the participants have fewer than five years of experience, while over one-fourth (28 percentage) have six to ten years, and nearly one-fifth (12 percentage) have more than eleven years. Nearly two-thirds (62 percentage) of the respondents make more than Rs. 5001 each month, while more than one-third (38 percentage) make less than Rs. 5000. Over one-third (38 percentage) of the respondents work in technical fields, while nearly two-thirds (62 percentage) work in non-technical fields. More than one-fifth (22 percentage) of the respondents worked at human resource department and 12 per cent of them work in the finance department, half of them (50 percentage) work in the production department, and nearly one-fifth (16 percentage) work in the quality control department.

Additionally, Table 2 showed that nearly two-thirds (62 percentage) of respondents have a high level of awareness regarding work performance appraisal, while over one-third (38 percentage) have a low level. Nearly half (44 percentage) of respondents have a high degree of work performance appraisal in the training component, while over half (56 percentage) have a low level. Regarding the production dimension, nearly half (46 percentage) of respondents have a high degree of job performance appraisal, while over half (54 percentage) have a low level. Additionally, in terms of personal satisfaction, nearly half (42 percentage) of respondents have low levels of work performance appraisal, and more than half

(58 percentage) have high levels. When looking at overall work performance, nearly two-thirds (62 percentage) of respondents have high levels of work performance appraisal, while nearly one-third (38 percentage) have low levels.

According to Table 3, there is a significant association between respondents' age and the training, production, personal satisfaction, and overall work performance appraisal dimensions; however, there is no significant association between respondents' ages and the work performance appraisal's awareness dimension.

Table 4 shows that there is no significant difference between the respondents' gender with regard to awareness, training, production, personal happiness, and overall work performance rating characteristics.

Table 5 indicated that the overall level of job performance appraisal and marital status differ significantly, and it also suggests that the mean value of respondents who are single is higher than that of respondents who are married. Additionally, it shows that there is no discernible difference in the respondents' marital status in terms of awareness, training, production, and personal satisfaction with job performance evaluations.

According to table 6, there is no significant difference in the respondents' income levels with regard to awareness, training, productivity, personal satisfaction, and overall work performance evaluation.

Table 7 showed that the training dimension of job performance appraisal and the nature of work differ significantly, and the mean value shows that technical respondents differ from non-technical respondents to a large degree. Additionally, research shows that there are no appreciable differences between the nature of work in terms of awareness, production, personal satisfaction, and overall work performance evaluation.

According to the mean value, the respondents who have studied graduation have a high degree of variance, and Table 8 suggests that there is a substantial variation among the respondents' different educational statuses with respect to the awareness dimension of job performance appraisal. According to the training component, production dimension, personal happiness, and overall level of work performance rating, there is no discernible difference between the respondents' diverse educational backgrounds.

Regarding the awareness dimension of performance appraisal, Table 9 shows that respondents' departments differ significantly from one another. It also shows that respondents in the HR department exhibit a high degree of variation. The general level of job performance appraisal varies significantly among the respondents' departments, indicating a high degree of variation among those employed in the finance sector. Regarding the training, productivity, and personal satisfaction dimensions, there is no discernible difference between the respondents' various departments.

Discussion

Employees are the backbone of any industry without whose support and co-operation, the industry cannot attain its goals through enhanced productivity and profit. On the other hand, the employees also through continuous appraisal of the work performance will be in a position to understand their own strengths and weaknesses and be in a position to analyze their work efficiency and strengthen their integrity to accomplish their organizational goals. Thus, in industries, social work interventions are essential for raising employee performance. Enhancing well-being, resolving personal issues, and creating a supportive work environment are the main goals of these interventions. In addition to improving job performance and lowering job burnout, mindfulness-based cognitive therapy will also increase industrial

workers' engagement and well-being. Giving employees flexible scheduling can boost their output and happiness by lowering stress levels. Setting up explicit accountability procedures and giving frequent feedback to employees aids in their understanding of performance expectations. Promoting mutual feedback creates a supportive and ever-improving culture. It is important to provide competitive pay, extensive benefits, and chances for professional growth in order to foster a culture of well-being. Positive engagement with work is more likely to occur among employees who feel appreciated. Employees' interpersonal relationships can be strengthened by facilitating social group work.

Suggestions

It is suggested that face-to-face interaction could be facilitated among the employees to understand their perceptions about work performance appraisal and the strategy to be incorporated to enhance the performance of the employees. On-the-job training has to be organized for the employees to share their opinion and to upgrade their skills and abilities in the trade. Recreation tours could be organized to refresh the monotonous work undertaken by the employees and to instill new thoughts to reach greater heights in future. An inclusive work environment has to be created to enable the employees to feel that they are valued and supported in the industry. Continuous performance appraisal has to be conducted and feedback from employees at 360 degrees could be obtained about performance appraisal and it has to be included in the appraisal system so as to create a conducive atmosphere for the employees to enhance their productivity and contribute for the attainment of organizational goals.

Conclusion

Through better communication, acknowledgment, and alignment with corporate objectives, performance reviews boost organizational effectiveness while also significantly improving employee performance, engagement, and growth. These assessments must be carried out on a regular basis in order to develop an engaged and productive staff.

Limitations & Scope for Future Research

The Present study focused only on work performance appraisal of employees working in an industry at Karur and the sample size is also small in numbers. So it could be taken for large number of Industries with more respondents. The future research can focus on work performance appraisal in relation to quality of work, time duration taken for completion of work, efficiency of employees and self-reliance of the workers in relation to work performance appraisal.

Acknowledgement

We thank the department of social work for their support and encouragement

References

- Agyare, R., Mensah, L., Aidoo, Z., & Ansah, I. O. (2016). Impacts of performance appraisal on employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A case of microfinance institutions in Ghana. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 11(9), 281-297.
- Attipoe, W. E., Agordzo, G. K., & Seddoh, M. J. E. (2021). Effect of performance appraisal system on employee productivity (selected public senior high schools, Ho Municipality, Ghana). *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 12(2), 1-14.

- Dauda, Y. (2018). A review of performance appraisal systems in different countries: The UK, India, South Africa, and Ghana. *International Journal of Applied Environmental Sciences*, 13(2), 203-221.
- Habibi, R., & Manurung, A. G. R. (2023). SLR systematic literature review: Metode penilaian kinerja karyawan menggunakan human performance technology. *Journal of Applied Computer Science and Technology*, 4(2), 100-107.
- Hassan, S. (2016). Impact of HRM practices on employee's performance. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 6(1), 15-22.
- Ismail, A. I., Majid, A. H. A., Jibrin-Bida, M., & Joarder, M. H. R. (2021). Moderating effect of management support on the relationship between HR practices and employee performance in Nigeria. *Global Business Review*, 22(1), 132-150.
- do Carmo Lameque, I., Velez, M. J. P., & Botelho, C. M. D. A. (2023). Purposes of performance appraisal: A systematic review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, 8(7), 40.
- Jeseni, P. V., & Mahesh, V. (2022). Performance appraisal of employees in textile industries in Kozhikode. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results*, 1905-1910.
- Kalaiselvan, S., & Maheswari, K. (2014). A case analysis of employee engagement in Sakthi Dairy in Pollachi, Tamil Nadu. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 19(1), 34-36.
- Rajeswari, D. S., Maheswari, D. K., & Sumathi, D. S. (2024). Assessment of socioeconomic conditions and marital adjustment among the working women in Trichy. *Migration Letters*, 21(S7), 519-528.
- Sahay, U., & Kaur, G. (2021). A systematic review of the impact of performance appraisal systems and competency management framework on the performance of employees in the telecom sector. *Psychology and Education*, 58(1), 2515-2531.
- Sridhar, R., & Elangovan, N. (2019). Perception and its impact on satisfaction on performance appraisal in the real estate industry in South India. *Asian Review of Social Sciences*, 8(S1), 60-63.
- Wright, B. E., Hassan, S., & Park, J. (2016). Does a public service ethic encourage ethical behaviour? Public service motivation, ethical leadership and the willingness to report ethical problems. *Public Administration*, 94(3), 647-663.
- Yoganandan, G., & Divya, R. (2015). Effectiveness of performance appraisal system in Seshasayee Paper and Boards limited, Erode. *International Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research*, 3(2), 71-77.
- Zerfu, T. A., Griffiths, P., Macharia, T., Kamande, E. W., Anono, E., Kiige, L., ... & Kimani-Murage, E. W. (2021). Communities and employers show a high level of preparedness in supporting working mothers to combine breastfeeding with work in rural Kenya. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, 17(4), e13180.

Table 1 Socio Demographic Variables of the Respondents

Sl.No	Variables	Number of Respondents (n=100)	Percentage of Respondents
1	Age wise distribution		
	Below 25 years	20	20
	26 to 35 years	42	42
	36 years and above	38	38
2	Gender wise distribution		
	Male	68	68
	Female	32	32
3	Marital Status		
	Married	72	72
	Unmarried	28	28
4	Educational Status		
	High School	42	42
	Higher Secondary	28	28
	Degree	30	30
5	Experience of work		
	Less than 5 years	60	60
	6 to 10 years	28	28
	11 years and above	12	12
6	Salary wise		
	Below Rs.5000	38	38
	Rs.5001 and above	62	62
7	Nature of Employment		
	Technical	38	38
	Non-Technical	62	62
8	Department wise Distribution		
	HR	22	22
	Finance	12	12
	Production	50	50
	Quality Control	16	16

Table 2 Distribution of the Respondents by Work Performance Appraisal

Sl.No	Variables	Number of Respondents (n=100)	Percentage of Respondents
1	Awareness Dimension		
	Low	38	38
	High	62	62
2	Training Dimension		
	Low	56	56
	High	44	44
3	Production Dimension		
	Low	54	54
	High	46	46
4	Personal Satisfaction		
	Low	42	42
	High	58	58
5	Overall Performance Appraisal		
	Low	38	38
	High	62	62

Table 3 Association between Age and Various Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal

Sl.No	Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal	Age of the Respondents		Statistical Inference
		Low	High	
1	Awareness Dimension			$X^2=0.582$
	Below 25 years	8	12	$P>0.05$
	26 to 35 years	18	24	Not Significant
	36 years and above	12	26	
2	Training Dimension			
	Below 25 years	06	14	$X^2=4.552$
	26 to 35 years	24	18	$P<0.05$
	36 years and above	13	12	Significant
3	Production Dimension			
	Below 25 years	6	14	$X^2=5.455$
	26 to 35 years	24	18	$P<0.05$
	36 years and above	24	14	Significant
4	Personal Satisfaction			
	Below 25 years	8	12	$X^2=2.798$
	26 to 35 years	18	24	$P<0.05$
	36 years and above	16	22	Significant
5	Overall Work Performance Appraisal			
	Below 25 years	2	18	$X^2=4.328$
	26 to 35 years	20	22	$P<0.05$
	36 years and above	16	22	Significant

Table 4 “T” Test between Gender and Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal

Sl.No	Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal	N	Mean	SD	Statistical Inference
1	Awareness Dimension				$t = .467$
	Male	68	38.18	2.19	$P>0.05$
	Female	32	38.50	2.47	Not significant
2	Training Dimension				$t = .825$
	Male	68	42.29	2.46	$P>0.05$
	Female	32	41.69	2.33	Not significant
3	Production Dimension				$t = .441$
	Male	68	41.91	2.83	$P>0.05$
	Female	32	42.25	1.69	Not significant
4	Personal Satisfaction				$t = .481$
	Male	68	29.94	1.85	$P>0.05$
	Female	32	29.69	1.44	Not significant
5	Overall Performance Appraisal				$t = .112$
	Male	68	152.32	6.30	$P>0.05$
	Female	32	152.13	4.68	Not significant

Table 5 “T” Test between Marital Status and Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal

Sl.No	Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal	N	Mean	SD	Statistical Inference
1	Awareness Dimension				$t = 1.414$
	Married	72	38.00	2.58	$P>0.05$
	Unmarried	28	39.00	.78	Not significant
2	Training Dimension				$t = 1.394$
	Married	72	41.81	2.57	$P>0.05$
	Unmarried	28	42.86	1.83	Not significant
3	Production Dimension				$t = 1.488$

	Married	72	41.69	2.78	P>0.05
	Unmarried	28	42.86	1.35	Not significant
4	Personal Satisfaction				t = .536
	Married	72	29.78	1.91	P>0.05
	Unmarried	28	30.07	1.14	Not significant
5	Overall Performance Appraisal				t = 1.987
	Married	72	151.28	6.42	P<0.05
	Unmarried	28	154.79	2.39	significant

Table 6 “T” Test between Income Level and Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal

Sl.No	Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal	N	Mean	SD	Statistical Inference
1	Awareness Dimension				t = .939
	Below Rs.5000	38	37.89	2.55	P>0.05
	Rs.5001 and above	62	38.52	2.08	Not significant
2	Training Dimension				t = 1.074
	Below Rs.5000	38	41.63	2.43	P>0.05
	Rs.5001 and above	62	42.39	2.40	Not significant
3	Production Dimension				t = 1.827
	Below Rs.5000	38	41.21	3.19	P>0.05
	Rs.5001 and above	62	42.52	1.87	Not significant
4	Personal Satisfaction				t = .445
	Below Rs.5000	38	30.00	2.21	P>0.05
	Rs.5001 and above	62	29.77	1.38	Not significant
5	Overall Performance Appraisal				t = 1.474
	Below Rs.5000	38	150.74	6.70	P>0.05
	Rs.5001 and above	62	153.19	5.03	Not significant

Table 7 “T” Test between Nature of Work and Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal

Sl.No	Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal	N	Mean	SD	Statistical Inference
1	Awareness Dimension				t = .551
	Technical	38	38.05	1.84	P>0.05
	Non-Technical	62	38.42	2.51	Not significant
2	Training Dimension				t = 3.159
	Technical	38	43.37	1.70	P<0.05
	Non-Technical	62	41.32	2.48	Significant
3	Production Dimension				t = 1.000
	Technical	38	42.47	2.22	P>0.05
	Non-Technical	62	41.74	2.67	Not significant
4	Personal Satisfaction				t = .614
	Technical	38	30.05	1.71	P>0.05
	Non-Technical	62	29.74	1.75	Not significant
5	Overall Performance Appraisal				t = 1.641
	Technical	38	153.95	2.95	P>0.05
	Non-Technical	62	151.23	6.82	Not significant

Table 8 One Way Anova between Educational Status with Regard to Various Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal

Sl.No	Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal	Df	SS	MS	Mean	Statistical Inferences
1	Awareness Dimension				G1=38.00	F=2.239
	Between Groups	4	21.93	10.96	G2=37.64	P<0.05
	Within Groups	94	230.14	4.89	G3=39.27	Significant
2	Training Dimension				G1=41.95	F=.468
	Between Groups	4	5.59	2.79	G2=41.79	P>0.05
	Within Groups	94	280.91	5.97	G3=42.60	Not Significant
3	Production Dimension				G1=41.86	F=.757
	Between Groups	4	9.64	4.82	G2=41.57	P>0.05
	Within Groups	94	293.33	6.36	G3=42.67	Not Significant
4	Personal Satisfaction				G1=29.90	F=0.19
	Between Groups	4	0.120	0.06	G2=29.79	P>0.05
	Within Groups	94	145.90	3.10	G3=29.87	Not Significant
5	Overall work performance				G1=151.71	F=1.612
	Between Groups	4	105.37	52.68	G2=150.79	P>0.05
	Within Groups	94	1536.24	32.68	G3=154.40	Not Significant

G1= High school

G2= Higher Secondary school

G3=Graduation

Table 9 One Way Anova between Departments With Regard To Various Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal

Sl.No	Dimensions of Work Performance Appraisal	Df	SS	MS	Mean	Statistical Inferences
1	Awareness Dimension				G1=39.36	F=2.106
	Between Groups	6	30.44	10.14	G2=39.33	P<0.05
	Within Groups	92	221.63	4.81	G3=37.64	Significant
					G4=38.00	
2	Training Dimension				G1=42.64	F=.542
	Between Groups	6	9.78	3.26	G2=42.67	P>0.05
	Within Groups	92	276.71	6.01	G3=41.96	Not Significant
					G4=41.38	
3	Production Dimension				G1=43.09	F=1.638
	Between Groups	6	29.82	9.94	G2=42.33	P>0.05
	Within Groups	92	279.15	6.06	G3=41.28	Not Significant
					G4=42.63	
4	Personal Satisfaction				G1=29.64	F=1.468
	Between Groups	6	12.76	4.25	G2=31.00	P>0.05
	Within Groups	92	133.26	2.89	G3=29.92	Not Significant
					G4=29.13	
5	Overall work performance				G1=154.73	F=1.982
	Between Groups	6	187.23	62.41	G2=155.33	P<0.05
	Within Groups	92	1454.39	31.61	G3=150.80	Significant
					G4=151.13	

G1= HR

G2=Finance

G3=Production

G4=Quality control

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).