INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, IT & MANAGEMENT

IJRCM

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, IT & MANAGEMENT ii

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed (Refereed/Juried) Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

http://ijrcm.org.in/

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to the recent developments & practices in the areas of Computer Science & Applications; Commerce; Business; Finance; Marketing; Human Resource Management; General Management; Banking; Economics; Tourism Administration & Management; Education; Law; Library & Information Science; Defence & Strategic Studies; Electronic Science; Corporate Governance; Industrial Relations; and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Rural Economics; Co-operation; Demography: Development Planning; Development Studies; Applied Economics; Development Economics; Business Economics; Monetary Policy; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Political Science; Continuing Education; Labour Welfare; Philosophy; Psychology; Sociology; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law; Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labour Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; International Relations; Human Rights & Duties; Public Administration; Population Studies; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism & Hospitality; Transportation Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic; Web Design and emerging paradigms in allied subjects.

Anybody can submit the **soft copy** of unpublished novel; original; empirical and high quality **research work**/**manuscript** <mark>*anytime*</mark> in *M.S. Word format* after preparing the same as per our **GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION**; at our email address i.e. infoijrcm@gmail.com or online by clicking the link **online submission** as given on our website (*FOR ONLINE SUBMISSION, CLICK HERE*).

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1.   <mark>**COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION**</mark>:

                                                                                 DATED: _____

THE EDITOR

IJRCM

Subject: **SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF** _____.

(<mark>**e.g. Finance/Mkt./HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify**</mark>)

DEAR SIR/MADAM

Please find my submission of manuscript titled '_____' for likely publication in one of your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published anywhere in any language fully or partly, nor it is under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the co-authors of this manuscript have seen the submitted version of the manuscript and have agreed to inclusion of their names as co-authors.

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal. The Journal has discretion to publish our contribution in any of its journals.

NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR	:
Designation/Post*	:
Institution/College/University with full address & Pin Code	:
Residential address with Pin Code	:
Mobile Number (s) with country ISD code	:
Is WhatsApp or Viber active on your above noted Mobile Number (Yes/No)	:
Landline Number (s) with country ISD code	:
E-mail Address	:
Alternate E-mail Address	:
Nationality	:

* i.e. Alumnus (Male Alumni), Alumna (Female Alumni), Student, Research Scholar (M. Phil), Research Scholar (Ph. D.), JRF, Research Assistant, Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Junior Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor, Senior Assistant Professor, Co-ordinator, Reader, Associate Professor, Professor, Head, Vice-Principal, Dy. Director, Principal, Director, Dean, President, Vice Chancellor, Industry Designation **etc**. *The qualification of author is not acceptable for the purpose.*

NOTES:

a) The whole manuscript has to be in *ONE MS WORD FILE* only, which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript. *pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration*.

b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN of the mail**:

   New Manuscript for Review in the area of (e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)

c) There is no need to give any text in the body of the mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any **specific message** w.r.t. to the manuscript.

d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is expected to be below **1000 KB**.

e) Only the **Abstract will not be considered for review** and the author is required to submit the **complete manuscript** in the first instance.

f) *The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email within twenty-four hours* and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of the manuscript, within two days of its submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending a separate mail to the journal.

g) The author (s) name or details should not appear anywhere on the body of the manuscript, except on the covering letter and the cover page of the manuscript, in the manner as mentioned in the guidelines.

2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be typed in **bold letters**, **centered** and **fully capitalised**.

3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** Author (s) **name**, **designation**, **affiliation** (s), **address**, **mobile/landline number** (s), and **email/alternate email address** should be given underneath the title.

4. **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:** Acknowledgements can be given to reviewers, guides, funding institutions, etc., if any.

5. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in **fully Italic printing**, ranging between **150** to **300 words**. The abstract must be informative and elucidating the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a **SINGLE PARA**. *Abbreviations must be mentioned in full*.

6. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of **five**. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stop at the end. All words of the keywords, including the first one should be in small letters, except special words e.g. name of the Countries, abbreviations etc.

7. **JEL CODE:** Provide the appropriate Journal of Economic Literature Classification System code (s). JEL codes are available at www.aeaweb.org/econlit/jelCodes.php. However, mentioning of JEL Code is not mandatory.

8. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in *BRITISH ENGLISH* prepared on a standard A4 size *PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER*. *It should be free from any errors i.e. grammatical, spelling or punctuation. It must be thoroughly edited at your end*.

9. **HEADINGS:** All the headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.

10. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.

11. **MAIN TEXT**:

THE MAIN TEXT SHOULD FOLLOW THE FOLLOWING SEQUENCE:

INTRODUCTION

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

OBJECTIVES

HYPOTHESIS (ES)

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

FINDINGS

RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS

CONCLUSIONS

LIMITATIONS

SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

REFERENCES

APPENDIX/ANNEXURE

The manuscript should preferably be in *2000 to 5000 WORDS*, But the limits can vary depending on the nature of the manuscript.

12. **FIGURES & TABLES**: These should be simple, crystal **CLEAR**, **centered**, **separately numbered** & self-explained, and the **titles must be above the table/figure**. **Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure**. *It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.*

13. **EQUATIONS/FORMULAE**: These should be consecutively numbered in parenthesis, left aligned with equation/formulae number placed at the right. The equation editor provided with standard versions of Microsoft Word may be utilised. If any other equation editor is utilised, author must confirm that these equations may be viewed and edited in versions of Microsoft Office that does not have the editor.

14. **ACRONYMS**: These should not be used in the abstract. The use of acronyms is elsewhere is acceptable. Acronyms should be defined on its first use in each section e.g. Reserve Bank of India (RBI). Acronyms should be redefined on first use in subsequent sections.

15. **REFERENCES**: The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. ***The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript*** and they may follow Harvard Style of Referencing. **Also check to ensure that everything that you are including in the reference section is duly cited in the paper**. The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:

- All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.

- Use (**ed.**) for one editor, and (**ed.s**) for multiple editors.

- When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc., in chronologically ascending order.

- Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.

- The title of books and journals should be in italic printing. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.

- For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parenthesis.

- *Headers, footers, endnotes* and *footnotes* should **not be used** in the document. However, **you can mention short notes to elucidate some specific point**, which may be placed in number orders before the references.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:

BOOKS

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.

- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19–23

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

ONLINE RESOURCES

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

WEBSITES

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp

OPINION DIFFERENCE OF TEACHERS ON EXISTING PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PRACTICES IN PRIVATE ENGINEERING INSTITUTIONS

CHANDRA MOHAN SINGH
ASST. PROFESSOR & PH. D. RESEARCH SCHOLAR
KRUTI INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY & ENGINEERING
CHHATTISGARH SWAMI VIVEKANANDA TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
DURG

DR. ASHOK CHANDRA
SR. ASST. PROFESSOR
BHILAI INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
DURG

DR. SANJAY SHARMA
PROFESSOR
BHILAI INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
DURG

ABSTRACT

The content and pedagogy is continuously changing in higher education especially engineering study and this makes updating of engineering teachers very crucial. Teachers need to do this by themselves but there is chance of reduction of quality and standard. To overcome this, institutions must take its initiation. For this, the first step is of course the performance appraisal and later the training and development with help of knowledge management. This paper takes performance appraisal factor for study. The teaching staffs in engineering institutions are categorized gender wise and designation wise. The teachers were asked to evaluate the present performance appraisal practices in their colleges through structured and closed ended questionnaire. The proportional sample is drawn through convenient sampling. The data was collected through 5 point likert scale. The opinions of respondents were derived through the two top box scores method and later using mean value. Analysis of category wise difference in opinion was carried through t – test. The findings highlight that mostly the opinion of male and female teachers were having least variance. Further, the opinion of associate professor and assistant professor are also similar. The opinion of professor as compared to associate professor and assistant professor is different. The overall findings suggest that there is very little difference of opinion of teaching staff on the existing practices of performance appraisal in private engineering institutions.

KEYWORDS
higher education, engineering teachers, performance appraisal.

1.   INTRODUCTION

Engineering colleges in Chhattisgarh is seeing its bad phase with unemployable engineering students. This is also reflected in the report of Patrika Newspaper (2017) which says that till now since 2012 around 500 engineering colleges has got permission from AICTE to close down and reasons are lack of resources and quality. Devika Singh (2016) in her report highlighted that 80 percentage of all the engineering students in India are unemployable. The reasons as put by CareerBuilder Survey **(**2015) are students lacking in various skills interpersonal skills, problem solving skills, creative thinking, team work, leadership, oral communication, research and analysis, project management, written communication etc.

Various teaching techniques from simple like lecture, workshop chalk and talk, assignment, industrial visit, brainstorming, case analysis, role play, group discussion, research projects, market surveys, simulation games (Saroja 2014) and little complex like ethno/phenomeno-graphy, grounded theory, narrative/ discourse analysis, action research (Case and Light 2011) has made the delivery sophisticated. Whether, the faculty members are equipped with these or not is the question to be evaluated so that the teachers can be trained on these if lacking.

VARIOUS ASPECTS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Until and unless the evaluation of teaching staff is done how the status will be known and later if required training on pedagogy, content etc can be given. Table 1 given below shows few aspects related to performance appraisal around which the whole study is focused.

TABLE 1: VARIOUS ASPECTS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

BENEFITS OF PA		ELEMENTS OF PA
Faculty Members Present Status		Unbiased
Base for Training		Resulted Centered
Base for Promotion		Confidential
Base for New Responsibility		Encouraging Employees
	PA	
CONDUCTION OF PA		**UTILIZATION OF RESULTS OF PA**
Performance well informed		Result Communicated
Conducted on Regular Basis		Result Discussed
Conducted in Proper Format		Suggest Ways for Improvement
Suitable Questions Asked		Result Used for Training Purpose

NEED OF THE STUDY

As suggested by AICTE, the quality is one of the reasons for above mentioned scenario and under quality, it can be the quality of teaching staff. To maintain the standard of teaching staff in continuous manner, performance appraisal (PA) is the axis. The most important HRD tools like training and development, knowledge management etc directly responsible for quality of teaching staff revolves around PA. Due to this reason the study of status of PA practices in engineering institutions becomes very crucial as other is dependent on PA. Here it is imperative to mention that recruitment and selection is also very crucial but occurs once for any teaching staff and further these staff needs to update themselves continuously as per the requirement.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This paper is part of my Ph.D. work and it has its relation with its previous paper, Existing Performance Appraisal Practices in Private Engineering Institutions: Assessment through Teachers (Singh, Chandra and Sharma, 2017). For this paper the secondary data is taken from the above mentioned paper and converted into percentage. The aspects, questions and statements are also carried from previous paper. (While checking for plagiarism, the previous paper can be left) (Under publication process in Research Journal of Management Sciences so reference can be cited later)

The study has been done in self financed engineering colleges affiliated to CSVTU and located in Chhattisgarh. The population for the study was the teaching staff of these colleges and the sample is drawn category wise from this population. The whole sample is divided into two group i.e. designation wise and gender wise.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

PA AND EMPLOYEE & ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Performance appraisal acts as axis for the development of employee in any organization. It provides base for training and development thus help employee to keep themselves updated matching with dynamic changing requirements. Many researchers in their paper have shown that PA helps employee in many ways. Akinbowale and Lourens (2013) confirmed that performance appraisal policy leads to better employee performance. Performance appraisal is also responsible for employee motivation which leads to better employee performance [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. Employees' performance improvement is the united outcome of PA as well as training [13, 14] Femi (2013) advocated that right performance appraisal way with rational and clear approach results into improvement in performance [15]. Iqbal (2013) stated that strategic performance appraisal can improve the employees' inspiration, abilities and performance. [12]. Thus, it can be concluded that there is benefit of PA.

Various aspects of PA to be studied and the opinion about which is to be known and later analyzed are collected through various research papers. Details of the same are as follows:

TABLE 2

Factors	Authors
Performance appraisal shows where faculty members (FM) stands on performance	Bintu, Diriba
Performance appraisal provides base for training of FM	Khanam, Bintu, Adofo
Performance appraisal provides base for incentives of FM	Bintu, Adofo
Performance appraisal provides base for new responsibilities to FM	Bintu, Decheb
Performance standard is well informed	Khanam, Daoanis, Elverfeldt
Performance appraisal is conducted on regular basis	Bintu, Adofo, Diriba, Elverfeldt
Performance appraisal is conducted in proper format	Diriba
Performance appraisal is conducted with suitable questions	Bintu, Daoanis
Performance appraisal is use to be unbiased	Bintu, Daoanis, Diriba, Decheb, Elverfeldt
Performance appraisal is use to be result centred	Daoanis, Diriba
Performance appraisal is designed to motivate/encouraging FM	Daoanis, Diriba, Decheb, Elverfeldt
Performance appraisal result is always communicated to FM	Bintu, Adofo, Daoanis, Diriba
Performance appraisal result is discussed with FM	Daoanis, Diriba, Decheb
Performance appraisal result is used to provide ways for improved performance	Khanam, Diriba, Decheb, Elverfeldt
Performance appraisal result is used for training	Khanam, Bintu, Elverfeldt

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Objectives provide direction to any work. The objective guides about the sample to be chosen and data to be collected. The main objective of the study is to compare the difference in opinion between the three combinations of teaching staff i.e. professor vs. associate professor, professor vs. assistant professor and between associate professor and assistant professor on various aspects of performance appraisal practices in their institutions and later see the category wise variance between their opinions. Further, the study is to be done for between male and female teaching staff.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this study the research design is descriptive one. Professor, associate professor and assistant professor teaching in private engineering colleges affiliated to CSVTU, Bhilai makes the population. Opinion of 263 respondents was taken as primary source for data. Sample includes 11 (7M, 4F) are Professor, 30 (20M, 10F) are Associate Professor and 222 (140M, 82F) are Assistant Professor. Convenient sampling is used for data collection. Individual email is used for filling the close ended questionnaire. Incomplete were sent again for completion anthus 263 fully filled questionnaires were ready for analysis. Five point likert scale with Strongly Agree (**SA**)= 5, Agree (**A**)= 4, Neutral (**N**)= 3, Disagree (**DA**)= 2 and Strongly Disagree (**SDA**)= 1 options was used to know the views of respondents.

Secondary source i.e. CSVTU website (seniority list) provided the details of population figure both designation and gender wise. Various aspects of PA were found through various research papers and books. Four aspects of PA is taken for study namely, benefits of PA, conduction of PA, elements of PA, and utilization of PA results. Four questions separately were asked related to each four aspects. The questions are:

Statement 1: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits (As per general perception)
Question PA1_1: Performance appraisal shows where faculty members stand on performance
Question PA1_2: Performance appraisal provides base for training of faculty members
Question PA1_3: Performance appraisal provides base for promotion of faculty members
Question PA1_4: Performance appraisal provides base for new/potential responsibility to faculty

Statement 2: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner
Question PA2_1: Performance standard is well informed at in beginning
Question PA2_2: Performance appraisal is conducted on regular basis
Question PA2_3: Performance appraisal is conducted in proper format
Question PA2_4: Performance appraisal is conducted with suitable questions

Statement 3: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal
Question PA3_1: Performance appraisal is use to be unbiased
Question PA3_2: Performance appraisal is use to be result-centred
Question PA3_3: Performance appraisal is kept confidential
Question PA3_4: Performance appraisal is designed for encouraging employees

Statement 4: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized
Question PA4_1: Performance appraisal result is always communicated to faculty member
Question PA4_2: Performance appraisal result is discussed with faculty member
Question PA4_3: Performance appraisal result is used to provide ways for improved performance
Question PA4_4: Performance appraisal result is used for training of faculty member

Opinions of teachers were taken about the above mentioned sixteen (16) questions and later it was reduced to four (4) final opinions each related to one aspect of PA. Four questions under each statement are combined. Designation wise twelve (12) and gender wise four (4) opinions is formed. To form opinions, top two box scores methods as well as mean values method were used. Top two box scores method in 5 point likert scale includes strongly agree and agree opinions. If the major percentage of opinions comes under this, then the questions can be taken as positive answer and can be taken as opinions. In a study by Markillie (2012), top two box scores method is used to measure the attitudes of maker of hardware innovations using multiple questions. Again, Employers Survey (2012) of Workplace Health, Safety and Compensation Commission of Newfoundland & Labrador in its final report also used Top-2 box scores to find the proportion of employers, completely or mostly satisfied analysing data collected on 5 point satisfaction scale.

Later, there was need to know whether professor, associate professor and assistant professor groups are having similar opinion or differ. Also male and female teacher's groups' opinion difference was required to find out. Thus, designation wise twelve (12) and gender wise four (4) hypotheses were formed to be tested. These hypotheses are as follows:

Statement 1: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits (As per general perception)

H1_1: Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits.

H1_2: Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits.

H1_3: Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits.

H1_4: Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits.

Statement 2: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner

H2_1: Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner.

H2_2: Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner.

H2_3: Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner.

H2_4: Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner.

Statement 3: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal

H3_1: Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal.

H3_2: Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal.

H3_3: Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal.

H3_4: Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal.

Statement 4: **Pe**rformance appraisal result is properly utilized

H4_1: Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized.

H4_2: Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized.

H4_3: Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized.

H4_4: Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized.

The standard deviation of each question, designation and gender wise is calculated using SPSS 24 version. Later variance for two independent samples is calculated and at the last t-test is conducted through SPSS. All the hypotheses were tested at significance level of 5% i.e. 0.05.

5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

First of all, the reliability of the data set is verified by calculating Cronbach's Alpha using SPSS 24 version and found to be reliable.

Below, in tables, the observed data is given in percentage separately statement wise, under this then category wise (designation and gender) and under this question wise.

Later using top two box scores method for each question and calculating mean value of all four questions, the statement are converted into either agreeing or disagreeing opinions, designation wise – professor group, associate professor group, and assistant professor and also gender wise – male teacher group and female teacher group.

The mean value of each question calculated separately by SPSS also further helps in confirming the status of opinions category wise.

Statement wise analysis is presented below one by one.

Statement 1: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits (As per general perception)

TABLE 3

PA1	Reliability Statistics	Cronbach's Alpha	.994	N of Items	4

The value of Cronbach's Alpha shows the reliability of the data collected. Majority of authors opined that 0.70 and greater value of reliability coefficient is considered to be reliable although there is no as such predetermined standard. The value here is 0.994 which shows that data stands good on reliability.

The mean values of responses of all 263 respondents calculated by SPSS for each question of first statement are given below:

TABLE 4

Reliability Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PA1_1	4.1901	.39314	263
PA1_2	4.1749	.38061	263
PA1_3	4.1901	.39314	263
PA1_4	4.1901	.39314	263
Overall	**4.1863**	**.39001**	**263**

Zaidatol & Bagheri (2009) suggested that the mean value of responses given in five point likert scale with strongly agree=5, agree=4, neutral=3, disagree=2 and strongly agree=1 if comes under 3.39 then it is taken as low, from 3.40 to 3.79 as moderate and more than 3.8 as high[16]. This criteria is used by Zaidatol and Hisyamuddin (2009), Zaidatol and Bagheri (2011), Wogari (2016) in their study[17, 18, 19]. Here the overall mean value i.e. 4.19 being more than 3.8 is high suggesting overall response agreeing to the statement: Performance appraisal results in various benefits. The overall standard deviation value i.e. 0.39 suggests very less variance among the opinions of the entire sample.

Top two box scores and its mean values:

OVERALL

TABLE 5

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA1_1	19.01	80.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	263	100
PA1_2	17.49	82.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	263	100
PA1_3	19.01	80.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	263	100
PA1_4	19.01	80.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	263	100
Mean Value							**100**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the overall respondents as a group agree on statement: Performance appraisal results in various benefits.

PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 6

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA1_1	36.36	63.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	11	100
PA1_2	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11	100
PA1_3	36.36	63.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	11	100
PA1_4	36.36	63.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	11	100
Mean Value							**100**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the professor group **agrees** on statement: Performance appraisal results in various benefits.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 7

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA1_1	30.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30	100
PA1_2	30.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30	100
PA1_3	30.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30	100
Pa1_4	30.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30	100
Mean Value							**100**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the associate professor group **agrees** on statement: Performance appraisal results in various benefits.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 8

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA1_1	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	222	100
PA1_2	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	222	100
PA1_3	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	222	100
Pa1_4	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	222	100
Mean Value							**100**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the assistant professor group **agrees** on statement: Performance appraisal results in various benefits.

MALE TEACHERS GROUP

TABLE 9

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA1_1	17.96	82.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	167	100
PA1_2	16.77	83.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	167	100
PA1_3	17.96	82.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	167	100
Pa1_4	17.96	82.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	167	100
Mean Value							**100**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the male teacher group **agrees** on statement: Performance appraisal results in various benefits.

FEMALE TEACHERS GROUP

TABLE 10

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA1_1	20.83	79.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	96	100
PA1_2	18.75	81.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	96	100
PA1_3	20.83	79.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	96	100
Pa1_4	20.83	79.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	96	100
Mean Value							**100**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the female teacher group **agrees** on statement: Performance appraisal results in various benefits.
The data given below is of professors and associate professors.

TABLE 11

Group Statistics						Independent Samples Test				
	Designa-tion	N	Mean	Std. Devia-tion				Levene's Test for Equality of Var-iances		t-test for Equality of Means
								F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA1AVG	Professor	11	4.2727	.37839		PA1AVG	Equal variances as-sumed	1.497	.229	.863
	Asso. Professor	30	4.3000	.46609			Equal variances not as-sumed			.850

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against professor and associate professor can be considered to be high and at the same time as the mean value of professor group (4.27) is less than associate group (4.30), it can be said that professor group has little weak opinion than associate professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are not very far from each other on variance.

T-test is used here to find the difference between the mean values of two independent data values with significance value.05 (5% significance level). There are two values of sig. (2-tailed) and to decide which one is applicable, the sig. value (.229) in Levene's Test for Equality Variances is compared with value.05. if the sig. value is greater than .05 then the value of upper row is taken, here it is.863 otherwise if is lower than.05 then lower row value is taken which is.850 here.

Now to accept or reject the hypothesis, the p-value i.e. sig. (2-tailed) is compared with significance level value i.e. .05. If the p-value is greater than.05 then the hypothesis is accepted else rejected. Here p-value.863 is greater than.05 so the hypothesis, Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regard-ing the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of professor group and associate professor group.

The data given below is of professors and assistant professors.

TABLE 12

Group Statistics						Independent Samples Test				
	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Devia-tion				Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
								F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA1AVG	Professor	11	4.2727	.37839		PA1AVG	Equal variances as-sumed	.843	.360	.359
	Asstt. Pro-fessor	222	4.1667	.37352			Equal variances not as-sumed			.383

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against professor and assistant professor can be considered to be high and at the same time as the mean value of professor (4.27) is more than assistant professor (4.17). It can be said that professor has strong opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are almost near to each other on variance.

Either of the p-value.359 and.383 is greater than.05 and thus hypothesis, Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of professor and assistant professor. The data given below is of <u>associate professors and assistant professors</u>.

TABLE 13

Group Statistics						Independent Samples Test				
	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Devia-tion				Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
								F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA1 AVG	Asso. Profes-sor	30	4.3000	.46609		PA1AVG	Equal variances as-sumed	9.084	.003	.077
	Asstt. Pro-fessor	222	4.1667	.37352			Equal variances not as-sumed			.142

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against associate professor and assistant professor can be considered to be high and at the same time as the mean value of associate professor (4.30) is more than assistant professor (4.17). It can be said that associate professor has strong opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are not far from each other on variance.

Either of the p-value.077 and.142 is greater than.05 and thus hypothesis, Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of associate professor and assistant professor. The data given below is of <u>male and female teachers</u>.

TABLE 14

Group Statistics						Independent Samples Test				
	Gen-der	N	Mean	Std. Devia-tion				Levene's Test for Equality of Var-iances		t-test for Equality of Means
								F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA1 AVG	Male	167	4.1766	.37955		PA1AVG	Equal variances as-sumed	1.063	.303	.594
	Fe-male	96	4.2031	.39953			Equal variances not as-sumed			.599

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against male teachers group and female teachers group can be considered to be high and at the same time as the mean value of male teachers group (4.17) is less than female teachers group group (4.20), it can be said that male teachers group has little weak opinion than female teachers group. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are near to each other on variance.

Either of the p-value.594 and.599 is greater than.05 and thus hypothesis, Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of male teachers group and female teachers group.

Statement 2: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner

TABLE 15

PA2	Reliability Statistics	Cronbach's Alpha	.712	N of Items	4

The value here is 0.712 which shows that data stands good on reliability as it is greater than 0.70.

The mean values of responses of all 263 respondents calculated by SPSS for each question of second statement are given below:

TABLE 16: RELIABILITY STATISTICS

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PA2_1	1.9049	.29385	263
PA2_2	2.2966	.62660	263
PA2_3	2.1673	.55478	263
PA2_4	2.1673	.55478	263
Overall	**2.1340**	**0.50750**	**263**

The overall mean value i.e. 2.13 which is less than 3.39 and thus is low suggesting overall response disagreeing to the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner. The standard deviation values suggest very less variance for each statement among the overall sample.

OVERALL

TABLE 17

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA2_1	0.00	0.00	0.00	90.49	9.51	263	0.00
PA2_2	0.00	9.13	11.41	79.47	0.00	263	9.13
PA2_3	0.00	8.37	0.00	91.63	0.00	263	8.37
PA2_4	0.00	8.37	0.00	91.63	0.00	263	8.37
Mean Value							6.46

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the overall respondents as a group agree on statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner.

PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 18

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA2_1	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	11	0.00
PA2_2	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	11	0.00
PA2_3	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	11	0.00
PA2_4	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	11	0.00
Mean Value							**0.00**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the professor group disagrees on statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 19

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA2_1	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	30	0.00
PA2_2	0.00	16.67	10.00	73.33	0.00	30	16.67
PA2_3	0.00	10.00	0.00	90.00	0.00	30	10.00
PA2_4	0.00	10.00	0.00	90.00	0.00	30	10.00
Mean Value							**9.17**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the associate professor group disagrees on statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 20

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA2_1	0.00	0.00	0.00	88.74	11.26	222	0.00
PA2_2	0.00	8.56	12.16	79.28	0.00	222	8.56
PA2_3	0.00	8.56	0.00	91.44	0.00	222	8.56
PA2_4	0.00	8.56	0.00	91.44	0.00	222	8.56
Mean Value							**6.42**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the assistant professor group disagrees on statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner.

MALE TEACHERS GROUP

TABLE 21

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA2_1	0.00	0.00	0.00	89.82	10.18	167	0.00
PA2_2	0.00	9.58	11.38	79.04	0.00	167	9.58
PA2_3	0.00	7.19	0.00	92.81	0.00	167	7.19
PA2_4	0.00	7.19	0.00	92.81	0.00	167	7.19
Mean Value							**5.99**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the male teacher group disagrees on statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner.

FEMALE TEACHERS GROUP

TABLE 22

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA2_1	0.00	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	96	0.00
PA2_2	0.00	8.33	11.46	80.21	0.00	96	8.33
PA2_3	0.00	10.42	0.00	89.58	0.00	96	10.42
PA2_4	0.00	10.42	0.00	89.58	0.00	96	10.42
Mean Value							**7.29**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the female teacher group disagrees on statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner.

The data given below is of <u>professors and associate professors</u>.

TABLE 23

Group Statistics				
	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Devia-tion
	Professor	11	2.0000	.00000
PA2 AVG	Asso. Pro-fessor	30	2.2083	.45996

Independent Samples Test					
			Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
			F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA2AVG	Equal variances as-sumed		8.789	.005	.144
	Equal variances not as-sumed				.019

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against professor and associate professor can be considered to be low and at the same time as the overall mean value of professor group (2.00) is less than associate group (2.20), it can be said that professor group has little weak opinion than associate professor. The standard deviation values show that the two groups are quite far from each other on variance. The professor group has no standard deviation.
Under T-test, the sig. value (.005) in Levene's Test for Equality Variances is compared with significance level value.05. The value is less than.05 and so lower row sig. (2-tailed).019 is taken. Now as the value.019 is lower than value.05 so the hypothesis, Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner, is rejected which means there is significant difference between opinion of professor group and associate group.

The data given below is of <u>professors and assistant professors</u>.

TABLE 24

Group Statistics				
	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Devia-tion
	Professor	11	2.0000	.00000
PA2 AVG	Asstt. Profes-sor	222	2.1306	.38029

Independent Samples Test					
			Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
			F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA2AVG	Equal variances as-sumed		6.322	.013	.257
	Equal variances not as-sumed				.000

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against professor and assistant professor is low and at the same time as the overall mean value of professor (2.00) is less than assistant professor (2.13). It can be said that professor has little weak opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation values for professor in 0.00 showing that there is no deviation. There is huge variance between the opinion of professor and assistant professor.
Under T-test, the sig. value (.013) in Levene's Test for Equality Variances is compared with significance level value.05. The value is less than.05 and so lower row sig. (2-tailed).000 is taken. Now as the value.000 is lower than value.05 so the hypothesis, Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner, is rejected which means there is significant difference between opinion of professor and assistant professor.

The data given below is of <u>associate professors and assistant professors</u>.

TABLE 25

Group Statistics				
	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Devia-tion
PA2 AVG	Asso Profes-sor	30	2.2083	.45996
	Asstt. Pro-fessor	222	2.1306	.38029

Independent Samples Test					
			Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
			F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA2AVG	Equal variances as-sumed		1.607	.206	.307
	Equal variances not as-sumed				.382

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against professor and assistant professor is low and at the same time as the overall mean value of associate professor (2.21) is more than assistant professor (2.13). It can be said that associate professor has little strong opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation values.46 for associate professor and.38 for assistant professor can be said to be near thus very less variance.
Under T-test, both sig. (2-tailed) values.307 and.382 are greater than.05 thus the hypothesis, Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of associate professor and assistant professor.

The data given below is of <u>male and female teachers</u>.

TABLE 26

Group Statistics				
	Gen-der	N	Mean	Std. Devia-tion
PA2 AVG	Male	167	2.1228	.33817
	Fe-male	96	2.1536	.45214

Independent Samples Test					
			Levene's Test for Equality of Vari-ances		t-test for Equality of Means
			F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA2AVG	Equal variances as-sumed		5.210	.023	.530
	Equal variances not as-sumed				.561

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against male and female teachers can be considered to be low and at the same time as the mean value of male group and female group are very near suggesting that their opinion is almost similar. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are having very less variance.
0.530 and 0.561, either of the p-value i.e. sig. (2-tailed) is greater than.05 and thus hypothesis, Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of male group and female group.

Statement 3: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal

TABLE 27

PA3	Reliability Statistics	Cronbach's Alpha	.734	N of Items	4

The value here is 0.734 which shows that data stands good on reliability as it is greater than 0.70.

The mean values of responses of all 263 respondents calculated by SPSS for each question of third statement are given below:

TABLE 28: RELIABILITY STATISTICS

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PA3_1	2.9430	.52475	263
PA3_2	2.9430	.52475	263
PA3_3	3.3004	.75985	263
PA3_4	2.5323	.69753	263
Overall	**2.9297**	**0.62672**	**263**

The overall mean value i.e. 2.93 which is less than 3.39 and thus is low suggesting overall response disagreeing to the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal. The standard deviation values suggest very less variance for each statement among the overall sample.

OVERALL

TABLE 29

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA3_1	0.00	11.03	72.24	16.73	0.00	263	11.03
PA3_2	0.00	11.03	72.24	16.73	0.00	263	11.03
PA3_3	0.00	48.29	33.46	18.25	0.00	263	48.29
PA3_4	0.00	11.79	29.66	58.56	0.00	263	11.79
Mean Value							20.53

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the overall respondents as a group agree on statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal.

PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 30

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA3_1	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	11	0.00
PA3_2	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	11	0.00
PA3_3	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	11	0.00
PA3_4	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	11	**0.00**
Mean Value							**0.00**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the professor group disagrees on statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 31

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA3_1	0.00	16.67	66.67	16.67	0.00	30	16.67
PA3_2	0.00	16.67	66.67	16.67	0.00	30	16.67
PA3_3	0.00	56.67	26.67	16.67	0.00	30	56.67
PA3_4	0.00	20.00	26.67	53.33	0.00	30	20.00
Mean Value							**27.50**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the associate professor group disagrees on statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 32

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA3_1	0.00	10.81	71.62	17.57	0.00	222	10.81
PA3_2	0.00	10.81	71.62	17.57	0.00	222	10.81
PA3_3	0.00	49.55	31.08	19.37	0.00	222	49.55
PA3_4	0.00	11.26	26.58	62.16	0.00	222	11.26
Mean Value							**20.61**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the assistant professor group disagrees on statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal.

MALE TEACHERS GROUP

TABLE 33

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA3_1	0.00	10.18	73.05	16.77	0.00	167	10.18
PA3_2	0.00	10.18	73.05	16.77	0.00	167	10.18
PA3_3	0.00	48.50	32.93	18.56	0.00	167	48.50
PA3_4	0.00	12.57	29.34	58.08	0.00	167	12.57
Mean Value							**20.36**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the male teacher group disagrees on statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal.

FEMALE TEACHERS GROUP

TABLE 34

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA3_1	0.00	12.50	70.83	16.67	0.00	96	12.50
PA3_2	0.00	12.50	70.83	16.67	0.00	96	12.50
PA3_3	0.00	47.92	34.38	17.71	0.00	96	47.92
PA3_4	0.00	10.42	30.21	59.38	0.00	96	10.42
Mean Value							20.84

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the female teacher group disagrees on statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal.

The data given below is of professors and associate professors.

TABLE 35

Group Statistics

	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
PA3 AVG	**Professor**	**11**	**3.0000**	**.00000**
	Asso. Professor	**30**	**3.0167**	**.49101**

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA3AVG	Equal variances assumed	19.659	.000	.912
	Equal variances not assumed			.854

The mean value can be said to be low. The mean value of professor group (3.00) is almost equal to that of associate professor group (3.02) meaning by there is almost equal opinion of both. There is no deviation in professor opinion and there is large variance between the opinion of professor and associate professor.

0.912 and 0.854, both the p-value i.e. sig. (2-tailed) is greater than significance level value i.e. .05 so the hypothesis, Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of professor group and associate group.

The data given below is of professors and assistant professors.

TABLE 36

Group Statistics

	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
PA3 AVG	**Professor**	**11**	3.0000	.00000
	Asstt. Professor	**222**	2.9144	.48273

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA3 AVG	Equal variances assumed	12.678	.000	.558
	Equal variances not assumed			.009

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against professor and assistant professor are low. The mean value of professor (3.00) and assistant professor (2.91) is almost equal which means both have almost equal opinion. There is no deviation against professor group. The variance of opinion between professor and assistant professor is large.

The sig. value i.e. .000 is less than significance level value i.e. .05 and thus the lower sig. (2-tailed) value i.e. .009 is to taken to test the hypothesis. As this value i.e. 0.009 is less than.05 so the hypothesis, Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal, is rejected which means there is significant difference between opinion of professor and assistant professor.

The data given below is of associate professors and assistant professors.

TABLE 37

Group Statistics

	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
PA3 AVG	**Asso Professor**	**30**	**3.0167**	**.49101**
	Asstt. Professor	**222**	**2.9144**	**.48273**

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA3 AVG	Equal variances assumed	.342	.559	.278
	Equal variances not assumed			.290

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against associate professor and assistant professor can be considered to be low and at the same time as the mean value of associate professor (3.02) is slightly more than assistant professor (2.91). It can be said that associate professor has slightly strong opinion than assistant professor. The overall standard deviation value shows that the two groups are near to each other on variance.

Either of the p-value.278 and.290 is greater than.05 and thus hypothesis, Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of associate professor and assistant professor.

The data given below is of male and female teachers.

TABLE 38

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
PA3 AVG	**Female**	96	2.5104	.68048
	Male	**167**	2.9281	.42785

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA3 AVG	Equal variances assumed	8.038	.005	.946
	Equal variances not assumed			.949

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against male and female teachers can be considered to be low and at the same time as the mean value of male group and female group is 2.93 meaning by their opinion is similar. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are near to each other on variance.

Either of the p-value 0.946 and 0.949 is greater than.05 and thus hypothesis, Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of male group and female group.

Statement 4: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized

TABLE 39

PA4	Reliability Statistics	Cronbach's Alpha	.862	N of Items	4

The value here is 0.862 which shows that data stands good on reliability as it is greater than 0.70.

The mean values of responses of all 263 respondents calculated by SPSS for each question of fourth statement are given below:

TABLE 40

Reliability Statistics	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PA4_1	2.1065	.44985	263
PA4_2	2.1369	.50597	263
PA4_3	2.1369	.50597	263
PA4_4	2.0000	.00000	263
Overall	**2.0951**	**0.36545**	**263**

The overall mean value i.e. 2.10 which is less than 3.39 and thus is low suggesting overall response disagreeing to the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized. The standard deviation values suggest very less variance for each statement among the overall sample.

OVERALL

TABLE 41

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA1_1	0.00	5.32	0.00	94.68	0.00	263	5.32
PA1_2	0.00	6.84	0.00	93.16	0.00	263	6.84
PA1_3	0.00	6.84	0.00	93.16	0.00	263	6.84
PA1_4	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	263	0.00
Mean Value							4.75

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the overall respondents as a group disagree on statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized.

PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 42

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA4_1	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	11	0.00
PA4_2	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	11	0.00
PA4_3	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	11	0.00
PA4_4	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	11	0.00
Mean Value							**0.00**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the professor group disagrees on statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 43

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA4_1	0.00	10.00	0.00	90.00	0.00	30	10.00
PA4_2	0.00	10.00	0.00	90.00	0.00	30	10.00
PA4_3	0.00	10.00	0.00	90.00	0.00	30	10.00
PA4_4	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	30	0.00
Mean Value							**7.5**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the associate professor group disagrees on statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR GROUP

TABLE 44

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA4_1	0.00	4.95	0.00	95.05	0.00	222	4.95
PA4_2	0.00	6.76	0.00	93.24	0.00	222	6.76
PA4_3	0.00	6.76	0.00	93.24	0.00	222	6.76
PA4_4	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	222	0.00
Mean Value							4.61

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the assistant professor group disagrees on statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized.

MALE TEACHERS GROUP

TABLE 45

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA4_1	0.00	5.99	0.00	94.01	0.00	167	5.99
PA4_2	0.00	7.19	0.00	92.81	0.00	167	7.19
PA4_3	0.00	7.19	0.00	92.81	0.00	167	7.19
PA4_4	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	167	0.00
Mean Value							5.09

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the male teacher group disagrees on statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized.

FEMALE TEACHERS GROUP

TABLE 46

Category	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Top 2 box Scores
PA4_1	0.00	4.17	0.00	95.83	0.00	96	4.17
PA4_2	0.00	6.25	0.00	93.75	0.00	96	6.25
PA4_3	0.00	6.25	0.00	93.75	0.00	96	6.25
PA4_4	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	96	0.00
Mean Value							**4.17**

The mean value of top two box scores suggests that the female teacher group disagrees on statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized.
The data given below is of <u>professors and associate professors</u>.

TABLE 47

Group Statistics						Independent Samples Test				
	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation				Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
								F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA4 AVG	Professor	11	2.0000	.00000		PA4 AVG	Equal variances assumed	5.886	.020	.288
	Asso. Professor	30	2.2000	.61026			Equal variances not assumed			.083

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against professor and associate professor can be considered to be low and at the same time as the mean value of professor group (2.00) is slightly less than associate group (2.20), it can be said that professor group has little weak opinion than associate professor. There is no deviation against professors' opinion. The standard deviation values show great variance between the two group opinions.
The sig. value (.020) in Levene's Test for Equality Variances is less than the value 0.05 so the lower row significance value i.e.0.083 taken which is still greater than 0.05 so the hypothesis, Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of professor group and associate group.
The data given below is of <u>professors and assistant professors</u>.

TABLE 48

Group Statistics						Independent Samples Test				
	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation				Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
								F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA4 AVG	Professor	11	2.0000	.00000		PA4 AVG	Equal variances assumed	3.541	.061	.382
	Asstt. Professor	222	2.1171	0.46907			Equal variances not assumed			.000

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against professor and assistant professor can be considered to be low and at the same time as the mean value of professor (2.00) is less than assistant professor (2.12). It can be said that professor has little less opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation values show that the two groups are far away on variance.
As the sig. value.061 is greater than.05 so the upper row p-value is to be taken. The upper row p-value.382 is greater than.05 and thus hypothesis, Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of professor and assistant professor.
The data given below is of <u>associate professors and assistant professors</u>.

TABLE 49

Group Statistics						Independent Samples Test				
	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation				Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
								F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA4 AVG	Asso Professor	30	2.1500	.45769		PA4AVG	Equal variances assumed	2.615	.107	.415
	Asstt. Professor	222	2.1261	.48611			Equal variances not assumed			.511

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against associate professor and assistant professor can be considered to be low and at the same time as the mean value of associate professor (2.15) is little more than assistant professor (2.12). It can be said that associate professor has little strong opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are near to each other on variance.
Either of the p-value.415 and.511 is greater than.05 and thus hypothesis, Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of associate professor and assistant professor.
The data given below is of <u>male and female teachers</u>.

TABLE 50

Group Statistics						Independent Samples Test				
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation				Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
								F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
PA4 AVG	Male	167	2.1317	.49701		PA4AVG	Equal variances assumed	.687	.408	.686
	Female	96	2.1041	.44421			Equal variances not assumed			.677

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against male and female teachers can be considered to be low and at the same time as the mean value of male group (2.13) is little more than female group (2.10). It can be said that male group has little strong opinion than female group. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are almost near to each other on variance.

Either of the p-value i.e. .686 and .677 is greater than .05 and thus hypothesis, Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of male group and female group.

6. DISCUSSION

This study was made to known the variance of opinion between the different groups of teachers in engineering colleges. These groups were divided into two categories namely, designation wise (professor, associate professor and assistant professor) and gender wise (male teachers and female teachers). The opinion was asked for various aspects of performance appraisal practices in their colleges. First of all, the reliability of data was checked by taking Cronbach's Alpha value. Later, the mean value and standard deviation was calculated. Further, to test the hypotheses, t-test were conducted. All these calculations are made through SPSS 24 version. Following are the category wise conclusions:

Data of all the groups (16) were found to be reliable as their values are more than 7.0.

Between Professor Group and Associate Professor Group

For PA1: The mean values are high. The professor group has little weak opinion than associate professor. The standard deviation values show that the two groups are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits, is accepted.

As shown above, for all four statements the mean values against male and female teachers can be considered to be low and at the same time as the mean value of male group (2.13) is little more than female group (2.10). It can be said that male group has little strong opinion than female group. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are almost near to each other on variance.

Either of the p-values i.e. value.686 and.677 is greater than.05 and thus hypothesis, Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of male group and female group.

7. CONCLUSIONS

This study was made to known the variance of opinion between the different groups of teachers in engineering colleges. These groups were divided into two categories namely, designation wise (professor, associate professor and assistant professor) and gender wise (male teachers and female teachers). The opinion was asked for various aspects of performance appraisal practices in their colleges. First of all, the reliability of data was checked by taking Cronbach's Alpha value. Later, the mean value and standard deviation was calculated. Further, to test the hypotheses, t-test were conducted. All these calculations are made through SPSS 24 version. Following are the category wise conclusions:

Data of all the groups (16) were found to be reliable as their values are more than 7.0.

Between Professor Group and Associate Professor Group

For PA1: The mean values are high. The professor group has little weak opinion than associate professor. The standard deviation values show that the two groups are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits, is accepted.

For PA2: The mean values re low. The professor group has little weak opinion than associate professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are quite far to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner, is rejected.

For PA3: The mean values are low. The professor and associate professor are almost equal in opinion. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are quite far to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of professor group and associate group.

For PA4: The mean values are low. The professors' opinion is little weak than associate professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups are quite far to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Professor and associate professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of professor group and associate professor group.

Between Professor Group and Assistant Professor Group

For PA1: The mean values are high. The professor has little strong opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of professor and assistant professor.

For PA2: The mean values are low. The professor has little weak opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are quite far to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner, is rejected which means there is significant difference between opinion of professor and assistant professor.

For PA3: The mean values are low. The professor and assistant professor opinions are almost same. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are quite far to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal, is rejected which means there is significant difference between opinion of professor and assistant professor.

For PA4: The mean values are low. The professor has little weak opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are quite far away from each other on variance. The hypothesis, Professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of professor and assistant professor.

Between Associate Professor Group and Assistant Professor Group

For PA1: The mean values are high. The associate professor has little strong opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of associate professor and assistant professor.

For PA2: The mean values are low. The associate professor has little strong opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of associate professor and assistant professor.

For PA3: The mean values are low. The associate professor has little strong opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of associate professor and assistant professor.

For PA4: The mean values are low. The associate professor has little strong opinion than assistant professor. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Associate professor and assistant professor do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of associate professor and assistant professor.

Between Male Teachers Group and Female Teachers Group

For PA1: The mean values are high. The opinion of male and female teachers is almost equal. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal results in various benefits, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of male group and female group.

For PA2: The mean values are low. The male and female teacher's opinion are almost similar. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance Appraisal is conducted in well manner, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of male group and female group.

For PA3: The mean values are low. The male group and female group opinions are similar. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal has elements of good performance appraisal, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of male group and female group.

For PA4: The mean values are low. The male teachers' opinion is slightly strong than female teachers'. The standard deviation value shows that the two groups' opinions are near to each other on variance. The hypothesis, Male teacher and female teacher do not differ in their opinion regarding the statement: Performance appraisal result is properly utilized, is accepted which means there is no significant difference between opinion of male group and female group.

8. FUTURE

With reference to this paper there can be future study on training & development aspect of faculty members in same pattern and also study can be on knowledge management.

9. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

1. Anonyms. (2017). Band Honge 221 Takniki Sansthan. Patrika Xpose. http,//epaper.patrika.com /1126700/Raipur-Patrika/Raipur-Patrika-News#page/29/2. Browsing Date, 6th March 2017.
2. Devika, S. (2016). Most Engineering Students in India Lack Basic Skills. Business Today. http,//www.businesstoday.in/management/career/most-engineering-students-in-india-lack-basic-skills-aspiring-minds/story/229453.html. Browsing Date, 26th February 2016.
3. Tandon A. Press Release, University Graduates Not Prepared for The Workplace, A CareerBuilder India Survey Reveals. http,//www.thecareer-muse.co.in/press-release-graduate-not-prepared-workplace/. Browsing Date, 28th July 2015.
4. Saroja, S. (2014). Effect of Teaching Pedagogy on Empowering Employability Skills in Management Education. Acme Intellects International Journal of Research in Management, Social Sciences & Technology, 1 – 7
5. Case, J. M. and Light, G. (2011). Emerging Methodologies in Engineering Education Research. Journal of Engineering Education. 100 (1), 186 – 210.
6. Akinbowale, M. A. and Lourens, M. E. (2013). Role of Performance Appraisal Policy and Its Effects on Employee Performance. European Journal of Business and Social Sciences. 2 (7), 19-26.
7. Ajitha, H. and Panchanatham, N. (2014). Impact of Performance Appraisal on Employee Motivation in New Private Sector Banks in Coimbatore City. International Research Journal of Business Management. 7 (11), 48 – 57.
8. Tahsildari, A. and Shahnaei, S. (2015). Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness by Performance Appraisal, Training, Employee Participation, and Job Definition. European Journal of Business and Management. 7 (12), 56 – 63.
9. Chaponda, N. C. (2014). The Effect of Performance Appraisal on Employee Motivation, A Survey of Slum Based Non-Governmental Organizations in Nairobi. Project Report. Chandaria School of Business. Kenya.
10. Rathi, R. and Goyal, S. (2015). Impact of Performance Appraisal on Employee's Motivation. ASM's International E-Journal on Ongoing Research in Management and IT. INCON – X 2015, 246 -255.
11. Malik, M. S. and Aslam, S. (2013). Performance Appraisal and Employee's Motivation, A Comparative Analysis of Telecom Industry of Pakistan. Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences. 33 (1), 179-189.
12. Iqbal, N. et al. (2013). Impact of Performance Appraisal on Employee's Performance Involving The Moderating Role of Motivation. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter) 3 (1), 37 – 56.
13. AL-Sinawi, A., Piawa, C. Y. and Idrisa, A. R. (2015). Factors Influencing the Employees Service Performance in Ministry of Education in Sultanate of Oman. Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences. 197, 23 – 30.
14. Mohamad, A. A., Lo, M. and La, M. K. (2009). Human Resource Practices and Organizational Performance. Incentives As Moderator. Journal of Academic Research in Economics. 1 (2) 229 – 244.
15. Femi, A. F. (2013). Perception of Performance Appraisal and Workers' Performance in Wema Bank Headquarters, Lagos. Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences 1 (4), 89-101.
16. Zaidatol, A. L. (2009). Entrepreneurship as a Career Choice: An Analysis of Entrepreneurial Self- Efficiency and Intention of University Student. European Journal of Social Science, 9(2): 338-349.
17. Zaidatol, A. L., & Hisyamuddin, H. (2009). Choice of Self-Employment Intentions Among Secondary School Students. The Journal of International Social Research. 2(9): 539-549.
18. Zaidatol, A. L., & Bagheri, A. (2011). Teachers' and Students' Entrepreneurial Selfefficacy: Implication for Effective Teaching. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 29: 1071-1080.
19. Wogari, M. (2016). Employee's Perception of Performance Based Incentive Schemes and Its Influence On Employee Productivity: The Case of Africa Village Financial Services S.C. Thesis. Addis Ababa University.

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Dear Readers

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce, IT & Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue, as well as on the journal as a whole, on our e-mail **infoijrcm@gmail.com** for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries, please feel free to contact us on our e-mail **infoijrcm@gmail.com**.

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward to an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

Academically yours

Sd/-
Co-ordinator

DISCLAIMER

The information and opinions presented in the Journal reflect the views of the authors and not of the Journal or its Editorial Board or the Publishers/Editors. Publication does not constitute endorsement by the journal. Neither the Journal nor its publishers/Editors/Editorial Board nor anyone else involved in creating, producing or delivering the journal or the materials contained therein, assumes any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information provided in the journal, nor shall they be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, consequential or punitive damages arising out of the use of information/material contained in the journal. The journal, neither its publishers/Editors/ Editorial Board, nor any other party involved in the preparation of material contained in the journal represents or warrants that the information contained herein is in every respect accurate or complete, and they are not responsible for any errors or omissions or for the results obtained from the use of such material. Readers are encouraged to confirm the information contained herein with other sources. The responsibility of the contents and the opinions expressed in this journal are exclusively of the author (s) concerned.

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

Our Other Journals