

**EXHIBIT 11.9**  
**Common**  
**Errors in the**  
**Appraisal**  
**Process**

<b>Halo error</b>	An appraiser giving favorable ratings to all job duties based on impressive performance in just one job function. For example, a rater who hates tardiness rates a prompt subordinate high across all performance dimensions exclusively because of this one characteristic.
<b>Horn error</b>	The opposite of a halo error. Downgrading an employee across all performance dimensions exclusively because of poor performance on one dimension.
<b>First impression error</b>	Developing a negative or positive opinion of an employee early in the review period and allowing that to negatively or positively influence all later perceptions of performance.
<b>Recency error</b>	The opposite of first impression error. Allowing performance, either good or bad, at the end of the review period to play too large a role in determining an employee's rating for the entire period.
<b>Leniency error</b>	Consistently rating someone higher than is deserved.
<b>Severity error</b>	The opposite of leniency error. Rating individuals consistently lower than is deserved.
<b>Central tendency error</b>	Avoiding extremes in ratings across employees.
<b>Clone error</b>	Giving better ratings to individuals who are like the rater in behavior and/or personality.
<b>Spillover error</b>	Continuing to downgrade an employee for performance errors in prior rating periods.

Not surprisingly, the potential for errors causes employees to lose faith in the performance appraisal process. Employees, quite naturally, will be reluctant to have pay systems tied to such error-ridden performance ratings. At the very least, charges that the evaluation process is political will abound.<sup>70</sup> There are several factors that lead raters to give inaccurate appraisals: (1) guilt, (2) embarrassment about giving praise, (3) taking things for granted, (4) not noticing good or poor performance, (5) the halo effect (seeing one good attribute and leaping to positive impressions on remaining attributes), (6) dislike of confrontation, and (7) spending too little time on preparation of the appraisal.<sup>71</sup> To counter such problems, companies and researchers alike have expended considerable time and money to identify ways job performance can be measured better.

**Errors in Observation (Attention)**

Generally, researchers have varied three types of input information to see what raters pay attention to when they are collecting information for performance appraisals. First, it appears that raters are influenced by general appearance characteristics of the rates. Males are rated higher than females (other things being equal). A female ratee is observed not as a ratee but as a female ratee. A rater may form impressions based on stereotypic beliefs about women rather than the reality of the work situation and quite apart from any performance information. Females are rated less accurately when