Ionut NANU
The Faculty of Sociology and Social Work, University of Bucharest, Doctoral School in Sociology
Ana Rodica STAICULESCU
The Faculty of Psychosociology, „Andrei Saguna" University of Constanta

OBJECTIVE VS. SUBJECTIVE IN THE HUMAN RESOURCES EVALUATION PROCESS

Original
Research

Keywords
Employees;
Evaluation;
Performance;
Stereotypes;
Organisation;
Human capital

Abstract

The analysis of the previous researches in the field indicates different results regarding the perception of the process of professional evaluation of the performances of the workers. This is why a broader investigation has been proposed of the way in which the employees give confidence to the management personnel and the way they perceive the periodic evaluations. The identification of the attitude of the employees regarding the correctness of the professional evaluations and the relation between it and the trust in their managers is the general objective of the research. For a scientific treatment of the specific objectives, the research approach requires the existence of a number of three stages: an initial, qualitative study, which aims to gather information on the social representation that the workers have about the process of evaluating human resources performance, such as identifying stereotypes, misconceptions that regular employees develop in relation to the process of evaluating human resources performance; a pilot study, aimed at choosing and adapting the research instruments that will be considered and their pre-testing to ensure the quality of the measurement; the actual research in which the instruments will be administered to a research group consisting of employees, but also of managers or representatives of the human resources departments belonging to the private and public system for collecting data in relation to the management of the human resources evaluation process within to each organization. The results of the statistical analysis as well as those of the qualitative analysis emphasize that the null hypothesis can be rejected, claiming that social stereotypes exert a statistically significant influence on the process of evaluating the professional performances of workers.

Human Resources' performance evaluation holds a well-defined position within human capital management, as a very important process for either the worker's particular and organisation's general development, which grows more sensitive during its actual performance due to its implications and negative connotations workers usually assign thereto. The human resources' performance evaluation is often regarded as a pre-dismissal warning or a virtual expelling measure, a coercion or punishment method, the human resources' performance evaluation is interpreted as an excuse and justification for demotion, the human resources' performance evaluation is self-partial, the human resources' performance evaluation is a bare formality, while positive connotations of the human resources' performance evaluation, such as identification of the professional training needs, motivation and promotion of workers, are less spread among the workers.

The concept generality is of course very wide when referring to the human resources' performance evaluation. We discuss human resources' performance evaluation when profiling the behaviour and skills an individual should possess for filling a certain vacancy; we discuss it within the recruitment process – the recruiter shall assess several résumés, and, implicitly, some professional performance of a number of people; we discuss human resources' performance evaluation during selection interviews; we discuss human resources' performance evaluation when job descriptions are being drafted – that's when a worker's professional skills are being assessed; we discuss human resources' performance evaluation during disciplinary investigations relating to violation of applicable laws; we discuss human resources' performance evaluation prior to individual and collective redundancy; we discuss human resources' performance evaluation in consideration of diagnosing the organisation's professional training needs; we discuss human resources' performance evaluation prior to workers' promotion; we discuss human resources' performance evaluation yearly during the workers' professional performance assessment, etc. In support of all above-mentioned, the professional literature (Constantin, 2004, p. 205) identifies the cases where the performance evaluation takes place: for promotion purposes / referral to specialisation, for selection relating to restructuring / discharge purposes, for training purposes, for identifying the training needs, in order to facilitate workers' mutual acquaintance and accommodation, for professional counselling and personal development management purposes.

A review of previous research points to various results on the perception of professional evaluation, and therefore an extensive investigation has been proposed on how the workers trust the management staff and also how they perceive periodic evaluations. Therefore, the general goal of this research is to identify the workers' attitude towards the trustworthiness of the professional evaluation and the relation between such attitude and trust in their managers. Based on this general goal, this paper sets the following specific goals: Identifying and analysing the tools used to rate such concepts; Understanding how do employees actually perceive the professional evaluation process; Studying the relations between the apprehension of professional evaluation and trust in the managers; Identification of the most relevant variables that might influence this relation.

For a scientific approach of the specific goals, the research requires three stages: An initial study, aiming to gather data on the workers' social representation of human resources' evaluation, and to identify stereotypes and misapprehension of common employees with respect to human resources' evaluation (Bourhis and Leyenes, 1996, p. 87); A pilot study designed for choosing and adapting the research tools, which shall also consider the pre-testing thereof for rating's quality assurance purposes (Chelcea, 2007, p. 186). A relevant factorial analysis should observe the data ratio of 1:20 (40x20=800 subjects) in order for the research to possess well designed tools, in order to obtain a true approximation of latent factors and to verify the tools' rating properties, as there are a large amount of items; The actual research where the tools shall be applied to a research lot consisting in employees, and also in managers or officers of HR departments for collection of data relating to the management of the human resources' evaluation in each organisation, representatives of HR departments or the managers of such employees, who volunteered to be included in the research sample, as applicable. The workers participating in the research were not the same as in the initial study and the pilot study, the selection criterion considered was the status of "active employee / worker" of a private or public organisation, and those who agreed to be a part of the actual research lot were treated with confidentiality and they provided their answers at their workplace (Chelcea, Mărginean and Cauc, 1998, p. 84).

The research is based on the logic of testing the implication of null hypothesis, in this case such being that social stereotypes have no statistically significant influence on the workers' professional performance evaluation (H0). The dismissal of the null hypothesis shall occur at a statistical significance threshold of $p < .05$ and research-related alternative hypothesis might be put forth in case of its dismissal. The toolset designed for rating the variables includes three tests, which were selected from the professional literature based on the following main criteria: they have been used in

other research, as well, with publishable results, which built validity sources; they possess validity and fidelity features that recommend them at least for research purposes; they are economical, as they include few items as compared to other tools targeting the same concepts, considering the specificity of the investigated subjects and the limited time resources they have. As distribution normality is a fundamental condition of many parametric techniques, the authors shall analyse it and they shall quantize the scalar variables in order to use them as independent variables.

The perceived fairness of the evaluations was investigated using the scale elaborated by McFarlin and Sweeney (1992, p. 630), with 3 items only, presented as sentences concerning the extent an employee perceives the evaluations of their professional activity as fair. Items have a direct feature and the subject is required to read the sentences and to express how much they agree to each item by choosing an answer on a Likert-type scale, from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (6), thus resulting a theoretical scale amplitude between three and 18 points. Such scale has been used in various studies supporting its suitability, on topics such as relationship between professional satisfaction and the perceived fairness of evaluations (Lau and Sholihin, 2005, p. 395), or between professional satisfaction and managerial performance (Sholihin and Pike, 2009, p. 402). After having translated the tool, it was pre-tested in the pilot study, resulting a high scale consistency (alpha = .919; CI95%=.909 la .929), which recommends it for use as research tool. Under such circumstances, the overall score might be an appropriate measure for the scalar variable "fairness perception in professional performance evaluation", high values indicating the perception of a fair evaluation, while low values indicate the perception of an unfair performance evaluation. The perceived fairness of evaluations has a theoretical amplitude between three and 18 points, and the empirical amplitude is of 15 point, which is consistent with the theoretical one. There are no missing scores, the average being of 13.22 points ($SE_{Average}$ = 0.17 points) and the standard deviation is of 3.56 points. The median is located at the score 14 and the most frequent class is that of score 12 (61 cases), the distribution being unimodal. In terms on modality, the distribution is mesokurtic (Kurtosis=0.372; $SE_{Kurtosis}$=0.234) yet it has skewness issues (Skewness=-0.803; $SE_{Skewness}$=0.117), i.e. negative skewness, the interviewed persons perceiving a high level of fairness in evaluations, low scores being only outer. Therefore, the authors cannot conclude that the normality assumption is observed in this variable's case, the skewness making the arithmetic mean a sparely relevant indicator of the central trend, the lack of normality being also highlighted through

the Kolmogorov-Smirnov comparison test for empirical distribution vs. standard theoretical distribution, resulting statistically significant differences ($KS_{(432)}$=.119; p<.001). An outer score analysis results in the fact that 6 subjects answered that they perceived the professional performance evaluation as completely unfair compared to the other subjects set, thus casting a suspicion of vicious answers, but the removal of those subjects did not result in a distribution balancing, therefore the authors chose to quadrate the scores as a distribution adjustment. Even if such action would result in a platykurtic feature (Kurtosis=-0.751; $SE_{Kurtosis}$=0.234), with a high variability of scores around the central trend, this approach is preferable considering that when verifying the hypothesis the authors shall be reliant on the average as the central trend's indicator. Thus a new variable, called "Evaluation perceived fairness - Normalized", with an amplitude of 315 points, between the minimum score of nine and maximum score of 18, with an average of 187.55 points ($SE_{Average}$=4.11) and standard deviation of 85.87 points, the median of 196 and modal value of 144. The distribution remains unimodal and becomes symmetrical (Skewness = -0.102; $SE_{Skewness}$ = 0.114), although vaulting is affected, resulting in deviations from normality. Based on 33.33% of the research set, quantization shall be made considering three categories: For scores less than 144, subjects shall enter the category of those having an adverse perception on evaluations' perceived fairness (168 subjects – 38.7%), for scores between 145 and 255, subjects shall enter the category of those having a neutral perception on evaluations' perceived fairness (142 – 32.7%), while for score greater than 255 the authors find subjects having an appreciative perception on evaluations' perceived fairness (124 – 28.6%).

Trust in managers was investigated using a scale elaborated by Read (1962, p. 108), this method being used in many other studies on trusting the managers, such as those on relationships between trust and professional performance (Hopwood, 1972, p. 170), or on relationships between trust and stress at the workplace (Ross, 1994, p. 631), being one of the most frequently used tools when it comes to the assessment of this concept. The test consists in four direct items only, presented as statements concerning the extent to which an employee trusts that his managers possess several important positive features inn their relationship with the employee. The answering area is represented by a Likert-type ordinal scale, between "strongly disagree" (1) and "strongly agree" (6). After having translated the tool, it was pre-tested, resulting a very good internal consistency (alpha = .936; CI95%=.926 to .945), which recommends that overall score should be a variable's indicator. In the analysis of the answers to this scale the

authors used the overall score to its items as an indicator for the "trust in managers" variable. As his variable shall be also used as an independent variable, the authors shall quantize it based on terctile values (percentages of 33.33%) resulting three sets of subjects. The theoretical amplitude is between four and 24 points, high overall scores indicating high trust in managers, while low scores indicate low trust levels. The analysis of the "trust in managers" variable was carried using 434 valid cases, with a theoretical amplitude between four and 24 points, this value of 20 points being also present in empirical amplitude. The average score is of 16.56 points (SEAverage = 0.25) with a standard deviation of 5.31 points. The median is at score 17 and the modal value is 16, this category containing 42 cases. In terms of normality features, the distribution is unimodal, but skewed left, with a high occurrence of scores indicating high trust levels (Skewness=-0.541; SESkewness=0.117) and platykurtic, with a great variability of values around the central trend (Kurtosis=-0.480; SEKurtosis=0.234), so that the deviation from normality is statistically significant (KS(434)=.096; p<.01). No outer scores were present, yet skewness' occurrence recommends a mathematic adjustment of the scores using the same squaring method, although this method would significantly increase heterogeneity. A new variable called "Trust in managers - Normalized" results, with an amplitude of 560 points, between 16 and 576, with an average of 302.32 points (SEAverage=7.86) and a standard deviation of 163.74 points. The median is of 289 and the modal value becomes 256. This time the distribution is symmetrical (Skewness=0.053; SESkewness=0.117) but it emphasizes its platykurtic feature, increasing the scoring heterogeneity around the central trend (Kurtosis=-1.023; SEKurtosis=0.234), therefore the deviation from the normal distribution features remains statistically significant. Quantization in the three categories results in subjects with low trust in managers, i.e. those with scores below 225 points (157 – 36.2%), subjects with an average trust, having scores between 226 and 400 (159 – 36.6) and subjects with high trust, i.e. those with scores above 400 (118 – 27.2), thus resulting the category variable designed for use as an independent variable.

Attitude towards human resources' performance evaluation was investigated using the SERU questionnaire, resulting from the preliminary qualitative research, when subjects were required to cite the first sentences or clauses crossing their minds when thinking of the phrase "human resources' evaluation". 40 items were built, presented as statements on the attitude of the employee when they refer themselves to human resources' evaluation. The consistency degree with each item is expressed by choosing an answer on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from "never agree" (1) to "always agree" (7), with a theoretical amplitude between 40 and 280 points. The tool was also pre-tested within the pilot study, resulting a very good internal consistency of the tool, the resulting alpha Cronbach coefficient being of 0.92. The overall score was used as indicator of the "trust in managers" variable for the analysis of the answers to this scale; high overall scores indicate high trust in managers, while low scores indicate low trust levels. In respect of the tool's theoretical amplitude, it had a minimum score of 40 and a maximum score of 280, respectively. The analysis of the variable was carried using 434 cases, no missing cases, the amplitude being of 240 points, just like for theoretical amplitude, scores ranging from minimum 40 to maximum 280 points. The scale average is of 203.55 points (SEAverage=1.61), with a standard deviation of 33.65 points. The median is of 206 points, while the modal value is of 204, 12 cases being recorded. Although unimodal, the distribution is highly skewed to left, with high scores predominating, while the low scores are rather outer values (Skewness=-1.02; SESkewness=0.117) and also leptokurtic, with low variability of values around the central trend (Kurtosis=2.835; SEKurtosis=0.234). Therefore, distribution's normality assumption in not reached (KS(434)=.062; p<.01), as there are multiple extreme values, one of those to be discarded (subject at position 418) (Agabrian, 2006, p. 56). The removal of this subject shal result in a significant reduction of the symmetry coefficient (Skewness=-0.854) and, although no symmetrical distribution resulted, this operation allows adjustment by squaring. Analysing this new variable, called "Attitude towards human resources' evaluation - Normalized", the authors determine the presence of an amplitude of 75696 points, ranging from a minimum of 2704 points to a maximum of 78400 points, with an average of 42656.73 points (SEAverage=605.65) and a standard deviation of 12602.82 points. The median is of 42436 points and the modal value of 41616 points. Following this mathematical workaround, the authors shall observe a symmetrical (Skewness=-0.113; SESkewness=0.117) and mesokurtic distribution (Kurtosis=0.055; SEKurtosis=0.234), noticing the lack of a statistically significant deviation from the features of a normal distribution (KS(433)=.035; p=.20). This variable doesn't require quantization, therefore the authors shall conclude their descriptive preliminary approach and shall move to assaying the research's alternative hypothesis.

The statistical assay of research's alternative hypothesis:

H1: The accuracy of perception of the human resource's professional performance evaluation is statistically significantly influenced by the

workers' trust in their managers ($\mu_{high} \neq \mu_{average} \neq \mu_{low}$). As there is only one independent variable to carry an effect on a dependant variable, the independent variable having three levels, the authors face an unifactor research design, comparing the average scores of the three sets of subjects to the dependant variable, given that the authors assume equal variances among the three sets (Levene$_{(2, 430)}$=2.891; p=.057) (Table 1). The authors notice a statistically significant effect of the "trust in managers" variable upon the "accuracy of perception of the human resource's professional performance evaluation" ($F_{(2,432)}$=197.656; p<.01), i.e. 47.59% of the dependant variable's overall variance is determined by the independent variable (ω^2=.475), which is a very strong effect according to Cohen's specifications. As variance equality assumption was met, the adjustment of F-test values by means of solid statistic tests is no longer required. Therefore, the authors shall continue their analysis using post-hoc tests, in this case preferring the Bonferroni test, due to its rigour, although it might increase the risk of a type II error occurrence. The authors shall notice the presence of certain statistically significant differences between the averages of all sets. Thus, subjects with low trust in their managers do perceive the evaluation as highly unfair (m_{low}=118.54), obtaining statistically significantly lower scores as compared to the subjects with average trust ($m_{average}$=195.50), the size of this difference's effect being ES=1.238. Moreover, the highest scores in assessing the evaluation fairness are obtained by the subjects with high trust in managers (m_{high}=268.45), their opinions being statistically significantly different both from the opinions of the average trusting subjects (ES=1.174), and, obviously, from the opinions of low trusting subjects (ES=2.413), this certainly being the most important effect.

The null hypothesis stating that social stereotypes bear no statistically significant influence on the workers' professional performance evaluation can be rejected at this point, supporting at least the hypothesis of an influence of the extent of trust in managers upon the perception of the fairness of professional evaluation. So, the greatest statistically significant differences occur between subjects with low trust and those with high trust (ES=2.413), followed by the statistically significant differences between subjects with low trust and those with average trust (ES=1.238) and, finally by the statistically significant differences between subjects with average trust and those with high trust (ES=1.174).

H2: There are statistically significant differences on the fairness of professional performance evaluation determined by the organisation type ($\mu_{private} \neq \mu_{public}$). Only one independent variable with two levels can bear a statistically significant effect upon the dependant variable, and in such case, the authors can use the Student statistic test for comparing two independent populations from where the specimens derive. As the authors do not consider a specimen, but a research set, the research design has an inferential feature, only allowing to assay if there is a significant difference between those two environments. As the variance homogeneity assumption is met (F_{Levene}=0.240; p=.625), the authors can notice the presence of a statistically significant effect of the organisation type upon how the subjects perceive the fairness of performance evaluation ($t_{(431)}$=2.40; p<.05), its size being d=0.231, i.e. 23.19% of the professional performance evaluation fairness variance is determined by the organisation type, private employees ($m_{private}$=191.24) having a statistically significant more appreciatively perception of evaluation fairness than public employees (m_{public}=117.47), who consider themselves aggrieved from this point of view. Although this statistical test is pretty robust in violating the normality assumption, especially as the dependant variable's distribution symmetry has been adjusted, the dependent variable hasn't a normal distribution, requiring a double checking of the statistical significance of the effect through the Mann-Whitney U non-parametric test. This supports the statistical significance (Z=2.305; p<.05), the average ranking of the scores obtained by the private employees being statistically significantly higher as compared to the average ranking of the scores obtained by the public employees.

The qualitative assay on the perception of fairness of human resources' evaluation for public employees is also a reflection of the general public perception on this process. As the workers are part of a community, they consequently personally assume the public perception which is generally negative with respect to the management of public institutions and expresses the lack of trust in the fairness of human resources' evaluation in public organisations (m_{public}=117.47).

H3: The organisation type bear a statistically significant influence upon the perception of various staff categories on the fairness of the professional performance evaluation ($\mu_{private} \neq \mu_{public}$ I $\mu_{employee} \neq \mu_{management}$). The presence of two independent variables bearing effects upon a single dependant variable requests a variance univariate analysis based on a 2x2 factorial research design. In this case, there are 354 employees and 79 persons holding management and HR positions, and also 223 private employees and 210 public employees, the assumption of the minimal case count in the research sets being thus fulfilled, although the sets are not appropriately balanced, as the management set is disproportionate to the

others. The dependant variable is a variable located at least at an interval level and variance homogeneity is assured ($F_{Levene(3, 429)}=0.657$; $p=.579$), therefore the variable's minima level assumption and variance homogeneity assumptions are fulfilled. However, as there are sufficient cases in each research set, although sets are not balanced, the authors shall use the model of type III of squares' sum (Table 2). At the global model level, including the two main effects of the independent variables and the effect of their interaction, as well, it results that both the institution type and the staff category in such institutions, independently or jointly, bear a statistically significant, yet weak effect ($\eta^2=.028$) upon the perception of the fairness of human resource's performance evaluation ($F_{(3)}=4.109$; $p<.01$), 2.8% of the dependant variable's variation being assigned to the two independent variables. The authors actually notice the presence of a statistically significant and weak main effect ($\eta^2=.011$) of the staff set upon the dependant variable ($F_{(1,429)}=4.687$; $p<.05$), i.e. employees incline to assess evaluations as being statistically significantly more fair ($m_{employees}=191.37$) as compared to the management staff and HR specialists ($m_{management}=168.41$), such effect being accountable for 1.1% of the dependant variable's variance. The second statistically significant and weak main effect ($\eta^2=.019$) is that of company type, which accounts for 1.9% of the dependant variable's variance ($F_{(1,429)}=8.188$; $p<.01$). As the authors already know, even if a second independent variable is present, private employees ($m_{private} = 195.06$) assess the evaluations as statistically significantly more fair as compared to the public employees ($m_{public}=164.72$). There is no statistically significant interaction effect, therefore interaction between the staff category and the institution type does not explain probabilistically significant the variation of perception on evaluation fairness. This hypothesis is not clearly and unambiguously supported. No correlations can be made between the organisation type and the workers category so as to explain a certain perception on performance evaluation and fairness thereof. No statistical correlation key categories can be singularized so as to result in a certain fairness perception which is specific to a single staff category and a single organisation type.

H4: There are significant differences in the attitude towards the fairness of the human resources' performance evaluation based on the education level and organisation type they come from ($\mu_{upper\ secondary} \neq \mu_{undergraduate} \neq \mu_{postgraduate} \mid \mu_{private} \neq \mu_{public}$). The analysis' basic principles are those used in the verification of the previous hypothesis, involving a variance univariate analysis based on a 2x3 unifactor design, with better balanced and sufficient sets for the assumption of the minimum

case count. Thus, 101 subjects graduated at most upper secondary education, 231 are undergraduate and 101 possess a postgraduate degree. At the same time, 223 subjects work in private institutions and 210 in public institutions. Even if, generally speaking, the assumption of the minimum case count is fulfilled, the authors notice a reduced number of subjects possessing at most a secondary education degree in the public employees' set (26 people), which might affect the indicator's constancy under such circumstances. Yet, the variance homogeneity is perfectly fulfilled ($F_{Levene(5, 427)}=1.538$; $p=.117$), as well as the minimal interval level of the dependant variable, therefore both important assumptions of variance analysis were verified and comply with the analysis' requirements. Even if there are sufficient cases in most of the research sets, the presence of only 26 people employed in public institutions who also possess at most a secondary education degree recommends the use of a model of type IV of squares' sum (Table 3). The two main effects of independent variables and their joint effect globally explain 3% of the variance of perception in evaluation fairness ($\eta^2=.030$), a weak effect, although statistically significant ($F_{(5)}=2.623$; $p<.01$). Under such circumstances, the only statistically significant main effect is that of education level's ($F_{(2, 427)}=2.623$; $p<.01$), such effect being accountable for 1.4% of the variance of perception in evaluation fairness ($\eta^2=.030$), the difference to 3% being determined by the main effect of the other independent variable and by the interaction effect, yet they are not statistically significant. The effect's nature is indeed determined by the set of subjects possessing at most a secondary education degree ($m_{secondary}=207.85$) and those holding a postgraduate degree ($m_{postgraduate}=173.43$), i.e. the subjects possessing at most a secondary education degree assess the professional evaluations as statistically significantly more fair than the subjects holding a postgraduate degree ($ES=0.404$), irrespective of company type. In terms of behaviour type, both public and private employees holding a secondary education degree accept more willingly decisions made at higher hierarchic levels ($m_{secondary}=207.85$). The fact that an organisation's managers and management, stakeholders possess a higher education and training level compared to them determines a certain extent of acceptance of decisions and of the human resources' performance evaluation, notwithstanding the content thereof.

Persons possessing undergraduate and postgraduate education believe they are entitled to judge or doubt the human resources' evaluation ($m_{postgraduate} = 173.43$) as they consider themselves equals in terms of training level with the person actually performing the evaluation, they believe that they can be part of this process even if they do not hold

an appropriate position which would entitle them in this respect. That is why most cases of low or lack of trust in the fairness of workers' evaluation relate to workers holding a post-secondary education degree. These are generally the effect of a general attitude and not the result of a specific context.

H5: The relationship between the fair perception of the professional performance evaluation and the trust in managers is mediated by the attitude towards the evaluation of human resource's performance. The analysis of the bivariate correlation between the two extrinsic variables ("fair perception of professional performance evaluation" and "trust in managers") points to a statistically significant, positive and strong link ($r=.764$; $p<.01$), the two variables sharing more than 50% of the common variance ($r^2=0.583$). Yet, the authors cannot postulate a causality relationship between these two variables, therefore the authors shall consider a third variable, "attitude towards the human resource's evaluation". Thus, the authors are in a mediation relationship where they shall verify the following statistical model: response variable: Evaluation process' fairness; independent variable: trusting management; median variable: attitude towards evaluation. The proposed model is that of a path analysis, where the direct effect of trust in managers shall be verified, given that trust in managers influences the attitude towards evaluation and attitude towards evaluation influences the evaluation fairness, in turn. Should this indirect effect be statistically significant, the authors can accept the mediation relationship. For testing such mediation relationship, the authors shall use The Sobel test for the indirect effect's statistical significance. As this statistical test requires large data volumes and is not a robust one, being in fact highly sensitive to assumptions, especially to the one concerning distributions' normality, the authors shall use a simulated resampling method (bootstrapping) in order to mathematically adjust the data. Thus, 20.000 datasets were created using resampling by replacement, but, even under such circumstances, the 0 value is in the trust interval set out at 95%, which reveals that, in spite of resampling, the normality adjustment was not efficiently performed. As the IBM SPSS Statistics data analysing package has no default path analysis procedures, an external procedure (called PROCESS and installed as an additional package) was use. Analysing the complete standardised model on the indirect effect of the "trust in managers" variable upon the "evaluation's fairness" variable, it results a trust range $CI_{(95\%)}$ between -0.0116 and 0.0118, such interval including the 0 value, therefore there is no mediation relationship, as the size of the effect is very near to zero. The global effect of the "trust in

managers" variable actually exists and it is statistically significant, as well ($t=24.464$; $p<.01$), but it is exclusively caused by the direct effect ($t=23.736$; $p<.01$). Although in the first part of the path the authors notice the presence of a trust in managers effect over the attitude towards evaluation ($F_{(1, 431)}=11.757$; $p<.01$), in the second part, the attitude towards evaluation bears no further statistically significant effect upon the evaluation's fairness ($t=0.061$; $p=.951$). In conclusion, the authors cannot support this alternative hypothesis, therefore the relationship between trust in managers and evaluation fairness is a direct one, non-mediated by the attitude towards evaluation.

H6: There are statistically significant differences in the attitude towards human resources' evaluation, determined by the organisation type and staff category. As only two independent variables bear effects upon a single dependant variable, the authors shall use a variance univariate analysis based on a 2x2 unifactor research design. In this case, there are 354 employees and 79 managers and HR officers, and 223 private employees and 210 public employees, the assumption of the minimal case count within the research sets being thus fulfilled, although the sets are not properly balanced, i.e. the one of management staff is disproportionate to the others. The dependant variable is situated at least at an interval level and the variance homogeneity is assured ($F_{Levene(3, 429)}=0.738$; $p=.530$), therefore the assumption of the variable's minimal level and the assumption of variance homogeneity are fulfilled. However, as there are sufficient cases in each research set, although sets are not balanced, the authors shall use the model of type III of squares' sum. By including the two main effects of the independent variables and the effect of their interaction, as well, it results that both the institution type and the staff category in such institutions, independently or jointly, bear a statistically significant, yet weak effect ($\eta^2=.027$) upon the perception of the fairness of human resource's performance evaluation ($F_{(3)}=4.02$; $p<.01$), 2.7% of the dependant variable's variation being assigned to the two (Table 4). The authors actually notice only the presence of a statistically significant and weak main effect ($\eta^2=.016$) of the institution type upon the dependant variable ($F_{(1,429)}=7.078$; $p<.01$), i.e. private employees incline to have a statistically higher significant attitude towards the human resources' professional evaluation ($m_{private}=44228.5$) as compared to the public employees ($m_{public}=40086.5$), such effect being accountable for 1.6% of the dependant variable's variance. There are no statistically significant main effect of the second independent variable nor a statistically significant interaction effect, therefore interaction between the staff

category and the interaction between the staff category and institution type does not explain probabilistically significant the variation of attitude towards human resources' evaluation. Practice proved that the private environment is actually dealing with a continuous workers' performance evaluation. They are required to deliver the output of their work in due time, to meet the assigned budgets and to observe the pre-set quality standards on a daily basis. These are the challenges of the private environment to be taken into account by the workers in their daily activity, and they are also the goals to be considered, apart from other particular goals, when workers shall be assessed during the yearly human resources' performance evaluation. Therefore, the attitude of private employees towards the workers' performance evaluation is consistent with acceptance and acknowledgement of rules and regulations ($m_{private}$=44228.5). The authors couldn't apply the same acceptance terms to public employees. The way these evaluations take place, the formality and personalism of such process, the training of people involved in the performance of such evaluations, their objectivism when making valuable judgements on the workers' activity etc., represent reasons for which public employees have a sceptical representation of the workers performance evaluation (m_{public}=40086.5). Scepticism of public employees is attended by the individual and collective redundancies occurring in their systems, which determined them to refrain from adopting an indifference attitude towards the evaluation process. But even when such redundancies and staff reduction occur, the public organisations avail themselves on enforceable laws on transferring employees among institutions, such law provision being unavailable to the private environment. Although the workers' perception on human resources' performance evaluation was highlighted as negative within the research, the process itself is accepted by the workers under the law provisions transposed into the individual employment agreement, organisations' internal regulations – the workers' obligation to attend this activity of the organisation, the employer's obligation to carry out the workers' performance evaluation on a yearly basis. The human resources' performance evaluation remains a complex process with major implications in both the worker's life and organisation's existence and, from the reasons indicated above neither the staff category nor the organisation type influence the workers' attitude towards the human resources' evaluation within each organisation. Moreover, the results of the human resources' professional performance evaluation are accepted and undertaken by the workers and they represent a tool for displaying the complex labour relationship with their own employers.

The results of the statistical analysis and those of the qualitative analysis underline that a null hypothesis can be rejected, supporting that social stereotypes bear a statistically significant influence upon the workers' professional performance evaluation. Through this study and the actual research the authors intended to contextualise the social stereotype and to research the relevance of such contextualisation in its direct relationship with the human resources' evaluation process held in a company. Based on the statistics of the six alternative hypotheses delivered here, it results that the human resources' performance evaluation is influenced by social stereotype's own variables: trust in managers, organisation type, staff categories, education level.

REFERENCES

Journal article
[1] Lau, C., Sholihin, M. (2005). - *Financial and nonfinancial performance measures: How do they affect job satisfaction?*, The British Accounting Review 37, pp. 389–413.
[2] McFarlin, D. B. and Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal* 35, pp. 626–637.
[3] Hopwood, A. G. (1972). - An empirical study of the role of accounting data in performance evaluation. Empirical research in accounting: selected studies, *Journal of Accounting Research* 10, 156–182 (Supplement).
[4] Ross, A. (1994). Trust as a moderator of the effect of performance evaluation style on job related tension: a research note, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, pp. 629–635.
[5] Sholihin, M., Pike, R. (2009). Fairness in performance evaluation and its behavioural consequences, *Accounting and Business Research*, Volume 39, Issue 4, pp. 397 – 413.

Book
[1] Read, W. H. (1962). Upward communication industrial hierarchies. *Human Relations*, 15, 3–15.

Non-English reference
[1] Agabrian, M. (2006). *Analiza de conţinut* [Content analysis]. Iaşi: Polirom.
[2] Bourhis, R. Y. and Leyens , J.-P. [1994]. (1996). *Stereotipuri, discriminare şi relaţii intergrupuri* [Stereotypes, discrimination and intergroup relations]. Iaşi:Polirom.
[3] Chelcea, S., Mărginean, I. and Cauc, I. (1998). *Cercetarea sociologică. Metode şi tehnici*

[Sociological research. Methods and techniques]. Deva:Destin.

[4] Chelcea, S. (2007). *Metodologia cercetării sociologice. Metode cantitative şi calitative* [Methodology of sociological research. Quantitative and qualitative methods]. Bucureşti:Econimică.

[5] Constantin, T. (2004). *Evaluarea psihologică a resurselor umane* [Psychological evaluation of human resources]. Iaşi: Polirom.

List of tables

Table No. 1
The effect caused by the trust in managers upon the fairness of perception on professional performance evaluation

VD: Perceived evaluation fairness – Normalised

	Quadrates' sum	df	Quadrates' average	F	Sig.
Inter-sets	1525272.629	2	762636.315	197.656	.000
Own	1659115.713	430	3858.409		
Total	3184388.342	432			

Table No. 2
Analysis of independent variables' effects upon the dependant variable

Source models	Quadrates' sum (III type model)	df	Quadrates' average	F	Sig.	η^2	Exponent
Model global	**88955.746**	**3**	**29651.915**	**4.109**	**.007**	**.028**	**.847**
Intercept	8305774.238	1	8305774.238	1151.108	.000	.728	1.000
Staff category	33819.309	1	33819.309	4.687	**.031**	.011	.579
Company type	59077.840	1	59077.840	8.188	**.004**	.019	.815
Category*Company type	16147.895	1	16147.895	2.238	.135	.005	.320
Error	3095432.596	429	7215.461				
Total	18431617.000	433					
Edited Total	3184388.342	432					

Table No. 3
Analysis of independent variables' effects upon the dependant variable

Model	Quadrates' sum (IV type model)	df	Quadrates' average	F	Sig.	η^2	Exponent
Model global	**94881.646**	**5**	**18976.329**	**2.623**	**.024**	**.030**	**.804**
Intercept	11714022.271	1	11714022.271	1618.992	.000	.791	1.000
Education	42973.429	2	21486.715	2.970	**.052**	.014	.576
Company type	17554.440	1	17554.440	2.426	.120	.006	.343
Education*Company type	10443.342	2	5221.671	.722	.487	.003	.172
Error	3089506.696	427	7235.379				
Total	18431617.000	433					
Edited Total	3184388.342	432					

Table No. 4
Analysis of independent variables' effects upon the dependant variable

Source models	Quadrates' sum (III type model)	df	Quadrates' average	F	Sig.	η^2	Exponent
Model global	**1878245957.052**	**3**	**626081985.684**	**4.025**	**.008**	**.027**	**.839**
Intercept	456166024412.556	1	456166024412.556	2932.341	.000	.872	1.000
Staff category	121620242.892	1	121620242.892	.782	.377	.002	.143
Company type	1101081248.550	1	1101081248.550	7.078	**.008**	.016	.756
Category*Company type	1089061.180	1	1089061.180	.007	.933	.000	.051
Error	66736858961.243	429	155563773.802				
Total	856500260602.000	433					
Edited Total	68615104918.296	432					