Central tendency error in hrm

Central trend bias refers to a tendency for evaluators, or managers to rate most of their employees as average when applying an evaluation scale. So, for example, given a scale that runs with points in it running from one (bad) to seven (excellent), with four being average, many managers will refuse to use points at any of the ends. There will be a trend for almost all estimates to fall within the 3-5 range. This can be problematic, since a very poor worker can be rated slightly above average, even if that score is inaccurate, or, on the other hand, an officer can be rated in the same 3-5 series, even if he or she deserves a more excellent score. Smaller rating scales (e.g. those with only three units, instead of seven) tend to cause less central trend bias, but they also become less accurate. You've probably heard managers say, I never rate people as exceptional. This is an example of central trend bias. The central voltage error belongs to rating errors or rating distortions[1][2]. According to Michael G. Aamodt the central voltage error is a type of rating error in which an evaluator consistently evaluates all employees in the middle of the scale, regardless of their actual performance levels[3]. Causes of occurrence This error occurs when evaluators are reluctant to use the edges of the rating scale. Thus limiting the scope of evaluations and the possibility of objective and honest evaluation of employees. Particularly sensitive to this error are the five-point scales, with exemplary edges such as excellent and unacceptable. The result of using such a scale is to limit the possibility of evaluation and increase the likelihood that all evaluated people will be in the middle of the evaluation scale. This makes it difficult to accurately describe effectiveness at work in determining promotions and pay increases[4]. Some evaluators, instead of a lenient or rigorous evaluation, give an average score to all people who have been rated, despite their actual performance. Evaluators believe that providing an average score is the best way to avoid any misjudges. Some evaluators believe that performance evaluation is a waste of time, which is why the average score for them is the simplest solution[5]. Evaluators don't like to be overly strict towards anyone who gives low scores. At the same time, they believe that no one deserves the possible evaluation[6]. Some evaluation systems encourage evaluators to commit a central voltage error, requiring them to provide written justification when selecting an extreme assessment[7]. Effects of the occurrence of a central error trend Assessment errors indicate a situation where the evaluator does not distinguish the good and poor quality of the work. These errors cause problems when evaluating by multiple people if one evaluator is rigorous and the other will be evaluated finally, the rigorous evaluation will be taken into account[8]. Average scores due to the central error tend to discriminate against workers who achieve high scores and protect those who perform poorly. Evaluations are therefore rendered useless as a decision aid for promotions, training or feedback to management[9]. Evaluator training Some performance score distortions can be corrected by evaluator training. Frank J. Landy and Jeffrey M. Conte distinguishes three types of training for evaluators[10]: Administrative training Psychometric training Framework-of-reference training Other assessment errors In the most common assessment errors in evaluation officials belong[11][12]: Severity error Grace Wrong Halo Effect Recency of facts Error of similarity assessment Lowerer incentives Inflationary pressures Disadvantages of estimates Central voltage error and other distortions have an influence on the profitability of the enterprise. It usually reduces efficiency by[13][3][14][15]: The company cannot identify the strengths and weaknesses of employees. Discouraging effect, for example, when two employees do the same work with different efficiency and receive the same score. Worse relationship between the director and his subordinates. Exceeding or lacking bonuses for effective work. Increase the cost of the company's revaluation. Lack of consistency with low performance ↑ DeCenzo D., Robbins S. P., Verhulst S. L., (2016),Basic principles of Human Resources Management, Binder Ready Version, John Wiley & Sons, p. 223 ↑ Lunenburg F.C., (2012), Performance assessment: Methods and errors of assessment, International Journal of Academic Intellectual Diversity, Volume 14 number 1, Sam Houston State University, p. 7-9 ↑ 3.1 Aamodt M. G., (2015), Industrial/Organizational Psychology: An Applied Approach, Cage, Learning, Learning, Learning Boston, p. 259 ↑ DeCenzo D., Robbins S. P., Verhulst S. L., (2016),Basic Principles of Human Resources Management, Binder Ready Edition, John Wiley & Sons, p. 224 ↑ Kumar D. Bhattacharyya, (2011), performance management systems and strategies, Pearson Education India, New Delhi, p. 76 ↑ Lunenburg F.C., (2012), performance assessment : Methods and errors of evaluation, International Journal of Academic Academic Intellectual Diversity, Volume 14 Number 1, Sam Houston State University, p. 8 ↑ Landy F. J., Conte J.M., (2010), Work in the 21st Century: Introduction to Industrial and Organizational Psychology, John Wiley & Sons, Malden, p. 257 ↑ Levi-Jakšić M., (2012), Proceedings of the XIII International SymOrg Symposium 2012: Innovative Management and Business Performance, Belgrade, Belgrade, p. 849 ↑ Jones J. W., Stefby B. D., Bray D. W., (1991), Applying the in enterprises: The manual for human resources managers and professionals, Lexington books, Douglas Weston, p. 327 ↑ Landy F. J., Conte J.M., J.M., Work in the 21st century: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology, John Wiley & Sons, Malden, p. 258-259 ↑ Lunenburg F.C., (2012), Performance Assessment: Assessment Methods and Errors, International Journal of Academic Academic Intellectual Diversity, Volume 14 Number 1, Houston Sam State University, p. 7 ↑ DeCenzo D., Robbins S. P., Verhulst S. L., (2016), Basic Principles of Human Resources Management, Ready Edition, edition John Wiley & Sons p. 223 ↑ Landy F. J., Conte J.M., (2010), Work in the 21st century: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology, John Wiley & Sons, Malden, p. 257 ↑ Jones J. W., Steffi B. D., Bray D. W., (1991), Applying psychology to enterprises: The manual for human resources managers and professionals , Lexington Books, Douglas Weston, p. 327-329 ↑ Kumar D. Bhattacharyya, (2011), Performance Management Systems and Strategies, Pearson Education India, New Delhi, p. 76 Aamodt M. G., (2015), Industrial/Organizational Psychology: An Applied Approach, Cengage Learning, Boston. Birkenbach C. X., (1984) Halo, Central trend, and indulgence in performance assessment: A comparison between a graphic assessment scale and a behavioral based measure, Perspectives on Industrial Psychology, South African Journal of Industrial Psychology. Catano V.M., Wiesner W. H., Hackett R. D., (2009), Recruitment and Selection in Canada, Cengage Learning, Ontario. DeCenzo D., Robbins S. P., Verhulst S. L., (2016);Basic Principles of Human Resources Management, Binder Ready Version, John Wiley & Sons. Jones J. W., Steffy B. D., Bray D. W., (1991), Psychology Application in Business: The Handbook for Human Resources Managers and Professionals, Lexington Books, Douglas Weston. Knoff H.M., (2002), The Evaluation of Child and Teen Personality, Guilford Press, New York. Kumar D. Bhattacharyya, (2011), Performance Management Systems and Strategies, Pearson Education India, New Delhi. Landy F. J., Conte J.M., (2010), Work in the 21st Century: An Introduction to Industrial and Organizational Psychology, John Wiley & Sons, Malden. Lunenburg F.C., (2012), Performance Assessment: Methods and Evaluation Errors, International Journal of Academic Intellectual Diversity, Volume 14 Number 1, Sam Houston State University. Levi-Jakšić M., (2012), Proceedings of the Xiii International SymOrg Symposium 2012: Innovative Management and Business Performance, Belgrade University, Belgrade. Murphy K. R., Cleveland J. N., (1995), Understanding Performance Rating: Social, Organizational, and Goal-Based Prospects, SAGE, Thousand Oaks. Thyer B., (2009), The Handbook of Social Work Research Methods, SAGE, Thousand Oaks. Author: Fryderyk Olchawa We are all people, it is common for managers to make mistakes in evaluation behaviour of employees and the drafting of performance assessment documents. These errors reflect prejudices towards the employee. These biases can give an employee an unfair advantage or disadvantage over others in their peer group. The book, Human Resources Strategy, defines evaluator errors as reflecting our imperfect judgment of others. For this reason, it is important to understand these biases and to take them into account when preparing a performance assessment document. According to Dreher/Dougherty, An obstacle to the accuracy and reliability of performance measures is posed by a series of evaluator errors, perceptual biases and other sources of distortion in performance assessments. So, what are these evaluator errors? What is the effect of horns and halo effects? It is a cognitive bias that forces you to allow a characteristic, whether good (halo) or evil (horns), to overshadow other characteristics, behaviors, actions, or beliefs. This is most visible when the overall positive or negative impression of an evaluator of an individual employee leads to the evaluation of the individual in all evaluation dimensions. This is when a manager really likes or dislikes an employee and allows their personal feelings about that employee to affect their performance ratings.2. Leniency error:A leniency error is when the tendency of evaluators is to rate all employees at the positive end of the scale (positive leniency) or at the low end of the scale (negative leniency). This can happen when an administrator over-emphasizes either positive or negative behaviors.3. Central voltage error: A central voltage error is the tendency of evaluators to avoid making extreme employee performance crises resulting in the evaluation of all employees in the middle part of a scale. This can happen either when a manager is not comfortable with conflict and avoids low marks to avoid behavior issues or when a manager4. Recency error: Recency error is the evaluator's tendency to allow more recent incidents (either effective or ineffective) of employee behavior to carry too much weight in performance evaluation over an entire evaluation period. This can be extreme at both ends of the spectrum. Either an employee has just finished a major project successfully or an employee may have had a negative incident just before the performance evaluation process and is at the forefront of the manager's thoughts about that employee. For this reason, it is so important to keep accurate performance records throughout the year to report during the performance evaluation time.5. First Impression ErrorFirst Impression is the evaluator's tendency to leave the first impression of an employee's performance bearing too much weight in the performance assessment over an entire evaluation period. An example of this would be a new employee joining the organization and performing at high levels during their honeymoon period and then possibly losing some of that initial momentum. The administrator allows the first display blind it to actual performance over time.6. Similar-to-my Error: Similar-to-my error is when the evaluator's tendency is biased in evaluating performance toward employees who are considered similar to the evaluators themselves. We can all relate to people who are like us, but can't let our ability to relate to someone affect their employees' performance assessment. We all know that human prejudices can easily influence the evaluation process, it is important to create objective measures for evaluation performance. Analyzing examples of the different effects on the workplace can help you better understand how it can affect productivity and morale. Observing behaviors and using available technology to monitor performance can help prevent some of the biases from being taken out of the evaluation process. It would be really interesting if you could share your experience or if you experienced a similar effect during your own performance reviews. Book mentioned in this article: Human Resources Strategy: A Behavioral Perspective for the Ceo