

monetary reward. However, they view themselves as having loftier reasons. For example, most people overestimate the impact that financial reward exerts on their peers' willingness to donate blood.⁶⁰

Homogeneity Bias

Generally, appraisers rate appraisees who are similar to themselves more favorably than those who are different from them. This means that, in general, white male superiors tend to favor white male subordinates over females and minority supervisees.⁶¹

Halo Bias

Once we know one positive (or negative) fact about someone, we tend to perceive other information we learn about that person in line with our initial perceptions. This has several serious implications, the most obvious of which is the fact that physically attractive people are evaluated more positively than are less attractive people—even when holding constant their skills and competencies.

Fundamental Attribution Error

We tend to perceive people's behaviors as reflecting their personality rather than temporary, situational factors. This can obviously be a good thing for someone who seems to be doing well, but it can be problematic for a person who seems to be performing below expectations.

Communication Medium

Performance appraisers give poor performers substantially higher ratings when they have to give face-to-face feedback as opposed to anonymous written feedback. In one investigation, managers were asked to give feedback to a poorly performing employee, either in a face-to-face mode or via tape-recorded message.⁶² In all cases, the objective information about the poorly performing employee was identical. However, managers using direct, face-to-face communication gave more positive performance feedback than managers who used the indirect mode (the tape recorder).

Experience Effect

Experienced appraisers tend to render higher-quality appraisals, and training and practice can reduce error in ratings.⁶³

⁶⁰Miller, D. T., & Ratner, R. (1998). The disparity between the actual and assumed power of self-interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 53–62.

⁶¹Kraiger, K., & Ford, J. K. (1985, February). A meta-analysis of ratee race effects in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 56–65.

⁶²Waung, M., & Highhouse, S. (1997). Fear of conflict and empathic buffering: Two explanations for the inflation of performance feedback. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 71(1), 37–54.

⁶³Klimoski, R., & Inks, L. (1990, April). Accountability forces in performance appraisal. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 45(2), 194–208.