







Fig. 1 the interactive relationship between distrust between leaders and employees which caused by performance appraisal

### Management Tactics Which Are Based on the Interactive Relationship between Performance Appraisal and Trust

Although performance appraisal reflect leaders don't trust employees, but the ultimate aim that organization conduct it is to enhance leaders' trust for employees from management perspective. Therefore, we will analyze how to do performance appraisal can enhance employees trust for leaders.

Improve employees appraisal reaction is the key to solve this problem, and enhance employee fairness perception of performance appraisal is most important. The fairness perception of performance appraisal is extent of organizational fairness in performance appraisal, include of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactive justice. It has found that performance appraisal is very sensitive to fairness or justice in the final analysis, if employee don't think appraisal is fairness, justice, any appraisal system will be bound to fail. Fulk et al. (1985) pointed that only employee perceptive fairness of performance appraisal, they will want to trust their leaders. Hertzmann & Slapnicar (2009) also pointed that increase employee fairness perception of performance appraisal can improve the trust in leadership. Frazier et al. (2010) based on social exchange theory also proposed that when employee perceptive appraisal justice, they will enhance their trust propensity to organization and leaders. Therefore, leaders must enhance the distributive justice, procedural justice and interactive justice in performance appraisal.

*First*, performance appraisal must objective, comprehensive and truly represents employee effort and contribution. In order to achieve this, managers should adopt objective indicators as far as possible, and adopt scientific methods to quantize performance. If we can't find all objective indicators, managers also distribute weight among subjective and objective indicators reasonable, collect total performance information, strive to unbiased, and reflect employees' effort and contribution accurately.

*Second*, allow employees to express their opinion, and make sure justice in front of rule. Procedural justice means everybody justice in front of rule. Managers need announce appraisal procedural on time, and make sure each individual know the steps, laws and methods of appraisal. Impel employee take part in the procedural of appraisal decision, and allow them to express their opinion, suggestion and active listening. Make certain each decision is based on fact.

*Third*, explain and illustrate relevant information, respect and care for employees. Managers not only communicate with employee in performance appraisal, but also offer feedback at the end of assessment. For the unclear, doubtful issues, managers must give an explanation, make employees get a statement. Managers also respect, care for employees, confirm their value and contribution, and enhance their pride and "face".

### Conclusions

Trust is very important for organization operates healthy, and performance appraisal is also the

key tool to enhance organization performance. This paper analyze the interactive relationship between performance appraisal and trust, and point out that performance appraisal is the control tool for leaders don't trust employee, but employee also don't trust their leaders because of politics in performance appraisal, this interactive relationship will emerge "sick spiral relation" development trend. At last, we point that leaders should make distributive justice, procedural justice and interactive justice in performance appraisal to improve employee trust in leadership.

### **Acknowledgment**

This research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NO. 70972016).

### **References**

- [1] J. A. Colquitt, B. A. Scott, and J. A. LePine: Trust, Trustworthiness, and Trust Propensity: A Meta- Analytic Test of Their Unique Relationships with Risk Taking and Job Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 92, 2007, pp. 909-927.
- [2] S. Ghoshal, and P. Moran: Bad for Practice: A Critique of the Transaction Cost Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 21, 1996, pp. 13-47.
- [3] P. E. Levy, and J. R. Williams: The Social Context of Performance Appraisal: A Review and Framework for the Future. *Journal of Management*, vol. 30, 2004, pp. 881-905.
- [4] R. C. Mayer, J. H. Davis, and F. D. Schoorman: An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 20, 1995, pp. 709-734.
- [5] J. G. Fisher, L. A. Maines, S. A. Pfeffer, and G. B. Sprinkle: An Experimental Investigation of Employer Discretion in Employee Performance Evaluation and Compensation. *The Accounting Review*, vol. 80, 2005, pp. 563-583.
- [6] A. Tziner, G. P. Latham, B. S. Prince, and R. Haccoun: Development and Validation of a Questionnaire for Measuring Perceived Political Considerations in Performance Appraisal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 17, 1996, pp. 179-190.
- [7] J. Fulk, A .P. Brief, and S. H. Barr: Trust-in-Supervisor and Perceived Fairness and Accuracy of Performance Evaluations. *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 13, 1985, pp. 301-313.
- [8] F. Hartmann, and S. Slapnicar: How Formal Performance Evaluation Affects Trust between Superior and Subordinate Managers. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 34, 2009, pp. 722-737.
- [9] M. L. Frazier, P. D. Johnson, M. Gavin, J. Gooty, and D. B. Snow: Organizational Justice, Trustworthiness, and Trust: A Multifoci Examination. *Group & Organization Management*, vol. 35, 2010, pp. 39-76.