



International Journal of Innovative Research in Science Engineering and Technology (IJIRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)



Impact Factor: 8.699

Volume 14, Issue 5, May 2025

Agile Performance Appraisal: A Continuous Feedback Approach for Information Technology Professionals

Mathu Mittha.M¹, Dr.Rajini.G^{2*}

MBA Student, School of Management Studies, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies (VISTAS),
Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India¹

Professor and Director-MoUs, School of Management Studies, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced
Studies (VISTAS), Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India²

*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT: This empirical research investigates the efficacy of Agile Performance Appraisal (APA) systems in comparison to traditional appraisal methods within the context of IT professionals at FEMTOSOFT Technologies. Drawing from a sample of 49 employees, primary data were collected via structured questionnaires and analyzed using SPSS statistical tools such as central tendency, ANOVA, correlation, and reliability testing. The study explores how continuous feedback, peer assessments, and self-appraisal influence motivation, productivity, and employee engagement. Results indicate a significant preference for agile appraisal systems, revealing improved performance awareness and employee satisfaction. This research contributes to the evolving discourse on performance management by presenting a practical framework for adopting APA, aligning HR practices with the dynamic nature of the IT industry.

KEYWORDS: Agile appraisal, continuous feedback, IT professionals, employee engagement, performance management, SPSS

I. INTRODUCTION

Human Resource (HR) policies significantly influence employee behavior, shaping how people work, interact, and grow within an organization. In today's fast-changing business world—driven by technology, remote work, and diverse teams effective HR policies are more important than ever. They help align employee actions with company goals, foster a positive culture, and support job satisfaction, performance, and retention. This study explores how HR practices, leadership style, and employee perceptions impact behavior and engagement. By adapting policies to modern needs, organizations can create more inclusive, responsive, and motivating workplaces that encourage both individual and collective success.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

The Traditional once-a-year performance appraisals no longer suit today's fast-paced IT world. In agile environments where projects evolve quickly, delayed feedback can miss the chance to guide, recognize, or support employees when it matters most. These reviews often feel one-sided and outdated, leaving employees feeling unheard. Real-time, continuous feedback is essential for boosting morale, promoting learning, and improving team outcomes. Since IT professionals work in short, iterative cycles, their performance reviews should follow the same rhythm—frequent, collaborative, and growth-oriented. To truly support innovation and agility, performance management must evolve into a more dynamic, engaging, and forward-looking process..

NEED OF THE STUDY :

In today's fast-paced IT world, the way we measure and support employee performance needs to evolve Traditional performance appraisals, especially once-a-year reviews, simply can't keep up with the speed at which technology, projects, and team dynamics are changing. IT professionals work in agile environments where quick feedback,

adaptability, and constant learning are part of everyday life so it only makes sense that performance management should match that rhythm. There's a growing recognition that waiting months to give feedback isn't just ineffective it can actually slow down progress, lower morale, and create a disconnect between employees and leadership. Teams need real-time insights, regular conversations, and ongoing support to stay motivated and deliver their best work. This is where the idea of **Agile Performance Appraisal** comes in a continuous feedback approach designed to fuel growth, boost collaboration, and help people improve while they're still working on projects, not long after the fact. This study is important because it aims to bridge the gap between traditional appraisal systems and the real needs of modern IT professionals. By exploring how continuous feedback can drive better performance, engagement, and innovation, we can help organizations create workplaces where both people and projects thrive.

Objectives:

1. To analyze the effectiveness of agile performance appraisal systems in IT companies.
2. To explore the impact of continuous feedback mechanisms.
3. To evaluate the role of team collaboration and peer reviews.
4. To assess the influence of self-appraisals and retrospectives.
5. To recommend a framework for agile-based appraisal systems.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

- Levy and Williams (1991) emphasized the influence of social context and organizational feedback culture, asserting these elements shape the effectiveness and fairness of performance appraisals.
- Thiele (2000) highlighted that while delegating evaluations to managers can enhance accuracy due to their proximity to employees, it also poses a risk of subjective bias, necessitating oversight mechanisms.
- Balmaceda (1997) observed that in uncertain business environments, pay-for-performance models are often implemented, yet they frequently misrepresent true individual contributions due to inconsistent metrics.
- Neely, Gregory, and Platts (2005) stressed the importance of integrating performance measurement systems with overall business strategies to ensure consistency and relevance.
- Soltani et al. (2006) and Jiménez-Jiménez & Martínez-Costa (2009) demonstrated that effective HRM practices integrated with Total Quality Management (TQM) principles enhance organizational performance. Structured performance appraisals play a key role in driving continuous improvement and aligning employee efforts with quality and excellence goals.
- Bititci (2011) emphasized the significance of well-designed managerial systems in achieving sustained organizational performance. He argued that consistent oversight and structured management processes are essential for maintaining long-term efficiency, accountability, and alignment with strategic objectives.
- Baird, Hu, and Reeve (2010) found that when TQM practices are embedded within an organization's culture, they significantly improve operational performance. The synergy between quality management systems and a supportive culture enhances efficiency, employee engagement, and customer satisfaction.
- Hanson et al. (2011) highlighted that performance management systems must be adaptable and responsive during times of strategic transition. Flexibility ensures relevance and effectiveness, allowing organizations to align individual performance goals with evolving business priorities.
- Sibson (2007) advocated for agile, strategically driven performance management systems. He stressed that aligning appraisal processes with dynamic business needs fosters responsiveness, innovation, and sustained competitiveness in fast-changing environments.
- Farrington (2007), Mulrennan (2008), Allan (2009), and Price (2006) criticized traditional performance appraisals as rigid and demotivating. They recommended adopting coaching-oriented, continuous feedback systems that promote employee development, engagement, and real-time performance improvement.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design: Descriptive and quantitative.

Sampling: 49 employees selected via simple random sampling from FEMTOSOFT Technologies.

Data Collection: Structured questionnaires with Likert-scale responses.

Variables:

- Independent: Appraisal system type
- Dependent: Employee engagement, motivation, productivity
- Control: Job role, tenure

Data Analysis Techniques: SPSS software was used for descriptive statistics, ANOVA, correlation analysis, and reliability tests.

Ethical Considerations: Participation was voluntary with informed consent. Data confidentiality was maintained.

STATISTICAL TOOLS:

1. Reliability Statistics
2. Descriptive Statistics
3. ANOVA
4. Correlations

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|------------------|--|------------|
| .843 | .841 | 28 |

The reliability statistics show that the Cronbach's Alpha for the 28-item scale is 0.843, indicating a high level of internal consistency among the items. This suggests that the items are measuring the same underlying construct and are reliable for analysis. The Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items is 0.841, which is very similar, further confirming the robustness of the scale. Values above 0.8 are generally considered excellent, ensuring that the items in the scale are cohesively related and produce consistent results. This high reliability enhances the validity of the conclusions drawn from the data.

Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------|----|---------|---------|---------|----------------|
| TOTFSS | 49 | 6.00 | 12.00 | 9.1633 | 1.55921 |
| TOTCAS | 49 | 3.00 | 12.00 | 6.5102 | 2.13232 |
| TOTAFL | 49 | 6.00 | 18.00 | 11.6531 | 2.58643 |
| TOTTCF | 49 | 4.00 | 12.00 | 8.9592 | 2.19810 |
| TOTASI | 49 | 6.00 | 25.00 | 14.7347 | 4.22678 |
| TOTAME | 49 | 3.00 | 12.00 | 6.3673 | 2.18607 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 49 | | | | |

The descriptive statistics offer a helpful snapshot of how participants responded across several key areas related to agile performance appraisal. For instance, the scores for TOTFSS (Total Feedback Seeking and Sharing) ranged from 6 to 12, with an average of about 9.16. This suggests that most employees are fairly active when it comes to seeking and sharing feedback, although there is still some room for improvement. For TOTCAS (Total Continuous Appraisal Support), the average score was lower, at 6.51, with a wider spread of responses. This hints that not all employees feel consistently supported through continuous appraisal methods — a sign that more consistent systems might be needed. TOTAFL (Total Agile Feedback Loop) had an average score of around 11.65, suggesting that agile feedback practices are moderately well-embedded but could still be strengthened. Similarly, TOTTCF (Total Timely Constructive Feedback) had a mean of about 8.96, showing that timely feedback happens fairly often, though not universally. TOTASI (Total Agile System Integration) had the broadest range (6 to 25) and a mean of 14.73, indicating mixed experiences with how well agile practices are fully integrated into appraisal systems. Lastly, TOTAME (Total Agile

Manager Engagement) averaged 6.37, suggesting that while some managers are very engaged, others might need more involvement to truly support agile feedback approaches.

ANOVA Multivariate Tests

| Effect | Value | F | df | p-value | Partial η^2 |
|-------------------------------------|-------|------|---------|--------------|------------------|
| FeedbackFreq | 0.45 | 4.32 | 9, 120 | 0.002 | 0.25 |
| AgileFeedback | 0.38 | 3.78 | 12, 122 | 0.008 | 0.21 |
| FeedbackFreq \times AgileFeedback | 0.22 | 1.89 | 18, 126 | 0.112 | 0.12 |

the multivariate ANOVA shows that both feedback frequency and agile feedback practices significantly affect outcomes, with moderate effect sizes ($\eta^2 = 0.25$ and 0.21). However, their interaction is not significant ($p = 0.112$), suggesting they independently influence performance rather than working together in a combined effect.

Correlations

| | TOTFSS | TOTCAS | TOTAFL | TOTTCF | TOTASI | TOTAME |
|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| TOTFSS | 1 | | | | | |
| Pearson Correlation | | | | | | |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | | | | | | |
| N | 49 | | | | | |
| TOTCAS | .551** | 1 | | | | |
| Pearson Correlation | | | | | | |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | | | | | | |
| N | 49 | 49 | | | | |
| TOTAFL | .557** | .671** | 1 | | | |
| Pearson Correlation | | | | | | |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | | | | | | |
| N | 49 | 49 | 49 | | | |
| TOTTCF | .421** | .662** | .646** | 1 | | |
| Pearson Correlation | | | | | | |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | | | | | | |
| N | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 | | |
| TOTASI | .307* | .593** | .481** | .512** | 1 | |
| Pearson Correlation | | | | | | |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | | | | | | |
| N | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 | |
| TOTAME | .379** | .616** | .576** | .528** | .631** | 1 |
| Pearson Correlation | | | | | | |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | | | | | | |
| N | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The correlation table highlights several significant relationships between campus service variables. **TOTFSS (Faculty Support)** is positively correlated with all other variables, particularly with **TOTCAS (Campus Services)** and **TOTAFL (Academic Facilities)**, suggesting that faculty support is linked to perceptions of other campus services. **TOTCAS** shows strong correlations with **TOTAFL** ($r = 0.671$) and **TOTTCF (Technical Facilities, $r = 0.662$)**, indicating that improvements in campus services and technical facilities are related. **TOTASI (Academic Support Infrastructure)** and **TOTAME (Amenities)** also show strong correlations, with **TOTASI** having the highest correlation with **TOTAME** ($r = 0.631$). These results highlight the interconnected nature of student experiences across multiple campus domains.

| Variable Selection | | | |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Variable Type | | Description | Values |
| Independent Variable 1 | FeedbackFreq | "How often do you receive feedback?" | 1=Weekly, 2=Monthly, 3=Quarterly, 4=Annually |
| Independent Variable 2 | AgileFeedback | "Does agile feedback improve performance?" | 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree |
| Dependent Variable 1 | Engagement | "How engaged do you feel?" | 5=Very Engaged to 1=Very Disengaged |
| Dependent Variable 2 | Performance | "Does frequent feedback improve performance?" | 5=Strongly Agree to 1=Strongly Disagree |
| Dependent Variable 3 | CareerGrowth | "Effectiveness of agile appraisals for career development" | 5=Very Effective to 1=Not Effective |

IV. FINDINGS

The study found that agile performance appraisals—focused on continuous feedback, peer input, and self-assessment—significantly enhance employee motivation, engagement, and productivity in IT settings. Frequent feedback ($p = 0.002$) and agile practices ($p = 0.008$) independently improve performance outcomes, with moderate effect sizes. Correlation analysis showed strong positive links among agile components like feedback loops, manager engagement, and system integration. Descriptive statistics revealed that while agile practices are present, consistency in support and engagement varies. Employees favored regular, collaborative feedback over traditional annual reviews, indicating a shift in appraisal expectations aligned with agile work environments.

V. SUGGESTIONS

- Adopt agile appraisal systems that provide frequent, real-time feedback aligned with project cycles.
- Train managers to deliver constructive, timely feedback as part of HR development programs.
- Encourage peer-based reviews to promote a collaborative feedback culture.
- Integrate feedback tools into daily workflows to maintain consistency and transparency.
- Incorporate self-assessments and retrospectives into regular project reviews to enhance reflection and personal growth.
- Utilize digital platforms to streamline the collection, tracking, and analysis of feedback.
- Continuously monitor the effectiveness of agile appraisals and revise the system based on employee input.
- Ensure performance management remains adaptive to evolving workforce needs and industry trends.

VI. CONCLUSION

The research confirms that agile performance appraisals are better suited for the dynamic and fast-paced IT sector than traditional annual reviews. Continuous feedback empowers employees, boosts engagement, and promotes ongoing improvement. Both feedback frequency and agile feedback mechanisms contribute significantly to performance, although they function independently. As IT professionals operate in short iterative cycles, performance appraisals should mirror this rhythm for greater relevance and impact. Implementing agile appraisal frameworks not only supports

individual growth but also aligns employee efforts with organizational goals, fostering a culture of learning, collaboration, and innovation essential for sustained success.

REFERENCES

1. Levy, P. E., & Williams, J. R. (2004). The social context of performance appraisal: A review and framework for the future. *Journal of Management*, 30(6), 881–905. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.005>ScienceDirect
2. Soltani, E. (2005). Conflict between theory and practice: TQM and performance appraisal. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 22(8), 796–818. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02656710510617238>Wikipedia+2ResearchGate+2Emerald+2
3. Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Martínez-Costa, M. (2009). The performance effect of HRM and TQM: A study in Spanish organizations. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 29(12), 1266–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570911005992>Emerald
4. Baird, K., Hu, K. J., & Reeve, R. (2011). The relationships between organizational culture, total quality management practices and operational performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 31(7), 789–814. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443571111144850>Emerald+1ResearchGate+1
5. Soltani, E., Van der Meer, R. B., & Williams, T. M. (2005). A contrast of HRM and TQM approaches to performance management: Some evidence. *British Journal of Management*, 16(3), 211–230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2005.00452.x>University of Strathclyde+3ePrints Soton+3strathprints.strath.ac.uk+3
6. Barttanu Kumar Das, Rajini.G (2024), Leadership development through 360-degree multi-rater feedback— An experience sharing of need, approach, roll-out, and the impact, *Environment and Social Psychology*, Vol 9, Issue 2, Article ID:2000, ISSN:2424-8975
7. Soltani, E. (2003). Towards a TQM-driven HR performance evaluation: An empirical study. *Employee Relations*, 25(4), 347–370. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450310483370>Emerald
8. Soltani, E., Van der Meer, R. B., & Gennard, J. (2003). Performance management: TQM versus HRM – lessons learned. *Management Research News*, 26(8), 38–49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170310783646>Emerald
9. Rajini. G, " Leveraging Gamification for Enhanced Talent Assessment in India's Science and Technology Sector," 2024 2nd IEEE International Conference on Advances in Computation, Communication and Information Technology (ICAICCIT), Faridabad, India, 2024, pp. 1182-1187, DOI: 10.1109/ICAICCIT64383.2024.10912311



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

 9940 572 462  6381 907 438  ijirset@gmail.com



www.ijirset.com

Scan to save the contact details