THE INFLUENCE OF SUBJECTIVE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY ON OPPORTUNISTIC BEHAVIOR IN ORGANIZATIONS

Sevara Umarjonova
Sharda University Uzbekistan

Abstract

Performance evaluation is a fundamental component of organizational management, influencing employee motivation, compensation decisions, professional development, and workplace relationships. However, performance assessment systems may create opportunities for managerial opportunism, particularly when evaluation criteria are subjective and decision-making processes lack transparency. This study examines the theoretical relationship between subjective performance evaluation, managerial accountability, and opportunistic behavior in organizations. Drawing on agency theory, organizational justice theory, and management control research, the article explores how discretion in performance assessment may influence the fairness and reliability of managerial decisions. Particular attention is given to the role of justification requirements, procedural transparency, and organizational monitoring in limiting biased evaluations. The research employs a conceptual and analytical approach based on a narrative review of relevant scientific literature. The analysis suggests that subjective evaluation is not inherently harmful; rather, its consequences depend on the institutional conditions under which managerial discretion is exercised. A conceptual framework is proposed in which accountability mechanisms, transparent evaluation standards, and documented justifications may reduce opportunities for self-interested managerial behavior. The study contributes to discussions on organizational governance, performance management, and ethical decision-making.

Keywords: employer moral hazard, performance evaluation, managerial opportunism, subjective performance measures, accountability, organizational justice, agency theory, managerial discretion.

Introduction

Employee performance evaluation plays an essential role in contemporary organizational management. It provides information for decisions concerning compensation, promotion, professional development, employee retention, and organizational performance improvement.Organizations use various approaches to assess employee performance, including objective productivity indicators, behavioral assessments, supervisor ratings, and multidimensional performance measurement systems.Objective performance indicators may include sales volume, production output, task completion rates, or measurable service outcomes. Subjective indicators often involve managerial judgments concerning teamwork, creativity, initiative, communication, leadership potential, and overall professional contribution.Although subjective performance measures allow organizations to evaluate dimensions that cannot easily be quantified, they may also create opportunities for biased judgments and opportunistic behavior.Managerial opportunism occurs when decision-makers use their authority to pursue personal interests or organizationally inappropriate objectives at the expense of fair and efficient outcomes.Within performance evaluation systems, such behavior may involve unjustified rating adjustments, favoritism, selective application of assessment criteria, or manipulation of compensation recommendations.

Agency theory provides an important framework for understanding these problems. Jensen and Meckling (1976) explain how conflicts of interest and information asymmetry may generate agency costs when decision-making authority is delegated [1].In employment relationships, managers frequently possess information and discretion that employees cannot fully observe or challenge. Consequently, subjective evaluation systems may create conditions in which managerial decisions are difficult to verify.

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

However, eliminating subjectivity is not necessarily an effective solution because many important aspects of employee performance cannot be measured through quantitative indicators alone.

The central challenge is therefore to establish organizational mechanisms that preserve the informational advantages of subjective assessment while limiting opportunities for unfair or self-interested decisions.

Relevance of the Study

The relevance of this research is associated with the increasing use of complex performance management systems and the growing importance of fairness, transparency, and accountability in organizational decision-making. Modern organizations frequently combine financial and nonfinancial indicators to evaluate employee performance. Subjective evaluation may improve assessment quality when managers possess relevant information about employee contributions that objective metrics fail to capture. Nevertheless, the same discretion may introduce favoritism, inconsistency, and conflicts of interest. Prendergast and Topel (1996) demonstrate that favoritism can influence organizational compensation decisions and generate inefficiencies [2]. Similarly, organizational justice research emphasizes that employees' perceptions of procedural fairness influence their attitudes toward organizational decisions and management practices [3]. When employees believe that performance evaluations are arbitrary or influenced by personal relationships, confidence in the evaluation system may decline.

This creates a need to examine the mechanisms through which managerial accountability can strengthen evaluation fairness.

The study is particularly relevant for organizations that rely heavily on supervisor assessments when making decisions about compensation, promotion, and professional recognition.

Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between subjective performance evaluation, managerial accountability, and opportunistic managerial behavior. The research seeks to identify conditions under which subjective evaluation may increase the risk of opportunism and determine how transparency, documented justification, and organizational oversight can help reduce these risks.

Materials and Methods

The study adopts a theoretical and conceptual research design. Scientific literature addressing agency theory, subjective performance measurement, organizational justice, managerial accountability, and performance management was analyzed. The methodological approach included comparative analysis, theoretical synthesis, conceptual classification, and the development of a framework describing potential relationships among evaluation subjectivity, accountability, and opportunistic behavior. The study draws on established theoretical contributions concerning agency relationships, managerial discretion, performance evaluation, and organizational fairness. No original survey, experiment, or organizational dataset was collected. Accordingly, the findings are presented as theoretically grounded propositions rather than empirically established causal effects.

Results and Discussion

Subjective performance evaluation enables managers to incorporate qualitative information into employee assessments.Such information may include the complexity of completed tasks, cooperation with colleagues, professional initiative, adaptability, and contributions that are difficult to capture through standardized quantitative indicators.Baker, Gibbons, and Murphy (1994) explain the importance of subjective performance measures in organizational incentive systems, particularly when objective indicators do not adequately represent overall employee contributions [4].Nevertheless, subjective assessment creates discretion because managers must interpret performance information and translate

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

their judgments into evaluation outcomes.This discretion can be beneficial when managers exercise professional judgment fairly.

However, it may also increase the possibility of opportunistic behavior if managers can influence ratings without sufficient explanation or oversight.The consequences of subjectivity therefore depend not only on the evaluation measures themselves but also on the organizational procedures governing their application.

Employer moral hazard can arise when organizations or their representatives possess discretion over employment-related decisions and their actions are not fully observable or verifiable by employees.For example, a manager may promise performance-based rewards but subsequently interpret ambiguous evaluation criteria in a way that reduces an employee's compensation.Such behavior may be difficult to challenge when assessment procedures lack transparency.The risk is especially relevant when managers control both the evaluation process and the distribution of rewards.From an agency perspective, differences in information and bargaining power may create incentives for decision-makers to pursue objectives that diverge from the interests of employees or the organization as a whole.

However, managerial discretion does not necessarily result in moral hazard.The likelihood of opportunistic behavior depends on incentives, monitoring arrangements, organizational culture, and the potential consequences of unfair decisions.

Managerial accountability refers to the obligation of decision-makers to explain and justify their actions to relevant organizational stakeholders.Accountability mechanisms may include written evaluation explanations, standardized assessment criteria, review procedures, and supervisory oversight.When managers are required to explain their decisions, they may devote greater attention to the consistency and defensibility of their judgments.Tetlock (1985) demonstrates that accountability can influence judgment and decision-making processes, although its effects depend on the conditions under which accountability is imposed [5].In performance evaluation, justification requirements may encourage managers to rely on observable evidence rather than personal preferences.

For example, a supervisor assigning a low performance rating may be required to identify specific examples of unmet expectations and demonstrate consistency with established assessment standards.Such procedures can make evaluations more transparent and provide a basis for organizational review.Nevertheless, accountability mechanisms may be ineffective if explanations are purely formal or if reviewers lack independence.Therefore, accountability should be supported by clear criteria, appropriate documentation, and credible review processes.

The perceived fairness of performance evaluation is closely related to organizational justice.Organizational justice is commonly examined through distributive, procedural, and interactional dimensions.Distributive justice concerns the fairness of outcomes, such as compensation and promotion decisions.Procedural justice concerns the fairness and consistency of decision-making processes.Interactional justice concerns the quality of interpersonal treatment and explanations provided during organizational decisions.Colquitt et al. (2001) identify important relationships between organizational justice perceptions and various organizational outcomes [6].In performance evaluation systems, employees may be more willing to accept unfavorable outcomes when they believe that the procedures were consistent, transparent, and respectful.Conversely, unexplained rating changes and inconsistent assessment criteria may undermine trust.Thus, performance management systems should be designed not only to generate accurate evaluations but also to ensure that employees understand how decisions are made.

Conclusion

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

Subjective performance evaluation is an important component of organizational management because it enables managers to assess employee contributions that cannot be fully represented by objective performance indicators.However, managerial discretion may create opportunities for opportunistic behavior when evaluation criteria are ambiguous and organizational oversight is insufficient.The theoretical analysis suggests that accountability mechanisms, particularly documented justification requirements and transparent review procedures, may help reduce the risks associated with subjective performance assessments.The effectiveness of these mechanisms depends on the quality of organizational governance, managerial incentives, and the consistency of evaluation standards.An effective performance management system should therefore combine the flexibility of subjective assessment with clear procedural safeguards.The proposed conceptual framework provides a foundation for future empirical studies examining the relationship between performance measure subjectivity, managerial accountability, and employer moral hazard.

Further research is needed to establish the causal effects of specific accountability mechanisms and determine the conditions under which they improve evaluation fairness and organizational performance.

References

1. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X
2. Prendergast, C., & Topel, R. H. (1996). Favoritism in organizations. *Journal of Political Economy*, 104(5), 958–978. https://doi.org/10.1086/262048
3. Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9–22. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1987.4306437
4. Baker, G., Gibbons, R., & Murphy, K. J. (1994). Subjective performance measures in optimal incentive contracts. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(4), 1125–1156. https://doi.org/10.2307/2118358
5. Tetlock, P. E. (1985). Accountability: A social check on the fundamental attribution error. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 48(3), 227–236. https://doi.org/10.2307/3033683
6. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425
7. Murphy, K. J. (1992). Performance measurement and appraisal: Motivating managers to identify and reward performance. In W. J. Bruns Jr. (Ed.), *Performance Measurement, Evaluation, and Incentives*. Harvard Business School Press.
8. Milgrom, P., & Roberts, J. (1988). An economic approach to influence activities in organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Supplement), S154–S179.
9. Bol, J. C. (2011). The determinants and performance effects of managers' performance evaluation biases. *The Accounting Review*, 86(5), 1549–1575. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-10099
10. Gibbs, M., Merchant, K. A., Van der Stede, W. A., & Vargus, M. E. (2004). Determinants and effects of subjectivity in incentives. *The Accounting Review*, 79(2), 409–436. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr.2004.79.2.409

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.