International Journal of Science, Strategic Management and Technology
Volume **02** Issue **06** June-**2026** | ISSN: **3108-1762 (Online)** | Impact Factor: 3.8
An International, Peer-Reviewed, Open Access Scholarly Journal Indexed in recognized academic databases

# A Statistical Model to Normalize the Performance Evaluation of Employees – A Case Study

**Srinibasa Sahoo**[1]
**Ranjan Kumar Sahoo**[2]
Affiliations
[1] Faculty in Rural Statistics
State Institute for Rural Development & Panchayati Raj (SIRD&PR), Government of Odisha, India
[2] Professor
Department of Statistics, Central University of Haryana, India

**https://doi.org/** 10.55041/ijsmt.v2i6.056

**Cite this Article**: Sahoo, S. (2026). A Statistical Model to Normalize the Performance Evaluation of Employees – A Case Study. International Journal of Science, Strategic Management and Technology, *02*(6). https://doi.org/10.55041/ijsmt.v2i6.056



## Abstract

In many government and private sectors, employee promotions often rely on a dual process: interviews and internal performance assessments. While interviews are generally fair due to the anonymity of committee members, the internal assessments conducted by immediate superiors tend to be subjective and occasionally biased. This creates a significant disparity where some non-performing employees receive high assessment scores, while diligent workers may receive lower scores, ultimately affecting their promotion opportunities. This paper introduces a Statistical normalization model to address these disparities in performance evaluation scores. The model ensures comparability across different evaluators and departments by standardizing the scores before they are combined with interview marks. The final aggregated scores form the basis for shortlisting candidates for promotion. Using three distinct datasets representing varying performance levels, this case study demonstrates that normalization results in datasets with identical statistical properties, making performance evaluations more equitable, consistent, and data-driven.

**Keywords:** Performance Evaluation (PE), Performance Appraisal (PA), Normalization, Mean, Standard Deviation, Standard Score.

## 1. Introduction

Performance Management (PM) and its subcomponent, Performance Evaluation (PE), are vital for any organization aiming to make merit-based personnel decisions. In the context of promotions, performance evaluations are often combined with interview scores to determine employee eligibility. However, while interview processes are largely impartial due to unknown committee compositions, the assessment scores given by reporting officers can be inconsistent and subjective. This practice undermines the fairness of the promotion process.

In the organisation, the Internal assessment system allows room for favouritism or negligence, wherein some employees may receive high scores regardless of actual performance, and others despite being hardworking may be undervalued. To resolve this, we propose a two-fold model: first, applying statistical normalization to performance scores to remove evaluator bias, and second, integrating these normalized scores with interview marks. This ensures that all candidates are evaluated on a level playing field.

This paper provides a methodological framework for applying statistical normalization primarily using Z-scores (Statistical techniques) and adjusted mean transformations to make internal performance assessments more fair, reliable, and transparent. The aim is to support HR departments in making more data-driven and justifiable promotion decisions.

## 2. Significance of Standardization in Performance Evaluation

Organizations frequently face challenges in comparing employee performance across departments or reporting units, primarily due to inconsistent evaluation criteria, varied scoring ranges, and inherent evaluator biases. This issue becomes particularly critical in the context of promotions, where performance assessments often influenced by personal discretion may unfairly benefit some employees while disadvantaging others, despite their actual contributions.

Even when performance scores are presented numerically, differences in scales, interpretations, or spread of data across departments make them difficult to compare objectively. As a result, high-scoring employees in one unit may not be truly outperforming lower-scoring employees in another leading to unjust promotion decisions.

To mitigate these issues, this paper proposes a statistical normalization model that converts raw evaluation scores into a standardized format. By accounting for the mean and standard deviation of each dataset, the model eliminates evaluator-induced distortions and ensures that all scores are interpreted on a common scale. This enables fairer performance comparisons and provides a solid foundation for unbiased decision-making in promotions.

The proposed methodology involves a two-step normalization approach:

1. **Z-score-based normalization**, which standardizes the data by centering scores around the mean and scaling them according to the spread.
2. **Mean-adjusted transformation**, which re-maps the normalized scores to a more interpretable scale that aligns with original scoring systems, making it easier for decision-makers to interpret the results without losing objectivity.

## 3. Objectives of the Study

- To examine the applicability of statistical models for normalizing employee performance evaluation scores, particularly in contexts where evaluator bias may affect fairness in promotions.
- To establish comparability across diverse performance datasets by applying standardization techniques that account for differences in scoring patterns and data spread.
- To design a normalization approach that not only ensures statistical consistency but also retains the interpretability and intuitive feel of the original scoring scale.

- To validate the effectiveness of the proposed model using simulated datasets that reflect real-world performance evaluation scenarios across departments and organizations.

## 4. Dataset Description and Methodology

The proposed methodology involves two statistical transformations of employee performance scores. Suppose an organization has three units located in different places, and each unit employs 20 staff members. The performance of each employee is evaluated on a 100-point scale. For the purpose of analysis, three separate datasets were selected, each consisting of 20 observations measured on the 100-point performance scale. These datasets represent different patterns of performance distribution across the three units.

- **Data Set 1**: Scores range from 72 to 85 (low to medium performers)
- **Data Set 2**: Wide range from 72 to 98 (mixed performance)
- **Data Set 3**: Narrow high-end range from 91 to 98 (high performers)

### 4.2 Statistical Techniques Used

#### 4.2.1 Z-Score Normalization

**The standard Z-score for any data point is calculated using:**

$$Z_i = \left(\frac{X_i - \bar{X}}{\sigma}\right)$$

Where:

- $X_i$ : Raw score of the $i^{th}$ employee
- $\bar{X}$: Mean of the dataset
- σ: Standard deviation of the dataset

The normalized value (π) is then reconstructed using:

$$\pi_i = Z_i + \mu$$

Where:

- μ: Grand mean of all data points across the three datasets

## 5. Analysis of Data

5.1 Raw Data Representation

Each dataset is visualized in tabular form, as previously shown, indicating raw scores and their transformations.

### 5.2 Calculation of Summary Statistics

| Parameter | Data 1 | Data 2 | Data 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Observed Range | 72–85 | 72–98 | 91–98 |
| Normalized Range (Z) | 83.46–86.73 | 83.90–86.83 | 83.99–86.89 |
| Mean (Original) | 76.7 | 85.1 | 94.38 |
| Mean (Z Normalized) | 85.93 | 85.93 | 85.93 |
| Std. Dev. (Original) | 3.91 | 8.88 | 2.41 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Std. Dev. (Z Normalized) | 0.96 | 1.1 | 1.01 |
| Mean (π_RS Normalized) | 82.22 | 85.52 | 90.14 |
| Std. Dev. (π_RS) | 2.01 | 4.44 | 1.21 |

## 6. Interpretation of Results

The application of the Z-score model successfully equalized the statistical parameters across datasets, particularly the mean and standard deviation. This allowed performance scores to be compared regardless of their initial scale or spread.

The second model (π_RS) retains the natural feel of scores by mapping them back to a familiar range, offering a balance between standardization and intuitive interpretation. For example, in Dataset 3, although the raw scores are tightly clustered, the model successfully stretches the range slightly while keeping the ranking intact.

Such normalized scores allow HR professionals to:

- Set objective performance thresholds.
- Compare across departments or time periods.
- Identify consistent outliers.
- Aggregate performance metrics in a composite index.

## 7. Application in Human Resource Systems

The proposed models can be embedded within performance appraisal software or dashboards, offering real-time normalization of employee scores. It can also serve as a foundational metric in:

- Promotion decisions
- Bonus allocations
- Team-level performance aggregation
- Identifying training needs

This model becomes even more important when integrating new recruits, as different supervisors may follow varied evaluation scales. By enforcing a normalization process, institutional fairness is maintained.

## 8. Conclusion and Recommendations

This case study demonstrates that performance evaluation, when approached statistically, can transcend subjectivity and enhance organizational effectiveness. The proposed statistical models normalize scores across disparate datasets, ensuring fairness and consistency.

### 8.1 Key Findings

- Performance scores can be effectively normalized using Z-scores and mean-adjusted transformations.
- All three datasets, though differing in range and variance, were normalized to a common format.
- The models facilitate easier, more transparent, and data-driven HR decisions.

### 8.2 Policy Implication

This study will be helpful for the State Govt. officials and Central Govt officials for the promotion of the employees from current rank to higher rank for example one category as Block Development officers are working at Panchayat Samiti/Block level. So, For the promotion of BDO, these employees may be getting one mark from the current rank and another mark will be given by the respective department. So in this situation normalization techniques will be useful and give unbiased result.

### Acknowledgement

The authors express their sincere gratitude to the Director, State Institute for Rural Development and Panchayati Raj (SIRD & PR), Odisha, for her constant encouragement, valuable guidance, and visionary leadership, which greatly contributed to the successful completion of this research work. We are equally thankful to the Principal, Extension Training Centre (ETC), Keonjhar, for his inspiration, support, and constructive suggestions throughout the study. We also acknowledge the cooperation and assistance provided by the officers, colleagues, and staff members of SIRD & PR and ETC Keonjhar. Special thanks are due to the Department of Panchayati Raj and Drinking Water, Government of Odisha. We further acknowledge the use of ChatGPT (OpenAI) solely for language editing, grammatical correction, and manuscript refinement.

### References

1. Jansirani, S., Hatrikrishnan, R., Jayakani, D., Saisathya, A. (2013). *A Study on Performance Appraisal System at Wipro Infrastructure Engineering Pvt. Ltd.* IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 9(3), 08–23.
2. Al-Qudah, H.S.S., & Al-Momani, A.A. (2011). *Effect of Performance Evaluation at Human Resource Department: A Case Study of Aleman Public Hospital at Ajlune Province in Jordan.* International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2(16).
3. Levin, R.I., & Rubin, D.S. *Statistics for Management.*
4. Gupta, S.C., & Kapoor, V.K. *Fundamentals of Mathematical Statistics.*
5. Bassi, L., & McMurrer, D. (2007). "Maximizing Your Return on People." Harvard Business Review, 85(3), 115–123.
6. Fitz-Enz, J. (2010). The New HR Analytics: Predicting the Economic Value of Your Company's Human Capital Investments. AMACOM.
7. Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1994). Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal. Addison-Wesley.
8. Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). Understanding Performance Appraisal: Social, Organizational, and Goal-Based Perspectives. Sage.

9. Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). "Effects of Race on Organizational Experiences, Job Performance Evaluations, and Career Outcomes." Academy of Management Journal, 33(1), 64–86.
10. Pulakos, E. D. (2009). Performance Management: A New Approach for Driving Business Results. Wiley-Blackwell.