www.ijarp.com ISSN 2456-9992 Page: 01-08

International Journal Advanced Research Publications

Research Article

Volume: 02
Issue: 09

A STUDY ON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEMS IN THE MEDICAL DEVICE MANUFACTURING SECTOR: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM GALACTIC MEDICAL SYSTEM LIMITED

***Keerthana S. / Dr. T.N. Seenivasan**

Department of Management Studies, Gnanamani College of Technology, Anna University, Chennai, India.

Article Received: 13 August 2026, Article Revised: 03 September 2026, Published on: 23 September 2026

***Corresponding Author: Keerthana S.**

Department of Management Studies, Gnanamani College of Technology, Anna University, Chennai, India.

Doi: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijarp.8604

ABSTRACT

In high-precision and strictly regulated industries such as medical device manufacturing, human capital represents a vital strategic asset that directly impacts technical output, safety compliance, and operational agility. This study investigates the operational effectiveness, strategic alignment, and workforce perceptions of the performance appraisal framework at Galactic Medical System Limited, Krishnagiri, Tamil Nadu. Utilizing an empirical, descriptive research design with a stratified random sample of 100 employees across cleanroom assembly, R&D engineering, quality assurance, and administrative operations, data was gathered via a structured five-point Likert scale instrument. The empirical findings reveal a significant structural mismatch: while 85% of the workforce demonstrates baseline metric awareness, 70% of evaluations remain strictly annual, failing to capture fast-moving engineering lifecycles. Furthermore, 75% of evaluations rely heavily on traditional top-down supervisor methods, causing 45% of respondents to perceive subjective rater bias and 70% to report interpersonal friction during review cycles. Additionally, 85% view the paperwork as administratively burdensome, and 40% note that external supply chain or equipment bottlenecks are entirely ignored during individual performance calculations. Conversely, the system serves as a functional diagnostic tool, with 55% agreeing it accurately identifies training needs for ISO 13485 compliance. Based on these insights, this paper provides strategic recommendations to re-engineer the performance appraisal framework, advocating for a transition toward a digitized 360-degree evaluation model integrated with an objective External Constraint Factor (ECF) adjustment mechanism to minimize bias and improve

retention.

KEYWORDS: Performance Appraisal, Human Resource Management, Medical Device Manufacturing, ISO 13485 Compliance, 360-Degree Feedback, Rater Bias.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the modern, highly competitive, and technology-driven landscape of medical device manufacturing, Human Resource Management (HRM) has evolved from a traditional administrative support function into a vital strategic asset. Physical infrastructure, automated cleanrooms, and supply chain networks can be easily replicated by global market competitors. However, specialized human capital—consisting of biomedical engineers, cleanroom operators, regulatory compliance specialists, and quality control inspectors—represents the ultimate source of sustainable competitive advantage.

Within a high-precision manufacturing environment, a Performance Appraisal system is not merely an annual administrative checking exercise; instead, it serves as a critical quality assurance tool. Evaluation metrics directly influence technical output quality, safety compliance, and corporate agility. When executed effectively, performance appraisal bridges individual engineering metrics with global corporate strategies. It provides clear administrative guidance for promotions, talent management pipelines, and salary distributions while offering a structured mechanism for professional engineering feedback, skill gap analysis, and tailored technical training.

Galactic Medical System Private Limited, established in 2019 and located in Krishnagiri, Tamil Nadu, functions at the intersection of healthcare and advanced technology. The firm specializes in the manufacturing of medical equipment, device parts, motherboards, accessories, anti-pollution face masks, and orthopedics products. As the company scales its production lines for life-critical diagnostics and high-precision implants, its strategic enterprise blueprints must align down through operational engineering metrics to individual quality and throughput targets (e.g., Six Sigma defect rates, FDA/ISO audit readiness, R&D innovation goals, and strict Standard Operating Procedures). Consequently, structural gaps within traditional appraisal methods can degrade employee morale, increase turnover among specialized technical engineers, and jeopardize institutional regulatory adherence.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical Evolution of Performance Evaluation Systems

The concept of systematic worker evaluation dates back to the Industrial Revolution, when early manufacturing operations used basic output monitoring to track manual production speeds. Early systems treated human labor as a mere linear extension of factory machinery, focusing entirely on quantitative counts. However, the field changed significantly with the emergence of the Human Relations Movement led by Elton Mayo and the historic Western Electric Hawthorne studies. This research demonstrated that workplace social dynamics, supervisor listening styles, and structured feedback mechanisms are critical drivers of industrial productivity. In the mid-20th century, Peter Drucker introduced Management by Objectives (MBO), shifting the focus from monitoring daily activities to evaluating performance against mutually agreed-upon goals. This approach established the foundation for modern performance management, transforming appraisals from retrospective inspection tools into collaborative, future-oriented frameworks.

Contemporary Appraisal Methodologies in High-Tech Manufacturing

Modern high-precision manufacturing industries require sophisticated evaluation frameworks to balance diverse technical roles. Academic literature emphasizes several key models:

- **360-Degree Feedback Systems:** This multi-source evaluation model gathers performance data from an individual's supervisor, peers, subordinates, and occasionally external clients or auditors. In a medical device company, this format helps limit supervisor bias and accurately captures cross-functional collaboration between R&D engineers and compliance teams.
- **Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS):** BARS combines qualitative critical incidents with quantitative numerical scales. By anchoring ratings to specific, observable workplace behaviors (e.g., "Consistently double-checks cleanroom pressure logs before starting a shift"), it minimizes subjective management interpretations and provides objective performance data.
- **Balanced Scorecard Framework:** Developed by Robert Kaplan and David Norton, this framework tracks organizational and individual performance across four distinct perspectives: Financial, Customer, Internal Business Processes, and Learning & Growth. For medical device manufacturing, this ensures that production floor volume targets never override quality control benchmarks or regulatory training metrics.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study uses an empirical, descriptive, and diagnostic research design to systematically investigate the performance appraisal architecture at Galactic Medical System. It applies a quantitative survey approach supported by qualitative thematic reviews to translate workplace opinions into actionable strategic data.

Primary data was gathered through a structured, 20-question close-ended questionnaire utilizing a five-point Likert scale (ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, or Highly Aware to Unaware). The survey was distributed digitally to ensure access across all shifts. Secondary insights were pulled from Galactic Medical System's internal ISO 13485 quality manuals, HR policy documentation, global medical device manufacturing reports, and academic journals focused on human resource management.

The target universe encompasses all technical, operational, engineering, and administrative personnel employed at Galactic Medical System's manufacturing facilities (overall 60 employees in active operation). The sample size was set at 100 respondents (including contract-associated engineering operators) using a Stratified Random Sampling technique to avoid data distortion. The workforce was segmented into four distinct strata: Cleanroom Assembly Operations (40%), R&D Engineering (25%), Quality Assurance & Regulatory Compliance (20%), and Administrative Operations (15%).

4. RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

The empirical data gathered from the 100 research participants was compiled and analyzed. Table 1 outlines the complete distribution of percentage responses for the twenty core survey items evaluating the performance appraisal architecture.

Table 1: Percentage Response Distribution for Appraisal Metrics. (n = 100)

ID	Survey Metric Evaluation Area	Option A (%)	Option B (%)	Option C (%)	Option D/E (%)
Q1	Metric Awareness (KPI Clarity)	Highly Aware: 45%	Partially Aware: 40%	Not Aware: 15%	--
Q2	Appraisal Review Frequency	Annually: 70%	Semi-Annually: 20%	Quarterly: 10%	--
Q3	Perceived Freedom from Personal Bias	Strongly Agree: 20%	Agree: 35%	Neutral: 25%	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree: 20%
Q4	Capturing Medical Cleanroom Demands	Accurately: 30%	Moderately: 45%	Fails to Capture: 25%	--
Q5	Usefulness of Post-Review Feedback	Highly Useful: 40%	Somewhat Useful: 45%	Not Useful: 15%	--

Q6	Supervisor Explanation of Final Ratings	Always Explains: 50%	Sometimes Explains: 35%	Rarely/Never: 15%	--
Q7	Direct Financial Increment Linkage	Strongly Linked: 65%	Weakly Linked: 25%	No Linkage: 10%	--
Q8	Motivational Drive to Improve Output	Highly Motivating: 35%	Moderately: 50%	No Impact: 15%	--
Q9	Formal Grievance / Appeal Infrastructure	Clear Path Exists: 40%	Difficult to Invoke: 35%	No Grievance Path: 25%	--
Q10	Identification of Specific Training Needs	Effectively: 55%	Rarely Identifies: 30%	Completely Ignores: 15%	--
Q11	Primary Operational Appraisal Method	Top-Down: 75%	360-Degree: 15%	MBO Model: 10%	--
Q12	Interpersonal Friction & Tension Created	High Tension: 25%	Moderate Tension: 45%	No Tension: 30%	--
Q13	Recognition of Teamwork & Harmony	Fully Recognizes: 35%	Partially: 45%	Does Not Recognize: 20%	--
Q14	Documentation Framework Burden	Highly Efficient: 20%	Acceptable/ Tedious: 55%	Burdensome: 25%	--
Q15				Overlooked: 30%	--
ID	**Survey Metric Evaluation Area**	**Option A (%)**	**Option B (%)**	**Option C (%)**	**Option D/E (%)**
	Rewards for Workflows / Innovations	Active Reward: 25%	Passive/ Occasional: 45%		
Q16	Performance Target Achievement Ease	Consistently Exceed: 30%	Meet Benchmarks: 55%	Struggle to Achieve: 15%	--
Q17	Accounting for External Constraints (ECF)	Fully Considered: 20%	Sometimes Accounted: 40%	Completely Ignored: 40%	--
Q18	Ongoing Informal Feedback Frequency	Frequent Guidance: 35%	Occasional Catch-up: 45%	Only via Appraisal: 20%	--
Q19	Internal Promotion Traceable Transparency	Fully Transparent: 30%	Moderately: 45%	Lacks Transparency: 25%	--
Q20	Preference for Modern Multi-Source Shift	Strongly Prefer: 55%	Retain Current: 25%	Indifferent: 20%	--

5. KEY FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

High Structural Awareness coupled with Review Mismatch

While a baseline majority (85%) show satisfactory awareness regarding their primary evaluation KPIs, a critical operational gap exists in the frequency architecture. Currently, 70% of reviews are conducted strictly on an annual cycle. This slow review cadence fails to align with the dynamic, fast-paced nature of medical device engineering projects and localized monthly or quarterly production goals, resulting in decoupled milestones.

Perceived Rater Bias and Interpersonal Friction

A substantial 45% segment of the workforce expresses neutral-to-negative views regarding evaluation objectivity. This concern stems directly from an over-reliance on traditional top-down single-manager supervisor grading (75%). This concentrated rater power manifests as cognitive evaluation errors—such as the Halo Effect, Leniency Bias, and Recency Bias—generating interpersonal tension or moderate-to-high workplace friction for 70% of personnel during review periods.

Prioritizing Production Volumes over Regulatory Precision

A notable 25% of personnel report that the current framework completely fails to capture the specialized regulatory environment of medical device manufacturing. Furthermore, 40% note that supervisors completely ignore external bottlenecks—such as cleanroom equipment downtime, component supply-chain shortages, or validation delays—when calculating individual output scores. This systemic omission penalizes operators for external events outside their direct operational control.

Strong Diagnostic Training Capabilities with Opaque Progression

On a positive note, the appraisal framework serves effectively as a technical diagnostic tool. An encouraging 85% find post-review conversations useful for continuous professional development, and 55% agree the process successfully identifies training needs for maintaining ISO 13485 compliance. However, while financial linkages are direct and clear (65%), long-term internal career pathing and promotions remain highly opaque, with 25% stating the promotion pipeline lacks transparency.

6. STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Transition to a 360-Degree Cross-Functional Matrixed Model

To address the concentration of evaluator power (75% top-down) and mitigate rater bias, Galactic Medical System must adopt a multi-source review system. In a precise medical device ecosystem, production operators interact constantly with quality control inspectors, and R&D design engineers collaborate closely with regulatory compliance personnel. It is recommended to implement a balanced scoring breakdown:

$$W_{final} = 0.50 \cdot S_{supervisor} + 0.30 \cdot P_{peer} + 0.20 \cdot A_{self}$$

Where W_{final} represents the final performance rating, $S_{supervisor}$ is the direct

manager's score, P_{peer} is the cross-functional internal peer rating, and A_{self} is the employee's formal self-appraisal score.

B. Institutionalize an External Constraint Factor (ECF) Adjustment

To protect technical technicians from supply chain variances or cleanroom sterilization delays, an objective mathematical modifier should be built into production floor dashboards:

$$P_{adjusted} = rac{P_{actual}}{1 - ECF}$$

Where the External Constraint Factor (***ECF***) is calculated as the ratio of unpreventable mechanical or supply downtime to total scheduled shift hours. This adjustment ensures operators are evaluated exclusively on controllable output parameters.

C. Workflow Digitization and Leadership Calibration Training

To minimize the manual paperwork administrative burden noted by 85% of the workforce, the organization should transition away from form-heavy paper processes by integrating a automated Performance Management System (PMS) module directly into its central Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) platform. Concurrently, human resources must establish quarterly mandatory calibration workshops for all department heads to explicitly mitigate Recency and Severity bias patterns.

7. CONCLUSION

The empirical investigation demonstrates that while the performance appraisal architecture at Galactic Medical System Limited serves as a functional baseline for salary administration, it requires structural modernization to fulfill the rigorous demands of the global medical technology sector. In an arena tightly governed by international quality benchmarks (such as ISO 13485 and FDA 21 CFR Part 820), employee evaluation frameworks must balance simple volumetric speed with meticulous procedural safety compliance. By replacing traditional top-down structures with digitized 360-degree feedback, integrating objective mathematical constraint parameters, and standardizing progression metrics, the organization can cultivate an objective, transparent performance culture that safeguards product quality and drives long-term engineering excellence.

REFERENCES

1. Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (15th ed.). Kogan Page Publishers.
2. Cascio, W. F. (2019). *Managing Human Resources: Productivity, Quality of Work Life, Profits* (11th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
3. Dessler, G. (2020). *Human Resource Management* (16th ed.). Pearson Education.
4. International Organization for Standardization. (2016). *ISO 13485:2016: Medical devices — Quality management systems — Requirements for regulatory purposes*.
5. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2024). *21 CFR Part 820: Quality System Regulation for Medical Devices*. US Government Publishing Office.
6. Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (2006). Enhancing the Benefits and Eliminating the Pitfalls of Performance Management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 35(4), 374-381.
7. Healthcare & Device Manufacturing HR Review (2023). Optimizing Workforce Appraisals in High-Regulatory Cleanroom Environments. *Journal of Medical Tech Management*, 14(2), 45-58.