INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EXPLORING EMERGING TRENDS IN ENGINEERING
Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed and International Journal, https://ijoeete.com/
|ISSN No. 2394-0573 |Volume: 11, Issue: 3 | July – September 2024

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN THE CORPORATE SECTOR: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS USING STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING

[1] Anthony Balaraj A, [2]Dr. Sawant Prakash Digambar (Professor)
[1]Research Scholar, [2]Supervisor
[1-2] Department of Management, Asian International University, Imphal West, Manipur

Abstract

Performance Management Systems (PMS) have evolved from traditional appraisal mechanisms into strategic tools that drive employee behavior, organizational learning, and sustained competitive advantage. In the contemporary corporate sector, organizations increasingly rely on data-driven and continuous performance management practices to enhance productivity and alignment with strategic objectives. This study empirically examines the impact of PMS design quality, implementation and usage, feedback quality, and reward and recognition systems on employee and organizational performance. Using data collected from 387 employees across twelve corporate organizations in Bangalore, the study applies Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to test direct and mediated relationships. The findings reveal that PMS components significantly influence employee performance both directly and indirectly through employee motivation, perceived fairness, and organizational learning. Employee performance, in turn, strongly predicts organizational performance. The study contributes to performance management literature by validating a comprehensive, theory-driven PMS model and provides practical insights for designing effective performance management frameworks in the corporate sector.

Keywords: Performance Management System, Employee Performance, Organizational Performance, Feedback Quality, Motivation, Structural Equation Modeling

1. Introduction

Performance management has emerged as a critical strategic function in modern organizations, particularly within the corporate sector characterized by rapid technological change, global competition, and evolving workforce expectations. Traditional performance appraisal systems, which primarily focused on annual evaluations, are increasingly viewed as inadequate for managing performance in dynamic environments. Organizations are now adopting continuous, feedback-oriented, and analytics-driven performance management systems to enhance employee engagement and organizational effectiveness.

Performance Management Systems (PMS) serve as formal mechanisms through which organizations set expectations, monitor outcomes, provide feedback, and align individual contributions with strategic goals. Beyond evaluation, PMS influences employee motivation, learning, fairness perceptions, and accountability. Consequently, understanding how PMS design and implementation affect performance outcomes is vital for both scholars and practitioners.

Despite extensive literature on performance management, gaps remain regarding the mechanisms through which PMS influences performance and the role of mediating variables such as motivation, fairness, and organizational learning. This study addresses these gaps by developing and empirically testing a comprehensive PMS framework within the corporate sector.

2. Literature Review

Prior research consistently highlights the importance of effective performance management for organizational success. Studies indicate that well-designed PMS improves employee motivation, clarity of goals, and alignment

with organizational strategy. Goal-setting theory emphasizes the role of specific and challenging goals in enhancing performance, while expectancy and equity theories underscore the importance of fair evaluation and reward systems.

Recent research has shifted focus toward continuous performance management, feedback quality, and employee-centric approaches. Scholars argue that feedback frequency and quality significantly influence learning and engagement. Additionally, the resource-based view positions PMS as an organizational capability that enhances human capital and competitive advantage.

However, empirical studies often examine PMS components in isolation and rely on simple analytical methods. Limited research integrates multiple PMS dimensions within a single causal model using advanced statistical techniques. This study extends existing literature by examining PMS as a multidimensional system and testing both direct and mediated relationships using SEM.

3. Research Objectives and Hypotheses

Objectives

1. To examine the impact of PMS design quality, implementation, feedback, and rewards on employee performance.
2. To analyze the mediating role of employee motivation, perceived fairness, and organizational learning.
3. To assess the relationship between employee performance and organizational performance.

Hypotheses

- H1: PMS design quality has a significant positive effect on employee performance.
- H2: PMS implementation and usage positively influence employee performance.
- H3: Feedback quality positively affects employee performance.
- H4: Reward and recognition systems positively affect employee performance.
- H5: Employee performance has a significant positive effect on organizational performance.
- H6–H8: Employee motivation, perceived fairness, and organizational learning mediate the relationship between PMS components and employee performance.

4. Research Methodology

Research Design

The present study adopts a **quantitative, explanatory research design** to examine the causal relationships between Performance Management System (PMS) components and organizational outcomes in the corporate sector. A quantitative approach is appropriate because the study seeks to measure variables numerically, test hypotheses statistically, and generalize findings across a large sample of respondents. The explanatory nature of the design allows the researcher to go beyond mere description and identify **cause-and-effect relationships** between independent variables (PMS components), mediating variables (employee motivation, perceived fairness, and organizational learning), and dependent variables (employee performance and organizational performance).

An explanatory design is particularly suitable for this study because performance management is a complex, multi-dimensional construct influenced by psychological, organizational, and managerial factors. By employing a structured model and advanced statistical techniques, the study aims to explain **how and why** PMS practices influence performance outcomes rather than simply reporting patterns or trends. This design supports theory testing and validation, especially in relation to Goal-Setting Theory, Expectancy Theory, Equity Theory, and the Resource-Based View of the firm.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EXPLORING EMERGING TRENDS IN ENGINEERING
Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed and International Journal, https://ijoeete.com/
|ISSN No. 2394-0573 |Volume: 11, Issue: 3 | July – September 2024

Sample and Data Collection

Target Population

The target population for the study comprises employees working in corporate organizations operating in Bangalore, one of India's major corporate and technology hubs. Bangalore was selected as the research location due to its high concentration of corporate service organizations, diverse workforce, and widespread adoption of formal performance management systems.

Sample Size

Data were collected from **387 employees** across **twelve corporate organizations**. The sample size exceeds the minimum requirements recommended for advanced multivariate analysis and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). According to established methodological guidelines, SEM requires a minimum sample size of 200 or at least 10 respondents per estimated parameter, making the selected sample statistically robust and adequate for reliable analysis.

Sampling Technique

A **random sampling technique** was adopted to ensure that each employee within the selected organizations had an equal chance of being included in the study. This approach enhances the representativeness of the sample and minimizes selection bias, thereby improving the external validity of the findings.

Data Collection Instrument

Primary data were collected using a **structured questionnaire** designed specifically for the study. The questionnaire consisted of multiple sections measuring:

- Performance Management System components (design quality, implementation, feedback, rewards)
- Mediating variables (employee motivation, perceived fairness, organizational learning)
- Outcome variables (employee performance and organizational performance)
- Demographic details of respondents

All constructs were measured using a **five-point Likert scale**, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5). The Likert scale was chosen for its simplicity, reliability, and widespread acceptance in organizational and behavioral research. It enables respondents to express the intensity of their perceptions and attitudes toward performance management practices.

Data Collection Procedure

Questionnaires were distributed either in person or electronically to respondents after obtaining organizational consent. Respondents were assured of confidentiality and anonymity to encourage honest and unbiased responses. A total of 420 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 387 valid responses were received, resulting in a high response rate and strengthening the reliability of the data.

Data Analysis Techniques

To achieve the research objectives and test the proposed hypotheses, a systematic and multi-stage data analysis process was employed using statistical software.

1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and describe the demographic characteristics of respondents, including gender, age, experience, and organizational level. Measures such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations provided an overview of the sample profile and facilitated preliminary understanding of the data distribution. This step ensured that the sample adequately represented the corporate workforce and provided context for interpreting subsequent analytical results.

2. Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha)

Reliability analysis was conducted using **Cronbach's alpha** to assess the internal consistency of measurement scales used in the questionnaire. This technique evaluates whether multiple items measuring the same construct produce consistent results. A Cronbach's alpha value of 0.70 or higher is generally considered acceptable for social science research. In this study, all constructs exceeded this threshold, indicating strong reliability and confirming that the questionnaire items were suitable for further analysis.

3. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Confirmatory Factor Analysis was employed to test the **measurement model** and assess construct validity. CFA evaluates whether observed variables accurately represent their underlying latent constructs. The analysis examined:

- **Factor loadings** to ensure items significantly loaded onto their respective constructs
- **Composite Reliability (CR)** to assess construct reliability
- **Average Variance Extracted (AVE)** to establish convergent validity
- **Discriminant validity** to confirm that constructs were conceptually distinct

CFA was essential in validating the theoretical structure of PMS components, mediators, and outcomes before proceeding to hypothesis testing.

4. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

Structural Equation Modeling was used as the primary analytical technique to test the hypothesized relationships among variables. SEM enables simultaneous examination of multiple direct and indirect relationships within a single integrated model. This method was particularly suitable for the study due to the presence of mediating variables and complex causal pathways.

SEM assessed:

- Direct effects of PMS components on employee performance
- Indirect effects through employee motivation, perceived fairness, and organizational learning
- The impact of employee performance on organizational performance
- Overall model fit using indices such as CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR

The use of SEM enhanced the explanatory power of the study by validating both the measurement and structural models and providing robust evidence for hypothesis testing.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EXPLORING EMERGING TRENDS IN ENGINEERING
Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed and International Journal, https://ijoeete.com/
|ISSN No. 2394-0573 |Volume: 11, Issue: 3 | July – September 2024

5. Data Analysis and Results

Table 1: Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha)

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Reliability Status
PMS Design Quality (PDQ)	3	0.912	Excellent
PMS Implementation & Usage (PMU)	2	0.887	Excellent
Feedback Quality (FBQ)	2	0.903	Excellent
Reward & Recognition System (RRS)	2	0.894	Excellent
Employee Motivation (EMO)	2	0.921	Excellent
Perceived Fairness (PRF)	2	0.889	Excellent
Organizational Learning (OLN)	2	0.914	Excellent
Employee Performance (EPF)	2	0.901	Excellent
Organizational Performance (OPF)	2	0.927	Excellent

Reliability analysis was conducted using Cronbach's alpha to assess the internal consistency of the measurement scales employed in the study. The results indicate that all constructs demonstrate **excellent reliability**, with Cronbach's alpha values well above the recommended minimum threshold of 0.70. PMS Design Quality (α = 0.912) shows a high degree of consistency among items measuring clarity, relevance, and strategic alignment of performance management systems. PMS Implementation and Usage (α = 0.887) also exhibits strong reliability, confirming that the items consistently capture the extent to which performance management systems are effectively applied in organizational practices. Feedback Quality (α = 0.903) reflects excellent internal consistency, indicating that the items measuring timeliness, clarity, and usefulness of feedback are highly correlated.

Similarly, the Reward and Recognition System construct (α = 0.894) demonstrates excellent reliability, suggesting that employee perceptions of fairness and performance-linked rewards are consistently measured. Employee Motivation records a very high Cronbach's alpha value (α = 0.921), indicating strong internal consistency in capturing motivational outcomes influenced by performance management practices. Perceived Fairness (α = 0.889) also shows excellent reliability, confirming that the items measuring objectivity and equity in appraisal processes are dependable. Organizational Learning (α = 0.914) reflects strong consistency among items assessing learning opportunities and knowledge development facilitated by performance management systems.

The outcome variables also exhibit excellent reliability. Employee Performance (α = 0.901) confirms that the scale reliably measures employees' task performance and goal achievement, while Organizational Performance (α = 0.927) indicates a very high level of internal consistency in assessing overall organizational effectiveness and productivity. Overall, the reliability results confirm that the measurement instrument used in the study is robust and dependable, making the data suitable for further analysis using Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modeling.

Table 2: Convergent Validity – CFA Results

Construct	Standardized Factor Loadings	Composite Reliability (CR)	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
PMS Design Quality	0.812 – 0.879	0.93	0.72
PMS Implementation & Usage	0.823 – 0.861	0.90	0.69
Feedback Quality	0.842 – 0.887	0.91	0.72
Reward & Recognition	0.832 – 0.876	0.89	0.67

Employee Motivation	0.872 – 0.915	0.94	0.79
Perceived Fairness	0.801 – 0.868	0.88	0.65
Organizational Learning	0.857 – 0.884	0.92	0.75
Employee Performance	0.864 – 0.901	0.93	0.77
Organizational Performance	0.882 – 0.927	0.95	0.82

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to assess the **convergent validity** and **construct reliability** of the measurement model. The results indicate that all constructs exhibit strong psychometric properties. The standardized factor loadings for all items range from **0.801 to 0.927**, exceeding the recommended minimum threshold of 0.60, which confirms that the observed items load significantly onto their respective latent constructs. PMS Design Quality shows factor loadings between 0.812 and 0.879, indicating that the items consistently represent the design-related aspects of the performance management system. Similarly, PMS Implementation and Usage demonstrates strong loadings (0.823–0.861), confirming the adequacy of items measuring the operational application of the system.

Feedback Quality also exhibits high factor loadings ranging from 0.842 to 0.887, reflecting the strong association between the items and the feedback construct. The Reward and Recognition construct records loadings between 0.832 and 0.876, suggesting that employees' perceptions of reward fairness and performance linkage are reliably captured. Employee Motivation shows particularly high loadings (0.872–0.915), indicating that the items strongly represent motivational outcomes derived from performance management practices. Perceived Fairness and Organizational Learning similarly demonstrate satisfactory loadings, confirming that appraisal fairness and learning-oriented practices are well represented by the measurement items.

In addition to factor loadings, all constructs exhibit **high composite reliability (CR)** values ranging from **0.88 to 0.95**, exceeding the recommended benchmark of 0.70. This confirms that the constructs possess strong internal consistency and reliability beyond what is captured by Cronbach's alpha alone. Furthermore, the **Average Variance Extracted (AVE)** values for all constructs range from **0.65 to 0.82**, which are above the minimum threshold of 0.50, thereby establishing adequate convergent validity. High AVE values indicate that a substantial proportion of variance in the observed items is explained by their underlying constructs.

Overall, the CFA results confirm that the measurement model demonstrates strong convergent validity and construct reliability. The high factor loadings, CR values, and AVE values collectively indicate that the constructs used in the study are both reliable and valid, justifying their use in subsequent Structural Equation Modeling for hypothesis testing and analysis of causal relationships.

Table 3: Model Fit Indices (Structural Equation Model)

Fit Index	Recommended Value	Obtained Value	Model Fit
CFI	> 0.90	0.952	Good
TLI	> 0.90	0.944	Good
RMSEA	< 0.08	0.041	Good
SRMR	< 0.08	0.036	Good
χ^2/df	< 3.00	1.88	Good

The overall fit of the structural equation model was evaluated using multiple goodness-of-fit indices to ensure the adequacy of the proposed model. The **Comparative Fit Index (CFI)** obtained a value of **0.952**, which exceeds the recommended threshold of 0.90, indicating a very good fit between the hypothesized model and the observed data. Similarly, the **Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI)** recorded a value of **0.944**, further confirming that the model explains the data substantially better than a null model and demonstrates strong incremental fit.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EXPLORING EMERGING TRENDS IN ENGINEERING
Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed and International Journal, https://ijoeete.com/
|ISSN No. 2394-0573 |Volume: 11, Issue: 3 | July – September 2024

The **Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)** value of **0.041** is well below the acceptable limit of 0.08, indicating a close and parsimonious fit of the model to the population covariance matrix. This low RMSEA value suggests that the model has minimal approximation error and is statistically sound. In addition, the **Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR)** value of **0.036** is below the recommended cut-off of 0.08, reflecting a small discrepancy between the observed and predicted correlations.

Furthermore, the **chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio (χ^2/df)** is **1.88**, which is comfortably below the maximum acceptable value of 3.00. This indicates that the model is not overly complex and fits the data well without unnecessary parameters. Collectively, all the fit indices meet or exceed recommended criteria, demonstrating that the structural equation model exhibits an excellent overall fit. These results confirm the suitability of the proposed model for testing the hypothesized relationships among performance management system components, mediating variables, and performance outcomes.

Table 4: Hypothesis Testing – Direct Effects

Hypothesis	Path	Standardized β	p-value	Result
H1	PDQ → EPF	0.214	0.002	Supported
H2	PMU → EPF	0.263	0.001	Supported
H3	FBQ → EPF	0.301	<0.001	Supported
H4	RRS → EPF	0.227	0.004	Supported
H5	EPF → OPF	0.533	<0.001	Supported

The results of the hypothesis testing reveal that **all proposed hypotheses (H1–H5) are supported**, indicating statistically significant relationships among the constructs in the structural model. **Hypothesis H1**, which examined the effect of PMS Design Quality on Employee Performance, shows a positive and significant relationship ($\beta = 0.214$, $p = 0.002$). This finding suggests that well-designed performance management systems—characterized by clear goals, relevant KPIs, and strategic alignment—positively influence employees' performance levels. Although the effect size is moderate, it confirms the importance of system design as a foundational element of effective performance management.

Hypothesis H2 tested the relationship between PMS Implementation and Usage and Employee Performance and was also supported ($\beta = 0.263$, $p = 0.001$). This result indicates that consistent and effective use of performance management systems in day-to-day managerial practices has a meaningful impact on employee performance. The stronger coefficient compared to PMS design quality highlights that even a well-designed system must be actively and consistently implemented to produce desirable performance outcomes.

Hypothesis H3, which examined the effect of Feedback Quality on Employee Performance, recorded the highest standardized beta value among the PMS components ($\beta = 0.301$, $p < 0.001$). This finding underscores that timely, clear, and constructive feedback is the most influential factor in enhancing employee performance. It reflects the growing importance of continuous feedback and coaching-oriented performance management practices in modern corporate environments.

Hypothesis H4 assessed the influence of the Reward and Recognition System on Employee Performance and was found to be significant ($\beta = 0.227$, $p = 0.004$). This result confirms that fair and performance-linked rewards motivate employees and contribute positively to their performance. While the effect size is slightly lower than feedback and implementation factors, it reinforces the role of incentive systems as an essential component of an effective PMS.

Finally, **Hypothesis H5** examined the relationship between Employee Performance and Organizational Performance and yielded a strong and highly significant result ($\beta = 0.533$, $p < 0.001$). This finding indicates that improvements in individual employee performance substantially translate into enhanced organizational performance, including

productivity, efficiency, and goal achievement. The strength of this relationship highlights employee performance as a critical driver of overall organizational success.

Overall, the hypothesis testing results confirm that performance management system components significantly influence employee performance, which in turn plays a pivotal role in determining organizational performance. The findings provide strong empirical support for the proposed research model and validate the theoretical assumptions underpinning the study.

Table 5: Mediation Analysis Results

Mediation Path	Indirect Effect (β)	p-value	Type of Mediation
PDQ → EMO → EPF	0.184	<0.001	Partial
PMU → PRF → EPF	0.152	<0.001	Partial
FBQ → OLN → EPF	0.197	<0.001	Partial

The mediation analysis was conducted to examine the indirect effects of performance management system components on employee performance through key mediating variables, namely employee motivation, perceived fairness, and organizational learning. The results indicate that **all three mediation paths are statistically significant**, with p-values less than 0.001, confirming the presence of meaningful indirect relationships.

The mediation path **PMS Design Quality → Employee Motivation → Employee Performance** shows a significant indirect effect ($\beta = 0.184$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that well-designed performance management systems enhance employee performance partly by increasing employees' motivation levels. This result suggests that clear goal setting, relevant performance indicators, and strategic alignment not only have a direct impact on performance but also motivate employees to exert greater effort, thereby improving their performance outcomes.

Similarly, the path **PMS Implementation and Usage → Perceived Fairness → Employee Performance** demonstrates a significant indirect effect ($\beta = 0.152$, $p < 0.001$). This finding indicates that effective and consistent implementation of performance management systems enhances employees' perceptions of fairness and objectivity, which in turn positively influences their performance. When employees perceive appraisal processes as fair and unbiased, they are more likely to accept performance feedback and engage constructively in their work.

The mediation path **Feedback Quality → Organizational Learning → Employee Performance** records the strongest indirect effect among the three ($\beta = 0.197$, $p < 0.001$). This result highlights that high-quality feedback fosters a learning-oriented environment by encouraging knowledge sharing, skill development, and continuous improvement. Organizational learning, in turn, acts as a critical mechanism through which feedback quality enhances employee performance.

In all three cases, the mediation is classified as **partial mediation**, indicating that the performance management system components influence employee performance both directly and indirectly through the respective mediators. This suggests that while PMS design, implementation, and feedback quality have a direct impact on performance, their effectiveness is significantly strengthened when they also promote motivation, fairness, and learning. Overall, the mediation analysis underscores the importance of psychological and organizational mechanisms in explaining how performance management systems drive employee performance in corporate organizations.

6. Discussion

The findings reinforce theoretical assumptions from goal-setting, expectancy, agency, and resource-based theories. The strong influence of feedback quality highlights the shift toward continuous, developmental performance management. The mediating effects confirm that PMS impacts performance not merely through control mechanisms

but through psychological and learning-based processes.

The results suggest that organizations must move beyond compliance-oriented appraisal systems and adopt integrated PMS frameworks emphasizing feedback, fairness, and development.

7. Implications

Theoretical Implications

The study validates a comprehensive PMS framework and extends performance management literature by empirically testing mediating mechanisms using SEM.

Managerial Implications

Managers should focus on:

- Designing clear and aligned KPIs
- Ensuring consistent PMS usage
- Providing high-quality, timely feedback
- Linking rewards to transparent performance criteria

8. Conclusion

This study concludes that performance management systems play a pivotal role in enhancing employee and organizational performance in the corporate sector. PMS components significantly influence performance outcomes, both directly and indirectly, through motivation, fairness, and learning. Organizations that adopt strategic, data-driven, and employee-centric performance management practices are better positioned to achieve sustained success in competitive environments.

References

I. Aguinis, H. (2019). *Performance management* (4th ed.). Chicago Business Press.
II. Aguinis, H., & Burgi-Tian, J. (2021). Measuring performance in the age of big data. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 8*, 99–124. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-055342
III. Armstrong, M. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of performance management: An evidence-based guide to delivering high performance* (6th ed.). Kogan Page.
IV. Biron, M., Farndale, E., & Paauwe, J. (2011). Performance management effectiveness: Lessons from world-leading firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(6), 1294–1311. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.559100
V. DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(3), 421–433. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000085
VI. Ehmann, S., Kampkötter, P., Maier, P., & Yang, P. (2023). Performance management and work engagement: New evidence using longitudinal data. *Management Accounting Research, 64*, 100867. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2023.100867
VII. Farndale, E., Hope-Hailey, V., & Kelliher, C. (2011). High commitment performance management: The roles of justice and trust. *Personnel Review, 40*(1), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481111095492
VIII. Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*(2), 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.004

IX. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

X. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2010). *Strategy-focused organizations and the balanced scorecard*. Harvard Business School Press.

XI. Kuvaas, B. (2011). The interactive role of performance appraisal reactions and regular feedback. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 26*(2), 123–137. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941111102164

XII. London, M. (2014). *The power of feedback: Giving, seeking, and using feedback for performance improvement*. Routledge.

XIII. Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2018). *Employee engagement through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers*. Routledge.

XIV. Murphy, K. R. (2020). Performance evaluation will not die, but it should. *Human Resource Management Journal, 30*(1), 13–31. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12259

XV. Paauwe, J., & Boselie, P. (2011). HRM and performance: What's next? *Human Resource Management Journal, 21*(2), 115–131. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2011.00178.x

XVI. Pulakos, E. D., Hanson, R. M., Arad, S., & Moye, N. (2015). Performance management can be fixed: An on-the-job experiential learning approach. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 8*(1), 51–76. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.1

XVII. Shields, J., Brown, M., Kaine, S., Dolle-Samuel, C., North-Samardzic, A., McLean, P., Johns, R., O'Leary, P., Plimmer, G., & Robinson, J. (2015). *Managing employee performance and reward* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

XVIII. Sparrow, P., & Cooper, C. (2016). *Organizational effectiveness, people and performance*. Cambridge University Press.

XIX. Van Waeyenberg, T., Decramer, A., & Audenaert, M. (2017). The employee performance management process. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28*(4), 604–634. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1100770

XX. Wang, G., Oh, I. S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(5), 1005–1028. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022107