The Impact of Performance Management Behaviors on Employee Performance

bushara musa bushara mohammed and   Ebru Günlü Kücükaltan   and   Sabri Erdem

College of Business Studies, Sudan University of Science and Technology

College of Business, Dokuz Eylul University , Turkey

Dokuz Eylul University, College of Business, Turkey

المستخلص :

هدفت هذه الدراسة الى اختبار العلاقة بين سلوكيات ادارة الاداء و اداء العاملين في شركات مختلفة عاملة بولاية الخرطوم. تم استهداف 6 شركات (2 بنوك، شركة اتصالات، 3 شركات بترول). وزعت 605 استبانة ، من بينها 337 تم تحليلها (96 استبانة للمشرفين، و 241 استبانة للمرؤسين). اظهرت نتائج الدراسة ان هنالك علاقة ذات دلالة احصائية بين سلوكيات ادارة الاداء و اداء الموظفين. حيث اوضحت النتائج ان جميع سلوكيات ادارة الاداء ما عدا وضع ومراقبة توقعات الاداء لها علاقة ايجابية مع اداء العاملين للمهمة. اوضحت النتائج كذلك ان هنالك علاقة سلبية بين سلوكيات ادارة الاداء(التغذية العكسية والاتصال والتوجيه العملي المباشر و وضع و مراقبة توقعات الاداء) و سلوك العمل المعاكس للانتاجية. بناءاً على هذه النتائج، هنالك فرصة يمكن للمدراء تطوير فعالية ادارة الاداء و اداء الموظفين و ذلك من خلال تشجيع المشرفين باظهار السلوكيات الايجابية تجاه عملية ادارة الاداء ،و بمزيد من التركيز على السلوكيات الخاصة بالتوجيه العملي المباشر و منح حوافز الاداء.

ABSTRACT:

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between performance management (PM) behaviors and employee performance among various companies operating in Khartoum State; whereas six companies were targeted (two banks, a communications company, and three oil companies). Out of 605 distributed questionnaires, 337 were analyzed (96 from supervisors and 241 from subordinates). The results indicated that supervisors' PM behaviors are significantly related to employee performance. Overall, all PM behaviors except establishing/monitoring performance expectations are positively related to task performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Whereas PM behaviors (feedback, communication, coaching, and establishing/monitoring performance expectations) are negatively related to counterproductive work behavior. Based on these findings, companies' managers have the opportunity to improve the overall effectiveness of PM and the employee performance by focusing on increasing the supervisors' engagement in positive behaviors with regard to PM processes, while putting more emphasis on coaching and provision of performance rewards.

Keywords: Performance Management, Behaviors, Employee, Supervisors' Characteristics**.**

Introduction:

The intensive competition that companies are facing today puts high pressure to look for various creative techniques in order to remain competitive. For instances, many organizations have recently adopted performance management (PM) as a technique for managing and improving employee

performance which constitutes a pre-requisite for organizational performance improvement (Guest, 1997; DeNisi and Pritchard, 2006).

According to Cascio (2006), a study stated that organizations use PM are more likely to outperform others with 51% in terms of financial performance and 41% in terms of other non-financial performance. In another study consisted of 1000 human resources management (HRM) professionals conducted in Australia reported that 96% of Australian companies are currently using various models of PM systems (Nankervis and Compton, 2006).

Further, prior research pointed out that aligning HRM practices with PM maximizes the current and future employee performance (Den Hartog et al, 2004 ; DeNisi and Pritchard, 2006)

Other studies indicated that using PM affects employees' attitudes like job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Fletcher and Williams, 1996; Harper and Vilkinas, 2005).

Problem statement :

Although extensive evidence has shown positive outcomes of PM, recent claims have argued the ineffectiveness of PM and its ability in positively affecting employee's performance (Moullakis, 2005; Pulakos and O'Leary, 2011, Deloitte University Press, 2014). This ineffectiveness of PM, to a large extent however, has been attributed to line managers/supervisors' behaviors with regard to performance management processes (Den Hartog et al, 2004; WorldatWork and Sibson Consulting, 2010; Kinicki et al, 2013). Moreover, these studies have called for empirical research to investigate the association of line managers' behaviors pertaining to PM process and subordinates' performance. However, the literature did not show research responding to these calls.

Research Questions:

The current study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the main behaviors of PM process?

2. Do PM behaviors relate to employee performance? If any, how do PM behaviors' dimensions relate to employee performance dimensions?

3. Which PM behaviors are highly related to employee performance?

Research objectives:

This study aims to examine the relationship between PM behaviors and employee performance based on a validated measure of PM behaviors. As such, it tries to examine how different PM behaviors relate with employee performance and figure out which PM behaviors are mostly influence employee performance.

Literature Review:

Performance Management Behaviors:

PM as a new concept that originated from performance appraisal can be traced back thousands of years. According to Koontz 1972 as cited in (Armstrong, 2009:10), PM started in China during the Wei Dynasty (A.D 221-265), when the emperor deployed an " imperial rater" whose job it was to evaluate the performance of members of the official family. The formal starting point of PM, however, was attributed to the work of Fredrick Taylor and his followers before the First World War (Pulakos, 2009, p10).

PM has been fully recognized, accepted and adopted as effective management practice in early 1990s by a research project conducted in Institute of Personnel Management (Linda and Ashdown, 2014: 5). Nevertheless, there were so many approaches in use for appraising employee performance such as merit rating, forced distributed, behavioral rating scale, and management by objectives

(MBO). These approaches had paved the way for PM to emerge. Particularly, performance appraisal and MBO (D Singh, 2010: 72-73).

PM is conceptualized by several scholars as a continuous interlinked set of processes and managerial behaviors aim to define, measure, and develop employee performance in alignment with organization's strategic goals for improving the success of entire organization (Casio, 2006; Aguinis, 2008; Pulakos, 2009). These scholars to a large extent also agree on four main processes that PM encompasses. These processes are; 1) Performance planning 2) Performance Execution 3) Performance Appraisal 4) Performance Review.

On the other hand, the development of effective human resource (HR) practices in many organizations is considered as a part of the responsibility of HR department. However, it is the line managers/supervisors (e.g. sales manager, manufacturing manager, quality manager...) who are responsible for implementing these practices (Gratton and Truss, 2003; Sikora and Ferris, 2014). Therefore, HR department can introduce a very complicated PM instrument, but the real value of this practice to a large extent depends on the behaviors of supervisors/line managers, e.g. their behaviors in setting-goals, providing feedback, coaching, holding performance review and deciding upon the appropriate action based on the performance results (e.g. rewards, developmental plans). These behaviors are more significant in determining whether PM delivers positive influences on employee attitudes and behaviors (Den Hartog et al, 2004). Consistent with the definition of PM noted earlier, there are many PM process models have been recently developed (Pulakos, 2009; Aguinis, 2009; Cascio, 2006; Cardy, 2004). Though these models are not similar in terms of the steps they include, the extent to which the subordinates and supervisors participate in the process, and the extent of complexity and specificity, all these models have common managerial behaviors which are needed to deliver an effective PM process (Kinicki et al, 2013).

Thus, the current study conceptualizes PM behaviors as the supervisor's behavior pertaining to PM processes (Goal setting, feedback, communication, coaching, establishing/monitoring performance expectations and providing consequences) as determined by (Kinicki et al, 2013).

Employee Performance :

The concept of employee performance or similarly job performance or individual performance has received a remarkable attention during the last two decades (Sonnetag et al, 2010). Many authors recently claimed that job performance is a multidimensional construct entails two different dimensions: behavioral dimension and outcome dimension. These two dimensions are directly related to the organizational goals (Campbell et al, 1993; Motowidlo and Schmit, 1999). The literature also showed considerable studies conducted by many authors to conceptualized job performance. However, the results of these studies are constructs overlapping sometimes and lack a comprehensive theoretical frameworks (Taxonomies) for distinguishing and integrating these different constructs to a one that reflects an ideal job performance (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002; Griffin et al, 2007, Koopmans et al, 2011)

In the present study, employee performance is conceptualized broadly as observable thing that is employees perform in terms of behaviors, actions and outcomes that contribute to the goals of organizations (Campbell et al, 1993; Motowidlo et al, 1997; Johnson, 2003; Griffin et al, 2007, Koopmans et al, 2011). Based on this definition, three components; task performance, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and counterproductive work behavior (CPW) were considered as measured dimensions of employee performance.

Performance Management Behaviors and Employee Performance :

Past research has linked employee performance with several elements such as personality traits (Mount et al, 1998; Judge et al, 2002); abilities (Schmidt et al, 1998; Boyatzis, 2008), motivation (Locke and Latham, 2002; Latham, 2004), and so forth. Concerning PM, empirical evidence was found within the research of human resource management, in which PM practice positively relates to various individual and organizational outcomes (Bartram et al, 2007; Veld et al, 2010). Further, a remarkable research has shown positive outcomes for the main components of PM on employee performance such as goal setting (Locke and Latham, 2002, 2006; Luthans et al, 2008), communication and feedback (Miles et al, 1996; Kluger and DeNisi, 1996; Kinicki et al, 2004), coaching (Ellinger et al, 2003; Agarwal et al, 2009; Hagen, 2012), performance monitoring (Holman et al, 2002; Amsler et al, 2009), and providing performance consequences (Stajkovic and Luthans, 1997; Podsakoff et al, 2006). Further, Contigan et al (2005) empirically investigated the relationship between PM composite and employee performance. Their results revealed a positive association between PM and employee performance. Fletcher and Williams (1996) in contrast, found that PM elements (goal setting aspects, perceived effort-performance linkage, and perceived performance-reward linkage) are significantly related employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Notwithstanding, these studies neither built on comprehensive approach of PM nor used a validated measure of PM behaviors. Therefore, there are still gaps in the literature for studies addressing a comprehensive approach of PM and the use of validated PM behaviors measure to be linked with employee related outcomes. Further, studies are also needed to be conducted in Sudan where the practice of PM is still in its infancy.

On the other hand, past research postulating the association between employee perceptions HRM practices and employee related outcomes has relied on Social Exchange Theory, Perceived Organizational Support (POS) (Eisenberger et al, 1986). POS assumes that employees form global beliefs about the extent to which their organization supports them, values their contributions, and cares about their well-being. Thus, when employees perceive their organization (as represented by supervisors) values their contributions and cares about their well-being, they feel obligated to reciprocate these support back to the organization through favorable attitudes e.g. organizational commitment, absenteeism and turnover (Cropanzano et al, 1997; Aryee et al, 2002; Purcell and Hutchinson, 2007) and both in-role and extra-role behavior (Moorman et al, 1998; Neves and Eisenberger, 2012).

Given the propositions of social exchange theory and POS, the current study argues that the essence of social exchange is manifested throughout the PM processes in which supervisors and their subordinates interact together to decide upon and perform many job related activities.

Therefore, employees can form global beliefs about their organization through their perception of PM behaviors that are exhibited by their supervisors as organizations' agents and then enact accordingly. That is when employees perceive their supervisors display favorable performance management behaviors; they consider them as support provided by the organization and feel obligated to reciprocate this support back through increasing their task and OCB and avoiding to engage in counterproductive work behaviors. Therefore, it is hypothesize that:

H1: Performance management behaviors will be related to employee performance H1a: Performance management behaviors (goal setting, feedback, communication, coaching,

establishing/monitoring performance expectations, and providing performance consequences) will be positively related to task performance, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)

H1b: Performance management behaviors (goal setting, feedback, communication, coaching, establishing/monitoring performance expectations, and providing performance consequences) will be negatively related to counterproductive work behavior (CPW).

Method:

Participants and Procedures:

The data for this study was collected from six companies located in city of Khartoum, during the period between October 2015 and February 2016. These companies were targeted on the basis of their adoption PM approach in evaluating their employees' performance. 605 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 460 were returned. The usable questionnaires were 337 (96 for supervisors, 241 for subordinates) achieving an overall response rate of 56%. This response rate is appropriate and consistent with the norm of response rate in organizational research (Baruch and Holtom, 2008).

For supervisors, the majority of supervisors (85.4%) were male, age ranged between 28 to 63, almost (99%) all had university degree or higher. With regard to subordinates, 62% were male, age ranged between 25 to 48, most (88%) of subordinates had university degree or higher.

Two versions of the questionnaires were distributed; one to the subordinates, another to supervisors. Subordinates' questionnaire was used to prompt subordinates' responses regarding their supervisors' PM behaviors. Supervisors' questionnaire on contrast was used to get supervisors rating of their subordinates' performance in task, OCB, and counterproductive work behaviors. Further, these two versions of questionnaire were also translated from English to Arabic language using the back translation method provided in Brislin (1970). The two questionnaires were coded to maintain the anonymity of the respondents, follow up, and matching supervisors with their subordinates.

Measurement:

Performance Management Behaviors :

The 27-item Performance Management Behaviors Questionnaire (PMBQ) developed by Kinicki et al (2013) was used. This instrument uses observer rating, the 27 items are used for measuring six PM behaviors dimensions which are; goal setting, feedback, coaching, and communication, providing consequences, and establishing/monitoring performance expectations. All performance management behaviors were answered on a five-point frequency scale ("1 = rarely/never exist", "2 = once in a while", "3 = sometimes", "4 = fairly often", "5 = very frequently/always").

Employee Performance:

A 31- item instrument which was developed from various existing instruments was used for measuring the three dimensions of employee performance. 6 items from Williams and Anderson (1991) were used to assess employee task performance, 6 items taken from (Lynch et al, 1999) were used to assess OCB, and 19 items from work deviance scale (Bennett and Robison, 2000) were used to measure counterproductive work behavior. A five-point Likert scale ranging from "1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree" was used.

Results:

Prior to analyzing the data a series of confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL 8.51 was conducted to test the validity and reliability of the study constructs. For PM behaviors construct, the

results of confirmatory factor analysis indicated that all standardized parameters were statistically significant (p<.00), the standardized factor loading structure indicated that the observed variables were strongly related to their respective factors, and the model fit indices were as follows: Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) = .85; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) =.94; Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .06; Root Mean Square Residual (SMRM) = .06.

Concerning task and OCB, the results of factor loading and the goodness-of-fit indices revealed reasonable fit for model to the data after elimination of two items (TP6 and OCB6 from TASK and OCB factors respectively) and the analysis was re-conducted. The model fit indices were (GFI) = .94; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) =.94; Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .08; Root Mean Square Residual (SMRM) = .03. Finally, as for counterproductive work behavior, the results of factor loading and goodness of fit indices indicated acceptable fit for the model to the data after the removal of two items; CPW5 and CPW6 from counterproductive behavior towards individuals, and four items; CPW8, CPW10, CPW12, and CPW17 from counterproductive work behavior towards the organization based on modification indices recommendations. The values of goodness of fit indices for Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) = .90; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) =.95; Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .08; Root Mean Square Residual (SMRM) = .02.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of study variables including alpha (Cronbach, 1951) reliability measures and the inter-correlations of variables.

Table (1): Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables

Note: N = 241

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Goal Setting	3.51	.95	(.87)									
Communication	3.85	.80	.57*	(.81)								
Feedback	3.25	.92	.68*	.49*	(.86)							
Coaching	3.74	.96	.55*	.68*	.64*	(.93)						
Establishing/Moni-toring Performance Expectations	3.74	.84	.54*	.57*	.60*	.75**	(.87)					
Performance Consequences	3.41	1.09	.55*	.53*	.62*	.61**	.61**	(.87)				
Task performance	4.29	.63	.13	.22*	.20*	.21**	.12	.26**	(.89)			
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	3.87	.74	.06	.09	.09	.06	.02	.14*	.72**	(.89)		
Counterproductive Work Behavior towards the Individuals	1.26	.50	-.00	-.09	-.08	-.16**	-.05	-.01	-.33**	-.27**	(.90)	

Counterproductive Work Behavior towards the Organization	1.38	.57	-.04	-.13*	-.19*	-.28**	-.13*	-.11*	-.57**	-.46**	.66**	(.93)

*p < .05, **p < .01*

Source: field work.

In the current study, canonical correlation analysis was used to test the relationship between performance management behaviors and employee performance.

Canonical correlation analysis (CCA) was originated by the work of Hoteling in 1935, 1936 (Sherry and Henson, 2005). CCA is a multivariate technique used to examine the relationship between two sets of metric variables i.e. independent and dependent variables (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007: 567), as such its objective to correlate simultaneously these variables and to develop a linear combination of each set of variables in way that maximizes the correlation between these two sets (Hair et al, 2010: 18). There are some examples of CCA exist across disciplines (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007: 568). In management research particularly, instances in which CCA has used to analyze multiple correlated independent and dependent variables include (King and Sethi, 1998; Chen, 2008).

In the present study, PM behaviors measures were considered to be independent variables and employee performance measures were considered to be dependent variables. Initially, WIlks Lambda was used to identify whether the canonical correlations were statistically significant. Then, canonical structure coefficient (loadings) was used to describe the variables that were significantly correlated to their canonical variates. Keeping with Lambart and Durand's (1975) recommendation, variables with loading greater than or equal (0.30) were only considered. Finally, commonality and redundancy coefficients were examined to determine whether the canonical variates adequately represented all of the PM behaviors and employee performance variables.

Table 2 presents the results of CCA. The analysis produced two statistically significant pairs of canonical correlation functions, the first with canonical correlation of 0.37 (WIlks Lambda = 0.77; F= 2.57; df = 24,807; p < 0.00) and the second function with canonical correlation of 0.31 (WIlks Lambda = 0.89; F= 1.78; df =15,640; p < 0.05).

An examination of the standardized canonical coefficient and structure canonical coefficient for the first variables representing employee performance measures revealed that task performance and counterproductive work behaviors directed towards both the individuals and the organization were the contributors of this variate, with high loading for counterproductive behaviors toward organization (0.93) and moderate loading for both counterproductive work behaviors towards the individuals (0.57) and task performance (-.43). Whereas, the structure canonical coefficient for the first variables representing PM behaviors indicated 4 variables were significantly contributed to this variate (feedback, communication, coaching, establishing/monitoring performance expectations) with loading (-.52), (-.37), (-.83), and (-.41) for each variable respectively.

Table(2): Canonical Correlation Results for Performance Management Behaviors Predicting Employee Performance.

Employee Performance Set	Canonical Function1		Canonical Function2		Comm-unality
	Standardized coefficient	Structure Coefficient	Standardized coefficient	Structure Coefficient	

	Standardized coefficient	Structure Coefficient	Standardized coefficient	Structure Coefficient	Comm-unality
TASK	-.20	-.43	1.30	0.86	0.92
OCB	0.51	-.11	-.16	0.51	0.27
CPW_IND	-.7	0.57	0.12	0.07	0.32
CPW_ORG	1.09	0.93	0.51	-.09	0.91
Redundancy		0.07		0.04	
Canonical Correlation		0.37		0.31	
	Canonical Function1		Canonical Function2		
Performance Management Behaviors Set	Standardized coefficient	Structure Coefficient	Standardized coefficient	Structure Coefficient	Comm-unality
Goal setting	0.52	-.12	-.04	0.44	0.20
Feedback	-.46	-.52	0.06	0.44	0.46
Communication	0.11	-.37	0.65	0.64	0.54
Coaching	-.1.29	-.83	-.44	0.31	0.77
Establishing/Monitoring Performance Expectations	0.33	-.41	-.40	0.26	0.24
Performance Consequences	0.26	-.27	0.98	0.83	0.74
Canonical Correlation	0.37		0.31		

Source: field work

By looking at the pattern of the correlation of PM behaviors and employee performance variables, the first function appeared to indicate that feedback, communication, coaching, establishing/monitoring performance expectations behaviors were positively associated with employee task performance and negatively associated with counterproductive work behavior towards both the individuals and the organization.

An examination of standardized and structure canonical coefficient for the second employee performance variate revealed that task performance and OCB were significantly correlated, with loading (0.86), (0.51) for each variable respectively. On the other hand, standardized and structure coefficient for the second PM behaviors variate revealed that all PM behaviors variables expect establishing/monitoring performance expectations were significantly correlated and with loading (0.44) for goal setting, (0.44) for feedback, (0.64) for communication, (0.31) for coaching, and (0.83) for performance consequences.

Looking at the structure coefficient of the entire function it appeared that goal setting, feedback, communication, coaching, and performance consequences behaviors were positively associated with task performance and OCB.

An examination of the commonalities for the employee performance dimensions indicated that the task performance and counterproductive behaviors towards the organization are the main predictors of this variate with commonality coefficient of (0.92) and (0.91) respectively. Whereas coaching and performance consequences were the primary predictors for PM behaviors dimensions with commonality coefficient of (0.77) and (0.74) respectively.

In summary, the results of the canonical correlation analysis indicated that PM behaviors (feedback, communication, coaching, and establishing/monitoring performance expectations) are positively related to employee performance (task performance) and negatively related to (counterproductive work behaviors directed towards both the individuals and the organization). Further, the results

indicated that PM behaviors (goal setting, feedback, communication, coaching, and performance consequences) are positively related to employee task performance and OCB. These results give support for the study hypotheses.

Discussion :

The main objective of the present study was to investigate the relationship between PM behaviors and employee performance. Given that, the literature in the field of human resource management and organizational behavior lacked studies examined such a relationship, lacked validated measures of PM behaviors, and according the literature, no study has yet to investigate this relationship based on a validated measure of PM behaviors.

The results of the present study found support for the role of PM behaviors in influencing employee performance. Most of PM behaviors specifically, feedback, communication, coaching, and establishing/monitoring performance expectations positively related to employee task performance and negatively related to counterproductive work behavior. Further, all PM behaviors except establishing/monitoring performance expectations positively associated with employee task performance and OCB. These results are in line with previous studies in performance management postulating PM behaviors affect employee performance (Dan Hartog et al, 2004; Aguinis and Pierce, 2008; Costigan et al, 2005).

Under the umbrella of social exchange theory and perceived organizational support, the findings of the current study also congruent in a way with Fletcher and Williams (1996) results which demonstrated that subordinates who perceived favorable aspects of performance management process(participation in goal setting, feedback, and reward) were more committed to their organizations.

The findings of this study also pointed out that, although most of PM behaviors have associated with employee performance (task, OCB, and counterproductive work behavior), in fact, coaching and providing performance consequences behaviors had the highest impact among other PM behaviors on this association as the canonical correlation analysis had shown. Perhaps this can be interpreted as indication of the great emphasis on coaching and providing performance consequences in influencing employee performance. This result also in line with the findings from the study of supervisor coaching behaviors (Ellinger et al, 2003; Agarwal et al, 2009; Liu and Batt, 2010). As for providing performance consequences, the result is also compatible with prior research which emphasized the critical role of performance consequences whether financial or non-financial in changing subordinates' attitudes and behaviors (Stajkovic and Luthans, 1997)

Unexpectedly, the study did not find a significant relationship between PM behavior (establishing/monitoring performance expectations) and OCB. This result is also hold true for the relationship between PM behaviors (goal setting, providing performance consequences) and counterproductive work behavior. These findings warrant further investigations to be conducted in order to judge on the exact impact of these behaviors on the employee performance as these findings were inconsistent with previous research (Dan Hartog et, al, 2004; Costigan et al, 2005). However, as social exchange theory "perceived organizational support" provides a theoretical ground for this relationship, a clue for this result and also for the relatively low correlations between PM behaviors and employee performance might be what is pointed out in prior research that the cultural context had a great impact on how subordinates reciprocate the relationship to their organization (Brockner et al, 2001; Taras et al, 2010). In particular, perceived organization support

and employee performance relationship found to be stronger in low power distance cultures (Farh et al, 1997; Yang et al, 2007). Thus, an explanation for these non-significant results and low correlations might be due to the Sudanese cultural context which apparently high in power distance. The findings of the present study have provided new insights on the ongoing debates with regard to the importance of PM in the organizations; first, the study extends on PM research and contributes to the field by empirically testing the relationship between PM behaviors and employee performance using a validated measure. This is important because prior research has not empirically examined these relationships as the current study did to determine if they do exist. Second, the application of social exchange theory is claimed to be very useful in demonstrating how PM affects employee performance (Den Hartog et al, 2004; Aguinis and Pierce, 2008), therefore this study contributed also by adopting social exchange theory, perceived organizational support to explain this association.

Third, the support of PM behaviors measure also needs to be noted in the present study. Kinicki et al (2013) states the absence of validated measure of PM behaviors as the main reason for the lack of empirical evidence to support the argument that PM leads to improvement in employee performance. Finally, the findings also contributed to literature by the emphasis on having comprehensive approach to performance management in influencing employee attitudes and behaviors instead of relying on an individual approach. In fact almost all of PM behaviors except establishing/monitoring performance expectations did relate to employee performance. This conclusion is also congruent with Fletcher and Williams (1996) who reported that comprehensive approach to PM is likely to enhance employee satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The findings of the current study also expected to have practical contributions; especially for HR managers and supervisor; For HR managers, PM behaviors measure can be utilized as criteria to be used in recruiting, training, promotion, and evaluating supervisors/line managers. Further, a part of PM behaviors can be included in the supervisor's list of key performance indicators (KPI). HR managers could also motivate supervisors to increase their frequent exhibition of PM behaviors in particular, coaching and providing performance consequences for the purpose of improving employees' performance by linking these behaviors to various types of rewards.

For supervisors, the results of the relationship between PM behaviors and employee performance will enable them to be aware of how to influence their subordinates' performance. Notwithstanding, supervisors could utilize all dimensions of PM behaviors, supervisors are encouraged to put more emphasis on coaching and providing performance consequences as these two behaviors highly relate to employee performance compared to other PM behaviors.

On the other hand, supervisors are also advised to improve their knowledge and increase the frequent display of PM behaviors because these behaviors might later influence their evaluation and career as well.

Although the current study has strengths, as such the rating of the variables was obtained from two different sources; subordinates and supervisors and this reduced many aspects of method biases (Podsakoff et al, 2003), the sample size is also pretty large (241 subordinates and 96 supervisor), and the study used a validated measure of PM behaviors which have not been used by previous research. However, there are also some limitations that may affect its findings. First, the fact that part of PM behaviors did not correlate with some dimensions of employee performance such as the association of establishing/monitoring performance behavior with OCB, and goal setting and

proving consequences behaviors with counterproductive work behavior is also annoying. Perhaps some explanatory variables would make more clarification for these relationships and also for the general pattern of correlation between the variables in the PM behaviors set and employee performance set. Thus, further research is needed to investigate for instances, the mediating effect of subordinates' attitudes such as the perceived fairness and job satisfaction. Similarly, future studies could also examine the effect of organizational culture on this relationship because organizational culture triggers the way organizational members behave. Second, as the sample of the present study obtained from three different (Bank, Telecom, and Petroleum) types of industries, this may also limit its generalizability across other industries. Therefore, it would be helpful that new studies increase the variety of industries or just focus on one industry, by doing so the findings would be more robust. Finally, another limitation of these study lies on its design. The cross-sectional nature of this research brings additional concern about the validity of its findings. Cross-sectional research provides only initial results about the phenomenon on the time it occurred, hence longitudinal research although it is time consuming, would provide more valid results. Similarly, due to the correlational nature, the study could not make any casual inference; and this is a setback of nonexperimental research. Thus future studies address this issue of causality would be very useful.

Conclusion :

Supervisors' behaviors with regard to PM processes have been an issue of great concern among organizational research scholars and practitioners alike. As such, the focal point of debates whether these behaviors lead to improvement in performance management effectiveness and employee performance. The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between performance management behaviors (goal setting, feedback, communication, coaching, and providing performance consequences) and employee performance. The findings revealed that PM behaviors did relate to employee performance.

According to these findings, by focusing on increasing the supervisors' exhibition of positive behaviors pertaining to PM processes with more emphasis on coaching and providing performance consequences behaviors, managers have the opportunity to improve the overall effectiveness of PM and the employee performance.

REFERENCES:

1. Agarwal, R., Angst, C. M., and Magni, M. (2009). The performance effects of coaching: a multilevel analysis using hierarchical linear modeling. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, Vol. 20, No. 10, pp. 2110–2134.

2. Aguinis, H. (2009). An expanded view of performance management. In J. W. Smither, and M. London (Eds.), Performance management: putting research into action (pp. 1–44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

3. Aguinis, H., and Pierce, C. A. (2008). Enhancing the relevance of organizational behavior by embracing performance management research. Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 139-145.

4. Amsler GM, Findley HM, Ingram E. (2009). Performance monitoring: Guidance for the modern workplace. Supervision, Vol. 70, pp. 12–18

5. Armstrong, M. (2009). Armstrong's handbook of performance management: an evidence-based guide to delivering high performance. Kogan Page Publishers.

185   Journal of Economic Sciences
ISSN (Print):1858-6740   Volume 18(2) 2017
e-ISSN (Online):1858-6759

6. Aryee, S., Budhwar, P.S. and Zhen Xiong, C. (2002). 'Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model'. Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 267–285.

7. Ashdown, L. (2014). Performance management, Vol. 8. Kogan Page Publishers.

8. Aycan, Z., Al-Hamadi, A. B., Davis, A., and Budhwar, P. (2007). Cultural orientations and preferences for HRM policies and practices: the case of Oman. The international journal of

9. Bartram, T., Stanton, P., Leggat, S., and Trobe, L. (2007). between HRM and performance in healthcare,Vol. 17, No 1, pp. 21–41.

10. Baruch, Y., and Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. Human Relations, Vol. 61, No. 8, pp. 1139-1160.

11. Bennett, R. J., and Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. Journal of applied psychology, Vol. 85, No.4, pp. 349.

12. Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., and Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. International journal of selection and assessment, Vol. 9, No.2, pp. 52-69.

13. Bowling, N. a., and Gruys, M. L. (2010). Overlooked issues in the conceptualization and measurement of counterproductive work behavior. Human Resource Management Review, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 54–61.

14. Boyatzis, R. E. (2008). Competencies in the 21st century. Journal of Management Development, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp.5–12.

15. Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. Journal of cross-cultural psychology, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 185-216.

16. Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M. J., Francesco, A. M., Chen, Z. X., Kirkman, B. L. (2001). Culture and Procedural Justice: The Influence of Power Distance on Reactions to Voice, Vol. 315, pp. 300–315.

17. Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., and Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. *Personnel selection in organizations*, pp. *35-70.*

18. Cardy, R. L. (2004). Performance management: Concepts, skills, and exercises. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

19. Cascio WF. (2006). Global performance management systems. In Bjorkman I, Stahl G (Eds.), Handbook of research in international human resources management, pp. 176–196. London, UK: Edward Elgar Ltd.

20. Chen, L. H. (2008). Job satisfaction among information system (IS) personnel. Computers in human behavior, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 105-118.

21. Costigan, R. D., Insinga, R. C., Berman, J. J., Ilter, S. S., Kranas, G., and Kureshov, V. A. (2005). An examination of the relationship of a Western performance-management process to key workplace behaviors in transition economies. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 22(3), 255-267.

22. Cropanzano, R., and Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. Journal of management, 31(6), 874-900.

23. Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., and Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18, 159–180.

24. Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. Journal of applied psychology, 90(6), 1241.

25. Den Hartog, D. N., Boselie, P., and Paauwe, J. (2004). Performance management: A model and research agenda. Applied psychology, 53(4), 556-569.

26. DeNisi, A. S., and Pritchard, R. D. (2006). Performance appraisal, performance management and improving individual performance: A motivational framework. Management and Organization Review, 2(2), 253-277.

27. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., and Sowa, D. (1986), Perceived organizational support, Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3): 500-507.

28. Ellinger, A. D., Ellinger, A. E., and Keller, S. B. (2003). Supervisory coaching behavior, employee satisfaction, and warehouse employee performance: A dyadic perspective in the distribution industry. Human resource development quarterly, 14(4), 435-458.

29. Farh, J. L., Earley, P. C., and Lin, S. C. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. Administrative science quarterly, 421-444.

30. Fletcher, C., and Williams, R. (1996). Performance Management, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment1. British Journal of Management, 7(2), 169-179.

31. Gratton, L., and Truss, C. (2003). The three-dimensional people strategy: Putting human resources policies into action. The Academy of Management Executive, 17(3), 74-86.

32. Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., and Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. Academy of management journal, 50(2), 327-347.

33. Gruys, M. L., and Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the Dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behavior. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11(1), 30–42.

34. Guest, D. E. (1997). Human resource management and performance: a review and research agenda. International journal of human resource management, 8(3), 263-276.

35. Hagen, M. (2012). Managerial coaching: A review of the literature. Performance Improvement Quarterly, 24(4), 17–39.

36. Harper, S., and Vilkinas, T. (2005). Determining the impact of an organization's performance management system. Asia pacific journal of human resources, 43(1), 76-97.

37. Holman, D., Chissick, C., and Totterdell, P. (2002). The effects of performance monitoring on emotional labor and well-being in call centers. Motivation and Emotion, 26(1), 57-81.

38. Johnson, J. W. (2003). Toward a better understanding of the relationship between personality and individual job performance. Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations, 83-120.

39. Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., and Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: a qualitative and quantitative review. Journal of applied psychology, 87(4), 765.

40. Keles, S., and Aycan, Z. (2011) The International Journal of Human The relationship of managerial values and assumptions with performance management in Turkey : understanding within culture variability, 22(15), 3080-3096

41. King, R. C., and Sethi, V. (1998). The impact of socialization on the role adjustment of information systems professionals. Journal of management information systems, 14(4), 195-217.

42. Kinicki, A. J., Jacobson, K. J., Peterson, S. J., and Prussia, G. E. (2013). Development and validation of the performance management behavior questionnaire. Personnel psychology, 66(1), 1-45.

43. Kinicki, A. J., Prussia, G. E., Wu, B. J., and McKee-Ryan, F. M. (2004). A covariance structure analysis of employees' response to performance feedback. The Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(6), 1057–1069.

44. Kluger, A. N., and DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. Psychological Bulletin, 119(2), 254–284.

45. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet Henrica, C. W., and van der Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: a

46. Lambert, Z. V., and Durand, R. M. (1975). Some precautions in using canonical analysis. Journal of Marketing Research, 12(4), 468-475.

47. Latham, G. P. (2004). The motivational benefits of goal-setting. The Academy of Management Executive, 18(4), 126-129.

48. Liu, X., and Batt, R. (2010). How supervisors influence performance: A multilevel study of coaching and group management in technology-mediated services. Personnel Psychology, 63(2), 265–298.

49. Locke, E. A., and Latham, G. P. (1990). A theory of goal setting and task performance. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

50. Locke, E. A., and Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. American psychologist,57(9), 705.

51. Locke, E. A., and Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. Current directions in psychological science, 15(5), 265-268.

52. Luthans, F., Rhee, S., Luthans, B. C., and Avey, J. B. (2008). Impact of behavioral performance management in a Korean application. Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 29(5), 427–443.

53. Lynch, P. D., Eisenberger, R., and Armeli, S. (1999). Perceived organizational support: Inferior versus superior performance by wary employees. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84(4), 467.

54. Miles, E. W., Patrick, S. L., and King, W. C. (1996). Job level as a systemic variable in predicting the relationship between supervisory communication and job satisfaction. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69(3), 277-292.

55. Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., and Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior?. Academy of Management journal,41(3), 351-357.

56. Motowidlo, S. J., and Schmit, M. J. (1999). Performance assessment in unique jobs. Pulakos (Eds.), The changing nature of performance, 56-86.

57. Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W.C., and Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. Human performance, 10(2), 71-83.

58. Moullakis, J. (2005). One in five workers ''actively disengaged''. The Australian Financial Review, 10.

59. Mount, M., Barrick, M., and Stewart, G. (1998). Five-Factor Model of Personality and Performance in Jobs Involving Interpersonal Interactions. Human Performance, 11(2), 145–165.

60. Nankervis, A. R., and Compton, R. L. (2006). Performance management: Theory in practice?. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 44(1), 83-101.

61. Neves, P., and Eisenberger, R. (2012). Management communication and employee performance: The contribution of perceived organizational support. Human Performance, 25(5), 452-464.

62. Nunnaly, J.C. (1978), Psychometric Theory, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

63. Podsakoff, P. M., Bommer, W. H., Podsakoff, N. P., and MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Relationships between leader reward and punishment behavior and subordinate attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors: A meta-analytic review of existing and new research. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 99(2), 113-142.

64. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., and Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of applied psychology, 88(5), 879.

65. Pulakos, E. D. (2009). Performance management: A new approach for driving business results. John Wiley and Sons.

66. Pulakos, E. D., and O'LEARY, R. S. (2011). Why is performance management broken?. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 4(2), 146-164.

67. Purcell, J., and Hutchinson, S. (2007). Front-line managers as agents in the HRM-performance causal chain: theory, analysis and evidence. Human resource management journal, 17(1), 3-20.

68. Rotundo, M., and Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: a policy-capturing approach. Journal of applied psychology, 87(1), 66.

69. Schmidt, F. L., and Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. Psychological Bulletin, 124(2), 262–274.

70. Sherry, A., and Henson, R. K. (2005). Conducting and interpreting canonical correlation analysis in personality research: A user-friendly primer. Journal of personality assessment, 84(1), 37-48.

71. Sikora, D. M., and Ferris, G. R. (2014). Strategic human resource practice implementation: The critical role of line management. Human Resource Management Review, 24(3), 271-281.

72. Singh, B. D. (2010). Performance management System: a holistic approach. Excel Books India. Sonnentag, S., Volmer, J., and Spychala, A. (2010). Job Performance. Konstanzer (Online) Publications System (KOPS).

73. Stajkovic, A. D., and Luthans, F. (1997). A meta-analysis of the effects of organizational behavior modification on task performance, 1975–95.Academy of Management journal, 40(5), 1122-1149.

74. Tabachnick, B. G., and Fidell, L. S. (2007). Using multivariate statistics (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon

75. Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., and Steel, P. (2010). Examining the impact of Culture's consequences: a three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(3), 405.

76. Toppo, M.L., and Prusty, D.T.(2012). From Performance Appraisal to Performance Management. Journal of Business and Management, 3(5), 01-06.

77. Trends, G. H. C. (2014). Engaging the 21st-century workforce. A report by Deloitte Consulting LLP and Bersin.

78. Veld M, J Paauwe and P Boselie (2010) HRM and strategic climates in hospitals: Does the message come across at the ward level? Human Resource Management Journal 20(4), 339–356.

79. WorldatWork and Sibson Consulting, (2010). Study on the State of Performance Management research, Scottsdale, AZ: Sibson Consulting Survey.

80. Yang, J., Mossholder, K. W., and Peng, T. K. (2007). Procedural justice climate and group power distance: an examination of cross-level interaction effects. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(3), 681.