



## International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research

ISSN : 0972-7302

available at <http://www.serialsjournal.com>

© Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Volume 15 • Number 17 (Part-II) • 2017

### Changing Contours of Performance Management Paradigm

Paritosh Mishra<sup>1</sup>, B. Shukla<sup>2</sup> and R. Sujatha<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Amity Business School, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh

<sup>2</sup> Professor of Entrepreneurship and Leadership, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh

<sup>3</sup> Associate Professor, Amity Business School, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh

**Abstract:** Changes in the business firmament through the vicissitudes of time have led to several changes in the workplace, including its constituents, its structure and its processes. Over the years there have been enormous concomitant changes in the human resource function as well as its activities. Optimising the human resource and measuring its delivery has been one of the biggest challenges in HR function. This research paper seeks to examine the changing contours of the Performance Management mechanism starting from Performance Appraisal through Balanced Scorecard and also shows the trend of contextual performance becoming a critical ingredient of performance assessment in view of the limitations of evaluation of task performance due to changed work place ramifications in the form of anytime anywhere access to information, remote connectedness, emergence of virtual teams and project-based working etc. The research paper ends with recommendations for extensive usage for building and strengthening contextual performance and integrating the same with the Performance Management mechanisms and rewards.

**Keywords:** Performance, Balanced Scorecard, Competency, Performance Management System, Contextual Performance

The strategy of an Organisation emanates from its vision and crystallises into overarching goals and objectives of the business. Organizational strategy impacts all managerial decisions starting from the nature and content of the business to identification of and service delivery to the clients and customers. It permeates all managerial actions – from front line to Board room. Regular and periodic changes to strategic decisions are both natural and healthy to a successful organisation, especially in to-day's world of volatility and uncertainty. Organisational change and organisational strategy are inextricably intertwined and cannot be unglued (Burnes, 2004; Rieley & Clarkson, 2001). The success of change in strategy of an organisation largely depends on its capability to develop appropriate and effective processes to manage such change. In so far as organisations are run and driven by its people, and it is through the people that such organisational

goals and objectives are realised, the performance of an organisation reduces to the performance of the sum total of its people. It is widely held that people provide organizations with an important resource of sustainable competitive advantage (Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Pfeffer, 1994; Wright, McMahan & McWilliams, 1994) and that the effective management of human capital, not just physical capital, may be the ultimate determinant of organizational performance (Adler, 1988; Reich, 1991). Further, it also a widely held premise that business strategies and HRM practices interact according to organisational context in determining business performance (Arthur, 1994; Guest & Hoque, 1994; Delery & Doty, 1996; Huselid & Becker, 1996; Ichniowski, Shaw & Prensushi, 1997).

In view of the persistent changes that business strategy goes through resultant upon continuous fluidity of the business world, performance measurement systems need to be vibrant, and performance measures need to be based on the ribs of realities and measure the cardinal issues impacting the business (Lynch & Cross, 1991). Colville and Millner (2011) aver that ‘a trap that organisations can fall into is not recognising that the implementation of performance management is a change process.’

## **THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND SURVEY OF LITERATURE**

### **Business Environment and Change in Business Models**

According to Burnes (2004), change is an ubiquitous feature of organisational life, both at an operational and strategic level. Many organizational events are commonly classified as change, including restructuring, downsizing, mergers and acquisitions, strategic change, and cultural change. Change is defined as “an empirical observation of difference in form, quality, or state over time in an organizational entity” (Van De Ven & Poole, 1995, p.512) . Organizational change refers to the adoption of an idea, procedure, process, or behavior that is new to an organization (Pierce & Delbecq , 1977) . Change management has been defined as ‘the process of continually renewing an organization’s direction, structure, and capabilities to serve the ever-changing needs of external and internal customers’ (Moran and Brightman, 2001, p. 111)

We are moving from a world in which we determined our destination to one on which we must learn to navigate a path between myriad and future possibilities (Thomson & Stickland, 1998). The increasing turbulence necessitates the adoption of a proactive and entrepreneurial policy within the organizations (Morgan, 1989). The most well- developed view regarding change is that it generally is precipitated by events in an organization’s environment- some problem or surprise such as shortfall in expected performance, unexpected moves by competitors, shifts in technology, or new customer demand triggers a change (March & Simon, 1958; Cyert & March, 1963).

New initiatives, project-based working, technology improvements, staying ahead of the competition – these things come together to drive ongoing changes to the way we work. There are so many changes impacting the workplace to-day that sometimes these trends become difficult to fathom. Business models are being challenged and altered. Lyft (Lyft,2017), Airbnb (Airbnb,2017) and Uber (Uber, 2017) are some which have re-defined business models and transformed the rules of the game radically.

The singular important change factor to-day is digitalisation. Digitalisation puts information directly in the hands of stakeholders simultaneously and thus changes many managerial dimensions such as capacity deployment, supplier-choice and the visibility of customer satisfaction. Uber, the ride sharing company,

which originated out of an endeavour to reduce the efforts for locating a cab on the streets of San Francisco, to-day operates in almost sixty countries and more than 300 cities. “In the third quarter of 2014, Uber accounted for 3% of business travellers’ incidental expenses. . . . Just one quarter later, that share expanded to 5%. As a percentage of total taxi rides, Uber usage has tripled from 11% in January 2014 to 33% of January this year” (“Expenses Uber”, 2015).

E-commerce businesses have reduced to nullity all earlier definitions of scale and speed and have evolved their own standards for the same. A Company like Xiaomi which makes smartphones has become the third largest smartphone manufacturer in the world. In India, they sell their competitively priced, but features-rich phones through the e-commerce site Flipkart. The result was 20, 000 devices were sold in five seconds (Gulveen, 2014).

Workplace including its constituents are changing and the trend is towards outsourcing, freelancing and contractual works. Generation X is quickly making way for Millennial and even this Gen Y is experiencing fast changes in the environment. The new generation wants everything to search or download must be on an App. It expects complementary services in a single bundled interconnected platform. Their digital presence gives them an overwhelming need for self-awareness, empathy and digital advocacy.

Even as getting the millennial into the business system remains a challenge, there are apprehensions that machines and robots may take over much of the regular works of the business. The US Army is going to replace several human soldiers with robots. (Farmer, 2014) The increasing use of drones in several civil applications such as such as policing and fire fighting, and non-military security work, such as inspection of power or pipelines is now well-known. Even the so-called knowledge works are at the risk of being replaced by artificial intelligence. The new ramifications of change are in the form of new generation know-hows such as big data analytics, social media and self-service technologies.

### **Change management**

Graetz (2000, p.550) suggests ‘Against a backdrop of increasing globalisation, deregulation, the rapid pace of technological innovation, a growing knowledge workforce, and shifting social and demographic trends, few would dispute that the primary task for management today is the leadership of organisational change.’ Change management is defined as ‘the process of continually renewing an organization’s direction, structure, and capabilities to serve the ever-changing needs of external and internal customers’ (Moran & Brightman, 2001, p. 111).

In to-day’s Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous backdrop, organisations need to anticipate changes, prepare to abreast uncertainty and ambiguity as the go of life and build the competencies to tide over complexities. Organisations must remain nimble, adaptive, agile, resilient and above all connected. Dave Gray, author of *The Connected Company* says, “To succeed in uncertain times, companies must organise differently. They must re-organise from hierarchies into holarchies, where every part can function as a whole unto itself. A connected company is flexible and resilient, able to adapt quickly to change. The path from divided to connected company is not simple or easy. But in an increasingly volatile world, it is also not optional.” (Gray, 2012).

According to Nel, Werner, Poisat, Sono, Du Plessis and Nqalo, (2011), such organisations as can efficiently manage change by unceasingly adjusting their strategies, systems, bureaucracies, products and

cultures as a sequel to the complex, volatile, unclear and unsettled environment of the twenty-first century, are characterised as leaders of renewal.

### **Alignment of HRM and Change process**

In to-day's world, HRM specialists have increasingly been perceived as strategic business partners and frontrunners of change (Du Plessis, 2009; Rennie, 2003; Walker & Stopper, 2000). Strategic human resources has progressively highlighted the pre-emptive management of change, which assists organizations to subsist in a complex, volatile competitive and globalised business environment (Grieves, 2003). HRM functions in current times significantly focus on contributing to organizational performance and corporate strategy (Barney & Wright, 1998).

In order to respond to the pace of change, "organizations are adopting flatter, more agile structures and more empowering team-oriented cultures", (Piderit, 2000) "building innovative and learning organizations, building a broad coalition" (Denis, Lamothe, & Langley, 2001), "using change agents, empowerment" and "prepare people for change, help people deal with stress" (Deal, 1985), keeping "people informed and demonstrating optimism" (Yukl, 2008).

A plaguing issue facing international HRM to-day is the extent to which the HR practices should either converge world-wide or diverge to be differentiated to suit local conditions. MNCs and their subsidiaries seek a balance between the implementation of HRM practices that conform to the legitimate expectations and requirements of the host country and the pursuit of more distinguishing practices in their country of origin (Gunnigle, Murphy, Cleveland, Heraty, & Morley, 2001). To face realistic challenges, MNCs do have best approaches from both HQ and host country culture (Doeringer, Lorenz & Terkla, 2003).

Thus, to deal with the huge vortex of change, internally, organisations have de-layered at many echelons, reduced staffing levels, and provided greater autonomy to business units with higher focus on decentralisation, increased internalisation leading to team or Project-based structures and adoption of many best practices such as TQM or Lean Management. These interventions have resulted in diminution of a large number of rigidities or formalisms in the organisations. For example, rigid 'job descriptions' have given way to more fluid and evolving set of roles and responsibilities. Matrix and project structures propel individuals to play roles that transcend geographical and functional boundaries.

Change in business strategy has lot of obligations for Human Resources Function and its goings-on. This calls for complete alignment of HR strategy to the business strategy so as to ensure single-mindedness, customer satisfaction, cost consciousness, agility, quantification, monitoring systems, integration with multi-dimensional perspectives including financial and customers etc. Accordingly, HR systems undergo change processes to suit the changing business firmament. All aspects of people management are put to tests and altered for this end – be it talent acquisition, or talent development or employee engagement or performance management.

### **PMS as a key driver to Manage change**

Since any change initiative impacts people, the Human Resources function and its processes have an important role to play in change management, HR is advantageously placed to play an active role in change management and achieve a strategic contribution (Caldwell, 2003) by replacing "resistance with resolve,

planning with results, and fear of change with excitement about its possibilities” (Ulrich, 1997, p. 152). HR ensures fruition of the change intervention by fulfilling different functional roles, such as to provide the requisite resources (Thornhill, Lewis, Millmore, & Saunders, 2000, p. 26), or help identify the process for managing change (Ulrich, 1997), or support the organisation in the process of institutionalization of the changes (Ulrich, 1997). “HR professionals as change agents do not carry out change, but they must be able to get the change done” (Ulrich, 1997, p. 161).

Performance Management System is a key driver of managing change through the instrumentalities of rewarding positive outcomes and reinforcing desirable behaviour. Hence, HR must have a rewards strategy linked to the Performance Management System in place to recognise and felicitate the early, though small milestones of change, so that it gets institutionalised. The best time to identify and reward such small wins is early and often (Amabile & Kramer, 2011), as small accomplishments would have domino effect, build great momentum and spiral into eventual transformation.

Colville and Millner (2011) argue that in order that Performance Management System delivers on ‘organisation strategy and vision’, HR needs to have an awareness of the ‘current state’ and the ‘desired state’ of the organisation and its processes. HR should create a situation of what is called ‘physiological disconfirmation’ and bring the employees to the brink from where they can clearly perceive the necessity and beneficence of change (Cummings & Worley, 2009).

The success of an organization depends on its ability to measure accurately the performance of its members and use it objectively to optimize them as a vital resource (Pattanayak, 2009). In the present highly competitive environment, organizations have to ensure peak performance of their employees continuously in order to compete and survive at the market place effectively (Prasad, 2005). The singular HR system that plays most pivotal role in fruition of organisational strategy is Performance Management in so far as it enables organizations to clarify their vision and strategy and brings in strategy-consistent endeavours and behaviour.

### **Changing Contours of Performance Management**

It is essential to examine the contours of the changes that the instrumentality of Performance Management itself has undergone through the changing times.

***Performance appraisal.*** Performance appraisal of employees implies the assessment of their performance undertaken during a specific period of time. According to Beach (1980), “Performance appraisal is a systematic evaluation of the individual with regard to his or her performance on the job and his potential for development.” Performance appraisal process helps organizations to evaluate individually the employee’s “behaviour and accomplishments over a specific period of time” (DeVries, Morrison, Shullman & Gerlach, 1981).

Performance measurement is the process of quantifying the efficiency and effectiveness of past action (Neely, Gregory & Platts, 1995). A performance measurement system enables informed decisions to be made and actions to be taken because it quantifies the efficiency and effectiveness of past actions through appropriate data. This is one of the oldest and most universal practices of management (Tripathi, 2006).



**Performance Management.** The intense competitiveness of the economy and volatility of the economic environment forced many organizations to shift from reactive performance appraisals to proactive performance management to lift productivity and improve organizational performance (Nayab, May, 2011). This was based on a realization that it is more imperative to focus on outlining, planning and managing performance than simply appraising performance (Pareek & Rao, 2006).

In their book 'Managing Performance', Armstrong and Baron (2005) note the shift in terminology from performance appraisal to performance management, which they believe indicates a wider shift in the philosophy and content of the process: 'Performance appraisal has a reputation as a punitive, top-down control device, an unloved system. Performance Management is a holistic, total approach to engaging everyone in the organisation in a continuous process, to improve everyone and their performance, and thereby the performance of the whole organisation.' Performance Management, which has been described as "*Managing the Performance of an organisation or individual*" (Treasury, 2001), is, in fact, a systematic process for improving organizational performance by developing the performance of individuals and teams (Armstrong, 2006).

**Balanced Scorecard.** Historically, performance reporting systems used to mirror facts about previous performance and were grossly inept to provide information about future performance (The Balanced Scorecard, 1999-2010). Traditional accounting based performance measures were characterised as being financially based, internally focused, backward looking and more concerned with local departmental performance than with the overall health or performance of the business (Johnson & Kaplan, 1987; Keegan, Eiler & Jones, 1989; Neely, Mills, Gregory & Platts, 1995; Olve, Roy & Wetter, 1999). As a consequence, in the late 1980s and early 1990s there was a great interest in the development of more balanced performance measurement systems with the creation of frameworks such as supportive performance measures matrix (Keegan, Eiler & Jones, 1989), the Results/Determinants Matrix (Fitzgerald & Moon, 1996; Fitzgerald, Johnston, Brignall, Silvestro & Voss, 1991) and the Balanced Scorecard (Kaplan & Norton, 1992)

The Balanced Scorecard initially was designed as a performance measurement tool (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). Through the whirligig of time it emerged as a tool for implementing strategies (Kaplan & Norton, 1996) and a charter for defining the configuration of human, information and organizational capital with strategy (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Thus, the essence of the Balanced Scorecard is cascading down of the organisational strategy into actionable result-oriented areas and its evaluation in a multi-dimensional paradigm involving not only financial parameters, but customer, internal processes and strategic capability perspectives as well.

The balanced scorecard concept has attracted a lot of research attention among academics and practitioners. According to Wiersma (2009) balanced scorecard is the most profound innovation in management accounting along with Activity Based Costing. In most of the developed world there are reports of major corporations experimenting with BSC (Speckbacher, Bischof & Pfeiffer 2003). In a more recent study Wiersma (2009) has shown that the BSC concept has actually been endorsed by major Corporations around the world with the software market being inundated with a plethora of BSC application software.

**Competency-based PMS.** Performance is usually described as desired results, behaviours, attitudes, or mannerisms. Some argue that performance refers to the final consequence. Others argue that performance

has to do with the behaviours people show in the course of producing results. Human performance is a complex phenomenon incorporating process as well as outcome aspects (Kozlowski, Gully, Nason, & Smith, 1999). The process-oriented approach to performance focuses on the competencies as the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviour that yield performance outcomes. Heneman and Thomas (1997) indicate that as performance measures outcomes, it may measure performance relative to the organization's goals, while competencies represent the means by which these results are attained.

Thus, an important component of Performance Management Systems has been competencies. The integration of competencies into performance management helps companies to identify and reinforce behaviours that lead to superlative performance. With a competency-based performance management system, the organization delineates the performance criteria for each level so that employees know what competencies they must possess and master in order to grow. Companies are able to manage their talent pool more easily, perform succession planning, and build bench strength. In addition, it creates a basis for rewards and recognition and merit increases, and promotions.

**Contextual performance.** Campbell (1990) conceptualised job performance as including “dimensions on execution of substantive tasks as well as elements focusing on motivational and interpersonal features.” Subsequent literature on performance generally rivets on two aspects of job performance- task performance and contextual performance. Task performance basically involves completion of jobs and responsibilities embodied in the Job Descriptions and Key Result areas where as contextual performance refers to activities that are not assigned or identified as a Key Result Area, but that make employees, functions or organizations more effective and efficacious, which includes attributes like liaising and collaborating and assisting others, performing *extra-role* activities of one's own volition, striving relentlessly with passion and persistence to complete tasks efficaciously, shielding the organization's vision and objects, and tenaciously observing to organization's guidelines and values come what may.

The 21<sup>st</sup> century has ushered in an era of ‘any time, any place’ access to information, flexible work time, information on the go. Today people from 20 odd countries can be part of the same Project, work for the same goal by forming a virtual team and unwind at the end of the Project. Such remote connectedness is fuelled by technology. Contextual performance behaviours have become even more important in such work situations. As job descriptions give way to going the extra mile through remote connectedness and team work emerges as the most cardinal of behavioural competencies, voluntarism and loyal steadfastness encapsulated in contextual performance become significant drivers for organizational performance.

Contextual performance is differentiated from task performance in many ways. First, task-related behaviours contribute directly or indirectly to the production of goods or delivery of services of the organisation (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). On the contrary, contextual performance impacts the social and psychological environment of the organization. A second way to distinguish is to consider behaviours that are set and agreed vs. those that are not set, agreed or documented. Contextual performance behaviours are discretionary behaviours that are not set or prescribed. (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Further, job-specific behaviours are offshoots of knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) and the KSAs differ consequent upon the job itself. Contextual behaviours, on the other hand, are more dependent upon other attributes resulting from personality factors. Such attributes leading to contextual behaviour permeate through several of actions thereby forming a common discernable strand across many jobs.

Contextual performance can augment productivity through multiple means (Podskoff & MacKenzie, 1997). For example,

- Interpersonal co-operation, such as, guiding colleagues on useful skills, or proffering alternative propositions, can enhance team efficiency in the immediate situation and over time, as “best practices” are shared throughout work groups and departments.
- Interpersonal enablement, involving supportive and considerate dealing of co-workers can aid in a manager’s productivity by reducing time or energy spent on group preservation activities.
- Employee obedience to organizational processes allows managers to focus on higher-order organisational tasks other than mundane disciplinary or monitoring activities.
- Suggesting on plugging organizational imperfections and redundancies and ways to improve may give managers valuable pointers on how to improve productivity.
- Employees demonstrating high levels of practicality or conscientiousness may voluntarily endeavour to grab new opportunities for acquiring new knowledge or developing new skills or abilities. This surely would facilitate the employee development process and would offload some pressure of employee development from the managers.
- Contextual performance also augurs well for customer satisfaction (Morrison, 1995). Meticulous employees go well beyond customer outlooks and are in the habits of bringing in what is called ‘customer delight’.

### **RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

The Research paper proposes to study the following Research objectives:

1. To study the extent to which the KRA Based Performance Management System (PMS) or the system of balanced scorecard agglomerated out of a set of key performance indicators (KPIs) that connect backwards with the organisational objectives has achieved the purpose of Performance assessment and Development in to-day’s world.
2. To examine whether the alignment of assessment of competencies (and values actualisation) with KRAs is a marked improvement over measurement of KRAs AND Scorecards only.
3. And finally to study if newer forms of performance management which emphasise on contextual performance (viz. Task / Job not covered in KRA, Voluntarily taking of assignment, defending Organizational Goals & Values) rather than task performance and continual feedback rather than one at the end of annual or bi-annual appraisal cycle, cater to the needs of to-day’s world of remote connectedness and team or Project-based working.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The research design was descriptive in nature utilizing survey method. Random sampling and availability was used to select and collect data from respondents through a questionnaire. Questionnaire for the study was designed after extensive literature review and in-depth discussions with Chief Executive Officers / HR Heads /HR Managers and Assistant HR Managers of a few Indian Companies. Five-point Likert-type rating scale was used for capturing the responses of the respondents. The rating scale ranging from ‘strongly



disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’ was used for each statement. The primary data collected using the questionnaire was checked for its reliability using Cronbach’s method. Since alpha (0.819) ranges between  $0.8 < \alpha < 0.9$ , the internal consistency of the data is considered to be good. The validity of the questionnaire has also been ascertained by this. The questionnaire was distributed to 600 full-time employees working in the companies under study, from which 391 responded, yielding a response rate of around 65%.

**Table 1**  
**Demographic Profile**

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<b>Total Work Experience</b>		
Below 5 yrs	36	9.2
6-10 years	51	13.0
11-15 years	112	28.6
Above 15 yrs	192	49.1
<b>Experience with Current Organisation</b>		
Below 2 yrs	74	18.9
3-7 years	100	25.6
8-15 years	119	30.4
Above 15 yrs	98	25.1
<b>No. of Direct Reports</b>		
Valid		
Below 2	71	18.2
3-5	66	16.9
6-9	105	26.9
10 or more	149	38.1

It may be seen from the demographic profile of the respondents that 90.8% of the respondents are having more than 5 years of total experience and 81.1% have more than 3 years’ experience in their current organisation. Further, 81.8% of the respondents have 3 or more direct reports under their supervision. This is suitable because employees who come under such category, would have experienced PMS overtime and can respond to the questionnaire clearly.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

KMO and Bartlett’s Test was carried out to examine adequacy of sample for undertaking factor analysis.

**Table 2**  
**KMO & Bartlett’s Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.932
Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	4169.402
	df	91
	Sig.	0.000

KMO value 0.932 indicates that the sample is adequate for undertaking factor analysis and significance of Bartlett's test of sphericity paves the way for putting the dataset into this.

**Table 3**  
**Variance of Rotated Components**

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.439	45.030	45.030	6.878	41.634	41.634
2	3.797	22.984	68.015	3.027	18.323	59.958
3	0.986	5.969	73.983	2.317	14.025	73.983
4	0.86	5.206	79.189			
5	0.697	4.219	83.408			
6	0.640	3.874	87.282			
7	0.487	2.948	90.230			
8	0.446	2.700	92.930			
9	0.363	2.197	95.127			
10	0.245	1.483	96.610			
11	0.212	1.283	97.893			
12	0.152	0.920	98.814			
13	0.126	0.763	99.576			
14	0.070	0.424	100.000			

The above table displays the total variance, percentage variance and cumulative percentage variance for both un-rotated and rotated components. The cumulative variance for both the cases is 73.983%. For un-rotated components, the first component accounts for 45.030% whereas for rotated it accounts for 41.634%. Likewise, in case of second component, these are 22.984% and 18.329% respectively for un-rotated and rotated respectively. The third component accounts for 5.969% and 14.025% of the total variance respectively towards un-rotated and rotated.

**Table 4**  
**Factor Loadings on Rotation**

	Component		
	1	2	3
1. Appraiser & Appraisee have equal say during setting of Key Result Areas (KRA).	0.875		
2. The KRAs set by appraiser fairly reflects appraisee performance.	0.811		
3. Appraisal of KRAs properly reflects major achievement and failure.	0.730		
4. Cascading down of the organisational strategy into employee Objectives in multiple dimensions of Financial, Customer, Process and Capability ensures overall health or performance of the business.	0.863		
5. Objectives these days are much more fluid and changeable than can be quantifiable into annual KRAs			0.880

*contd. table 4*

	<i>Component</i>		
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
6. Evaluation of KRAs along with competencies actually evaluates performance along with potential of the employees effectively in my organization		0.718	
7. Voluntarily taking up group task reflects positively in final assessment.	0.889		
8. Voluntarily taking up group task should reflect positively in final assessment.			0.647
9. Tasks & Assignments outside the KRAs are taken into consideration by appraiser during appraisal.	0.845		
10. Tasks & Assignments outside the KRAs should be taken into consideration by appraiser during appraisal.			0.862
11. Availability of Resources is taken into account while assessing performance & potential.		0.601	
12. Measuring performance on extra role activities of one's own volition should be a priority ingredient of PMS			0.787
13. Companies should use systems that collect data on the performance of people and teams on real time throughout the year			0.471
14. Our PMS effectively measures our commitment to our core values.		0.767	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

On application of the Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization to the above 14 aspects, above table presents the partial correlation coefficient between variables and rotated component. The variables having large factor loadings towards a given factor define the component. Hence, six variables constituting component-1 are: 1) Appraiser & Appraisee have equal say during setting of Key Result Areas (KRA), 2) The KRAs set by appraiser fairly reflects appraisee performance, 3) Appraisal of KRAs properly reflects major achievement and failure, 4) Cascading down of the organisational strategy into employee Objectives in multiple dimensions of Financial, Customer, Process and Capability ensures overall health or performance of the business, 5) Voluntarily taking up group task reflects positively in final assessment and 6) Tasks & Assignments outside the KRAs are taken into consideration by appraiser during appraisal. Together these variables are characterized as KRA and Scorecard-Based Performance Management System (PMS).

Similarly, three variables addressing the component-2 are: 1) Evaluation of KRAs along with competencies actually evaluates performance along with potential of the employees effectively in my organization, 2) Availability of Resources is taken into account while assessing performance & potential and 3) our PMS effectively measures our commitment to our core values. Together these variables are characterized as Competency and KRA Based Performance Management System (PMS).

The component-3 is constituted by: 1) Objectives these days are much more fluid and changeable than can be quantifiable into annual KRAs, 2) Voluntarily taking up group task should reflect positively in final assessment, 3) Tasks & Assignments outside the KRAs should be taken into consideration by appraiser during appraisal, 4) Measuring performance on extra role activities of one's own volition should be a priority ingredient of PMS and 5) Companies should use systems that collect data on the performance of people and teams on real time throughout the year. Together these variables are characterized as Contextual Performance.

Descriptive analysis was done to find out the mean scores, skewness and kurtosis for the statements in the questionnaire corresponding to various aspects of Key Result Areas Based Performance Management System, aligning assessment of competencies with KRAs for potential appraisal and assessment of job versus contextual performance.

**Table 5**  
**Findings on KRA and Scorecard-Based PMS**

		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>			
1.	Appraiser & Appraisee have equal say during setting of Key Result Areas (KRA).	Strongly Disagree	153	39.1	39.1	Mean	2.18
		Disagree	115	29.4	68.5	Skewness	0.854
		Neutral	50	12.8	81.3	SE Skewness	0.123
		Agree	46	11.8	93.1	Kurtosis	-0.391
		Strongly Agree	27	6.9	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246
2.	The KRAs set by appraiser fairly reflects appraisee performance.	Strongly Disagree	116	29.7	29.7	Mean	2.23
		Disagree	152	38.9	68.5	Skewness	0.737
		Neutral	54	13.8	82.4	SE Skewness	0.123
		Agree	55	14.1	96.4	Kurtosis	-0.361
		Strongly Agree	14	3.6	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246
3.	Appraisal of KRAs properly reflects major achievement and failure.	Strongly Disagree	127	32.5	32.5	Mean	2.47
		Disagree	111	28.4	60.9	Skewness	0.566
		Neutral	45	11.5	72.4	SE Skewness	0.123
		Agree	59	15.1	87.5	Kurtosis	-1.027
		Strongly Agree	49	12.5	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246
4.	Cascading down of the organisational strategy into employee Objectives in multiple dimensions of Financial, Customer, Process and Capability ensures overall health or performance of the business.	Strongly Disagree	198	50.6	50.6	Mean	2.08
		Disagree	85	21.7	72.4	Skewness	1.031
		Neutral	27	6.9	79.3	SE Skewness	0.123
		Agree	41	10.5	89.8	Kurtosis	-0.353
		Strongly Agree	40	10.2	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246
7.	Voluntarily taking up group task reflects positively in final assessment.	Strongly Disagree	112	28.6	28.6	Mean	2.33
		Disagree	166	42.5	71.1	Skewness	0.871
		Neutral	25	6.4	77.5	SE Skewness	0.123
		Agree	49	12.5	90	Kurtosis	-0.403
		Strongly Agree	39	10	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246
9.	Tasks & Assignments outside the KRAs are taken into consideration by appraiser during appraisal.	Strongly Disagree	155	39.6	39.6	Mean	2.22
		Disagree	123	31.5	71.1	Skewness	0.898
		Neutral	25	6.4	77.5	SE Skewness	0.123
		Agree	47	12	89.5	Kurtosis	-0.513
		Strongly Agree	41	10.5	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246

The above table depicts that there has been strong negative opinion and disagreements to the statements which corroborate that Management by Objectives, Key Result Area Based Performance Management Systems and Balanced Scorecards have got serious limitations of Performance Management. In case of all these questions the mean score is slightly above 2 which is nearly disagree. The disagreements (i.e Strongly

Disagree and Disagree together) have been in the range of 60% to 70%, which clearly indicate that the opinion is overwhelming. Further, the distributions are highly skewed to the right with longer tail in right i.e. bulk of data lie in left.

**Table 6**  
**Findings on Competency and KRA-based PMS**

		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>		
6. Evaluation of KRAs along with competencies actually evaluates performance along with potential of the employees effectively in my organization	Strongly Disagree	38	9.7	9.7	Mean	3.16
	Disagree	30	7.7	17.4	Skewness	-0.07
	Neutral	213	54.5	71.9	SE Skewness	0.123
	Agree	51	13	84.9	Kurtosis	-0.045
11. Availability of Resources is taken into account while assessing performance & potential.	Strongly Agree	59	15.1	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246
	Strongly Disagree	31	7.9	7.9	Mean	3.2
	Disagree	33	8.4	16.4	Skewness	-0.018
	Neutral	215	55	71.4	SE Skewness	0.123
14. Our PMS effectively measures our commitment to our core values.	Agree	52	13.3	84.7	Kurtosis	0.019
	Strongly Agree	60	15.3	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246
	Strongly Disagree	27	6.9	6.9	Mean	3.31
	Disagree	30	7.7	14.6	Skewness	-0.03
	Neutral	206	52.7	67.3	SE Skewness	0.123
	Agree	49	12.5	79.8	Kurtosis	-0.24
	Strongly Agree	79	20.2	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246

The Table above depicts the opinion of respondents towards questions related to PMS, which measure both KRAs and competency (including values). The highest opinion has been casted towards “Neutral (ranging from 52.7% to 55%). The average response is nearing 3. These distributions have tails of equal length in both side i.e. bulk of data lie in middle. This findings imply that even though combining evaluation of competencies is a marked improvement over PMS through measurement of KRAs only, it still fails to serve the purpose in entirety.

**Table 7**  
**Findings on Contextual Performance**

		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>		
5. Objectives these days are much more fluid and changeable than can be quantifiable into annual KRAs	Strongly Disagree	27	6.9	6.9	Mean	3.93
	Disagree	47	12	18.9	Skewness	-0.979
	Neutral	38	9.7	28.6	SE Skewness	0.123
	Agree	92	23.5	52.2	Kurtosis	-0.315
8. Voluntarily taking up group task should reflect positively in final assessment.	Strongly Agree	187	47.8	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246
	Strongly Disagree	26	6.6	6.6	Mean	4.12
	Disagree	32	8.2	14.8	Skewness	-1.372
	Neutral	20	5.1	19.9	SE Skewness	0.123
	Agree	105	26.9	46.8	Kurtosis	0.751
	Strongly Agree	208	53.2	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246

*contd. table 7*



		Frequency	%	Cumulative %		
10. Tasks & Assignments outside the KRAs should be taken into consideration by appraiser during appraisal.	Strongly Disagree	22	5.6	5.6	Mean	4.18
	Disagree	21	5.4	11	Skewness	-1.564
	Neutral	20	5.1	16.1	SE Skewness	0.123
	Agree	130	33.2	49.4	Kurtosis	1.725
	Strongly Agree	198	50.6	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246
12. Measuring performance on extra role activities of one's own volition should be a priority ingredient of PMS.	Strongly Disagree	23	5.9	5.9	Mean	4.12
	Disagree	28	7.2	13	Skewness	-1.42
	Neutral	20	5.1	18.2	SE Skewness	0.123
	Agree	129	33	51.2	Kurtosis	1.126
	Strongly Agree	191	48.8	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246
13. Companies should use systems that collect data on the performance of people and teams on real time throughout the year	Strongly Disagree	25	6.4	6.4	Mean	4.08
	Disagree	21	5.4	11.8	Skewness	-1.357
	Neutral	35	9	20.7	SE Skewness	0.123
	Agree	126	32.2	52.9	Kurtosis	1.035
	Strongly Agree	184	47.1	100	SE Kurtosis	0.246

In the Table above , more than 80% (70% in case of first item) of the respondents agree (i.e either Strongly Agree or Agree) to the statements which basically relate to advocacy for assessment of contextual performance. In all the 5 questions, the mean score is nearing or more than 4, which implies agreement to the statements. These distributions are highly skewed with longer tails towards left side i.e. bulk of data lies in right.

### CONCLUSION

Over the years the inadequacies of the Key Result Areas and Competency Based Performance Systems have come out glaringly. These performance-management systems have lost the utility of time in to-day's world. Primarily because they are entrenched in prototypes for concentrating and incessantly augmenting on distinct jobs. These are offshoots or remnants of the paradigm of scientific management dating back to late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Frederick W. Taylor was the proponent of scientific management, which has since become the most widely used principles for organising manufacturing and production The basic tenets of scientific management are reduced to three rules- reducing complex tasks into simple ones, measuring each component of such job or task and rewarding proportionate to performance. Taylorism may have changed in form in the digital age, but has remained the same in principle. Similarly, what is measured could change from the stop-watch based time and motion to more complex KPIs which could in turn get connected to the all-encompassing company goals. However, what is measured and weighted, could become ever more micro. In fact, technology itself allows time-and-motion studies to be taken to newer heights. The Human Dynamics Groups at MIT has devised a wearable device called sociometric badge, or sociometer, which measures the amount of face-to-face interaction, tone of voice, gestures, conversational time, physical proximity to other people, physical activity levels and the like. Such badges are being used in real time in organizations to automatically measure individual and collective patterns of behaviour and predict the same. Motorola makes terminals that tie to warehouse workers' arms as much to assist in their efficacy as to monitor their activities. Several construction

companies are these days using drones to monitor the progress of activities. The more the technology of measurement has advanced, the more the power Frederick Taylor's successors have gained.

However, digital Taylorism is as disliked as its precursor. Measuring each small nuance of a job makes it bereft of its inherent beauty. Micromanaging for measuring of knowledge jobs confines a knowledge worker's capability to use his proficiency imaginatively. Further, in such systems of micromanagement, there is no room for assessment of such contextual performance as voluntarily taking up group tasks, or accomplishing tasks and assignments outside the KRAs.

The eras when employees were considered as a factor of production have advanced to a time when employees are acquired and engaged to help them realise their full potential for progression and performance. There has to be more emphasis on assessment of contextual performance (viz. Task / Job not covered in KRA, Voluntarily taking of assignment, defending Organizational Goals & Values) rather than task performance, in to-day's world of remote connectedness and team or Project-based working. The process of PMS needs to help shape goals that are more volatile and unsettled, rather than a set of annualised Key Performance Indicators. It needs to facilitate a process of obtaining and disseminating continual feedback rather than one at the end of annual or bi-annual appraisal cycle, performed more in the nature of a religious more to be checked in the box.

Because of these reasons many a Companies, both in the international arena as well as in India have been doing away with such Performance Management Systems, of late. Companies, such as GE, Microsoft, Gap, and Adobe Systems have disbanded their annual appraisal systems and are instead resorting to new initiatives to get continual feedback and provide meaningful training. These Companies have dropped ratings, rankings, and annual reviews. These companies want to provide objectives that are more volatile and unsettled than annual goals, recurrent feedback discussions rather than annual or semi-annual ones, progressive coaching for development rather than backward-focused rating and ranking and a greater emphasis on teams than on individuals.

Data is fundamental to the new practices. Companies now no more rely on an annual, inexact scrutiny of individuals. They believe they can get better confirmation of individual performance by using systems to crowdsource and collect data on continual basis. Crowd-sourcing performance data through the year provides even better understandings. Needless to mention that in case of Annual Reviews managers and supervisors must stretch to remember details about the people they evaluate which can be avoided in case of such system of collecting continuous feedback

Employees at GE now use a tool, called PD@GE, which assists to keep track of the company's objectives even as they change through the year. Performance conversations centre on the observations of peers, managers, and the appraisees themselves about what facilitated and what hindered to deliver results. Zalando, which is a European electronic commerce company, has implemented a tool that crowdsources performance feedback from divergent sources. Companies which have or are moving on to feedback-based performance management in varying forms are Microsoft, HCL Technologies, Infosys and InMobi.

Organizations in sectors such as technology, finance, and media are ahead in adapting to digital technology and hence are also pioneering the transformation of performance management. Companies like GE are using technology to democratize and refine processes that have become machine-like and inflexible. Others in other sectors will take time to follow suit. However, in the meanwhile, they could also

re-vamp their processes. Following are some specific recommendations regarding usage of Performance Management System in such Companies:

To meet the modern-day challenges of business, organisations need to establish clear-cut linkages of performance management system to rewards. The synch of PMS with rewards need to be clearly disseminated and understood by employees. Rewards need to be linked to creative problem solving based on assessment of stakeholders, value addition to the process and overall impact to the business.

Contextual behaviours should be made explicit and should be recognized and rewarded. They should become part of the appraisal discussions and organizations should include contextual performance as part of feedback mechanism and managers should be trained on assessing and providing feedback on contextual behaviours.

Scorecards should be developed at Organisational, Divisional and individuals and there should be definite linkages among these. Creation of organisational strategies at the corporate level and then cascading it down is a fallacious approach and needs to be replaced. Strategic planning is to be seen as a set of tactical actions formalised through a comprehensively arranged bottom-up process. Such a process will lead to a high of engagement and ownership of the employees.

Communication is like the life blood for an organisation. An organization should also develop an effective organizational communication system to make all employees understand the common language of the scorecards.

The role of HR in building and strengthening contextual performance and eventually a successful Performance Management System is enormous. The HR professionals need to harness the data that they possess to provide insights on contextual performance. Similarly, they need to provide insightful information regarding equivalence of goals at the goal-setting stage. Some jobs offer little opening to exhibit contextual behaviours whereas other jobs provide the same in abundance. Evaluation, appreciation, rewards and growth opportunities should strike an appropriate equilibrium between the task and contextual performance opportunities in a work situation and it is here that the HR professionals need to provide insight regarding equivalence.

In assessing contextual performance managers should be sensitive to impression management and should collect information using tools such as 360 feedback from peers, subordinates and customers. HR needs to arrange training and development support to line managers to fine-tune their skills in evaluating contextual performance.

HR needs to carry out exercise on assessing the cultural dimensions on a continuum of individualism versus collectivism while administering contextual performance rewards. In highly individualistic cultures special attention needs to be paid to promoting the importance of the team interventions that might reduce the power distance.

## REFERENCES

- Adler, N.J. (1988). Organizational Development in a Multinational Environment. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, pp.349-65.
- Amabile, T. M., & Kramer, S. J. (2011, May). The Power of Small Wins. *Harvard Business Review*, 7180. Extracted from <https://hbr.org/2011/05/the-power-of-small-wins>

- Armstrong, M. & Baron, A. (2005). *Managing Performance*. London: CIPD.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *Human Resource Management Practice*, London and Philadelphia: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Arthur, J.B. (1994). Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, 670-87.
- Aulakh, Gulveen. (2014, Jul 30). *ET Bureau*. Retrieved from [http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2014-07-30/news/52237905\\_1\\_moto-e-flipkart-ceo-sachin-bansal](http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2014-07-30/news/52237905_1_moto-e-flipkart-ceo-sachin-bansal)
- Barney, J. & Wright, P. M. (1998). On Becoming a Strategic Partner: The Role of Human Resources in Competitive Advantage. *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 37, No. 1, 31-46. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-050X\(199821\)37:1<31::AID-HRM4>3.0.CO;2-W](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(199821)37:1<31::AID-HRM4>3.0.CO;2-W)
- Beach, S. D. (1980). *Personnel: The management of people at work*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Borman, W. C. & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W.C. B. a. Associates (Eds.), *Personnel Selections in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burnes, B. (2004). *Managing Change: A Strategic Approach to Organisational Dynamics*, (4th edn). Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Caldwell, R. (2003). The changing roles of personnel managers: old ambiguities, new uncertainties. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40 (4), 983-1004.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modelling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organisational Psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and rganisationl Psychology*, (Second Edition, vol. 1, 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Colville, K. & Millner, D. (2011). Embedding performance management: understanding the enablers for change. *Strategic HR Review*, Vol. 10 (No. 1).
- Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2009). *Organizational Development and Change*. Mason: SouthWestern Cengage Learning.
- Cyert, R.M. & March, J. A. (1963). *Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. NJ: Prentice- Hall.
- Deal, T.E. (1985). Culture change: Opportunity, silent killer, or metamorphosis? In R.H.Kilmann, M.J.Saxton, & R. SERPA, (Eds.), *Gaining control of the corporate culture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Delery, J. & Doty, D.H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: test of universalistic, contingency and configurational performance predictions. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 39, 802-35.
- Denis, J.L., Lamothe, L., & Langley, A. (2001). The Dynamics of collective leadership and strategic change in pluralistic organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44 (4), 809-837.
- DeVries, D.L., Morrison, A.M., Shullman, S. L., & Gerlach, M.L. (1981). *Performance Appraisal on the line*. NC: Center for Creative Leadership. Greensboro.
- Doeringer, P. B., Lorenz, E., & Terkla, D. G. (2003). The Adoption and Diffusion of High-Performance Management: Lessons from Japanese Multinationals in the West. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 27, 265-286.
- Du Plessis, A.J. (2009, March). An overview of the influence of globalisation and internationalisation on domestic Human Resource Management in New Zealand. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(2), 1-18.
- Expenses Uber Uber Alles, Gulliver Business Travel, *The economist*, (2015, March 11). Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2015/03/expenses>
- Farmer, B. US Army considers replacing thousands of troops with robots. *The Telegraph*, (2014, January 21). Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/defence/10587820/US-Army-considers-replacing-thousands-of-troops-with-robots.html>
- Fitzgerald, L. & Moon, P. (1996). *Performance measurement in service industries: Making it work*. London: The Chartered Institute of Management Accountants.
- Fitzgerald, L., Johnston, R., Brignall, T.J., Silvestro, R. and Voss, C. (1991). *Performance measurement in service businesses*. London: The Chartered Institute of Management Accountants.

- Graetz, F. (2000). *Strategic change leadership*. *Management Decision*, 38(8), 550–562.
- Gray, D. (2012). The Connected Company. O'Reilly Media, Cited in Editorial Comments. (2013, April). *NHRD Network Journal*, 6 (2).
- Grieves, J. (2003). *Strategic human resource development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guest, D.E. & Hoque, K. (1994). The good, the bad and the ugly: human resource management in new non-union establishments. *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 5, 1-14.
- Gunnigle, P., Murphy, K., Cleveland, J., Heraty, N., & Morley, M. (2001). Human Resource Management Practices of US-Owned Multinational Corporations in Europe: Standardization versus Localization?. *Advances in International Management*, 14, 259–284.
- Hedberg, B. (1981). How organizations learn and unlearn. In P.C Nystrom & W. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational design*, England: Oxford University Press.
- Heneman, R. L. & Thomas, A. L. (1997). The Limited Inc.: Using strategic performance management to drive brand leadership. *Compensation and Benefits Review*, 27(6), 33-40.
- HM Treasury. (2001).  
<https://www.byt.com> .(2017).  
<https://www.uber.com/en-IN/> .(2017).  
<https://www.airbnb.co.in/> .(2017).
- Huselid, M.A. and Becker, B.E. (1996). Methodological issues in cross-sectional and panel estimates of the human resource-firm performance link. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 35, 400-22.
- Ichniowski, C., Shaw, K. & Prennushi, G. (1997). The effects of human resource management practices on productivity: a study of steel finishing lines, *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 87, 291-313.
- Johnson, H.T. & Kaplan, R.S. (1987). *Relevance Lost: the Rise and Fall of Management Accounting*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kaplan, R. S. & Norton D. P. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (2004). *Strategy Maps: Converting Intangible Assets into Tangible Outcomes*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kaplan, R.S. & Norton, D.P. (1992, Jan./ Feb.). The balanced scorecard—measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, pp.71–79.
- Keegan, D.P., Eiler, R.G. & Jones, C.R. (1989, June). Are your performance measures obsolete?. *Management Accounting*, pp.45–50.
- Kozlowski, S. W. J, Gully, S.M., Nason, E. R. & Smith, E. M. (1999). Developing adaptive teams: A theory of compilation and performance across levels and time. In D. R. Ilgen, & E.D. Pulakos, (Eds.), *The changing nature of performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers. pp. 240-292
- Levitt, B. & March, J. (1988). Organizational Learning. *Annual Rev. Sociology*; Vol. 14, 319-340.
- Lynch, R.L. & Cross, K.F. (1991). *Measure Up – The Essential Guide to Measuring Business Performance*. London: Mandarin.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P. M. & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 123 – 150.
- March, J. G. & Simon, H. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Moran, J. W. & Brightman, B. K. (2001). Leading organizational change. *Career Development International*, 6(2), 111–118.
- Morgan, G. (1989). *Reading the Waves of Change*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.



- Morrison, E.W. (1995). Organizational citizenship behavior as a critical link between HRM practices and service quality. *Human Resource Management*, 35, 493-512.
- Motowidlo, S.J. & Van Scotter, J.R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinct from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, (4), 475-480.
- Nayab, N. & Richter, L. (2011, May 18). The difference Between Performance Appraisal and performance Management. Extracted from [www.brighthub.com/office/human-resources/article/84772](http://www.brighthub.com/office/human-resources/article/84772)
- Neely, A.D., Gregory, M.J., & Platts, K.W. (1995). Performance Measurement System Design: A Literature Review and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 15, No. 4, 80-116.
- Nel, P. S., Werner, A., Poisat, P., Sono, T., Du Plessis, A. J. & Nqalo, O. (2011). *Human resources management* (8th ed.). South Africa: Oxford University Press.
- Olve, N., Roy, J. & Wetter, M. (1999). *Performance Drivers: a Practical Guide to Using the Balanced Scorecard*, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Pareek, U. & Rao, T.V. (2006). *Designing and Managing Human Resource System*. Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd.
- Pattanayak, B. (2009). *Human Resource Management*. Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Pfeffer, J. (1994). *Competitive Advantage through People*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press
- Piderit, S.K. (2000, Oct). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: a multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management*, 794. A, 783.
- Pierce, J. & Delbecq, A. (1977). Organizational Structure, Individual Attitudes and Innovation. *Academy of Management Review*, pp. 27- 37.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M. & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 262-270.
- Prahalad, C.K. & Hamel, G. (1990). The Core Competence of the Organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 90, 79-93.
- Prasad, L. M. (2006). *Human Resource Management*. Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons.
- Reich, R.B. (1991). *The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism*. New York: Knopf.
- Rennie, W. H. (2003). *The role of human resource management and the human resource professional in the new economy*. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Rieley, J. B. & Clarkson, I. (2001). The impact of change on performance. *Journal of Change Management*, 2(2), 160–172
- Speckbacher, G., Bischof, J. & Pfeiffer, T. (2003). A descriptive analysis on the implementation of Balanced Scorecards in German-speaking countries. *Management Accounting Research*, vol. 14, no. 4, 361-388.
- Stickland F. (1998). *The Dynamics of Change*. London: Routledge. The balanced scorecard, (1999-2010). Retrieved from the World Wide web : <http://www.quickmba.com/accounting/mgmt/balanced-scorecard/>
- Thornhill, A., Lewis, P., Millmore, M., & Saunders, M. (2000). *Managing change: a human resource strategy approach*. Harlow [etc.]: Financial Times/Prentice Hall.
- Tripathi, P.C., (2006). *Human Resource Development*. Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons.
- Ulrich, D. (1997). *Human Resource Champions: the next agenda for adding value and delivering results*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
- Van De Ven, A.H. & Poole, M.S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3),512.
- Walker, J.W. and Stopper, W.G. (2000). Developing Human Resources Leaders. *Human Resource Planning*, 23(1), 38–44.
- Wiersma, E. (2009). For which purposes do managers use Balanced Scorecards?: An empirical study. *Management Accounting Research*, vol. 20, no. 4, 239-251.
- Wright, P.M., McMahan, G.C. & McWilliams, A. (1994). Human Resource and Sustained Competitive Advantage: A Resource-Based Perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5, 301—26.
- Yukl, G. (2008). *Leadership in Organizations*, (7th Ed. ). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.