

Conference Paper

Factors Influencing Employee Perception on Performance Management System

Fatimah Mahmud and Nik Anis Nik Azemi

Faculty of Industrial Management, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Lebuhraya Tun Razak, 26300 Gambang, Pahang, Malaysia

Abstract

Without the employee feedback, the developed performance management system (PMS) cannot be assumed as an effective system that able to stimulate their workers to achieve the company's objectives and targets. This paper aims to identify the implementation of performance management system in the company, to analyze the factors that affect employee perception on PMS, and subsequently to determine the relationship between factors influencing employee perception and PMS. 119 questionnaires were distributed to employees in Company X. The response rate is 43% of the total sample. The finding shows that the respondents strongly agreed on the implemented PMS in the company. Also, employee participation was the highest factor that influencing employee perception of PMS, followed by employee knowledge and skills, and rating techniques. Overall, each of the factors had a significant relationship with the PMS. This study may assist managers in improving their communication with employees on their work performance. Therefore, this will increase the employee understanding of how they have been assessed and feel that the process is fair. Later, this will ensure a positive employee perception of the implemented PMS.

Corresponding Author:

Fatimah Mahmud
fatimahm@ump.edu.my

Received: 5 August 2019

Accepted: 14 August 2019

Published: 18 August 2019

Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E**Keywords:** performance management system, employee perception, employee participation, employee knowledge and skills, rating techniques.

© Fatimah Mahmud and Nik Anis Nik Azemi. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons](#)

[Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the FGIC2019 Conference Committee.

1. Introduction

Based on Kohli (2008), the terms of performance management were established by Beer and Ruth in 1976. The weight of these terms has changed from control, command, and cautious system to a commitment-based system. A complete cycle of PMS consists of the goals and objectives, feedback, coaching, advice, and motivating employee to perform at a high level of performance (Storey, 2005). Asaju and Kayode (2008) stated that the objective of PMS in an organization is aligned with the process of the objective set for each of the employees. As time passed, PMS has developed Performance Pyramid (Tangen, 2004), Balanced Score Card (Kaplan & Norton, 2001b) and Performance Prism (Neely & Adams, 2000) which can be used for appraising different aspect of performance.

OPEN ACCESS

The effectiveness of PMS can be seen when the organization's objectives are achieved (Boland & Fowler, 2000). A performance management model recommended by (Murphy & DeNISI, 2008) explained that the recognition of PMS by employees is an important factor for the effectiveness of the system. Moreover, PMS cannot be assumed to be effective without employees' respond (Sharma, Sharma, & Agarwal, 2016)

This research focuses on exploring factors influencing employee perception of PMS. Perceptions are related with PMS to understand the purposes of the system, implement the evaluation in a certain frequency and improve managers' knowledge about the responsibility of the employees (Landy, Barnes, & Murphy, 1978). Companies should hold a formal assessment regularly regarding their PMS and consider a radical effort to deal with the lacks (Seotlela & Miruka, 2014). According to Sharma et al. (2016), a complete investigation is needed to acknowledge the effectiveness of PMS in the companies, particularly from the perspective of their employees. Besides, according to previous researchers, they express that PMS is a value of an organization's plan towards its employees and will be clarified by individual employees (Rousseau & Greller, 1994). However, employees do not always recognize that value the same as how the organization wants it to be. This can be concluded that the employee's perception gives an impact on PMS practices (Guest, 1999). Perceptions may intrude the link between PMS practices (Miruka, 2014).

Based on research conducted by Jamali, El Dirani, & Harwood (2015) found that there are still arise the not satisfied employees on the implementation of PMS even though it used the right method to measure employees' performance, there are issues of arising regarding the implementation of the system. Employee perception is hardly considered in organizations. However, it is essential that needs attention when implementing PMS (Prasetya & Kato, 2011). An employee with a positive perception is more likely to be more encouraged to complete their task while an employee with a negative perception tends to reflect that system is not correctly implemented and somehow bias towards them (Gabris & Mitchell, 1989).

Participation of employees in several aspects of a system is needed because it can lower the rate of dysfunctions of company PMS (Roberts, 2003). Therefore, employee participation is crucial to achieving organizational change (Mikkelsen, Saksvik, & Landsbergis, 2000). High positive perceptions of justice can be achieved with a high level of employee participation (Hopkins & Weathington, 2006). Employee participation also can achieve a positive result on the effects of work-related stress and the perceptions towards the system (Nytrø, Saksvik, Mikkelsen, Bohle, & Quinlan, 2000). Consequently, issues arrive when employees refuse to participate.

Lastly, according to Gabris and Mitchell (1989), employees who have a positive perception towards the system become more inspired to perform their work compared to employees who have a negative perception that believe the system is biased, not applied in good order, and in an improper way to evaluate employees' perception towards work performance. Employee perception is controlled by employee knowledge (Onyango, 2013). Furthermore, another research confirmed that employee knowledge about the criteria used when setting goals for a system gives a positive perception of the system (Erdogan, Baker, & Tagg, 2001). After that, issues arise when employees lack of knowledge and skills give negative perception towards the system.

2. Literature Review

2.1. PMS

Definition of performance management is a collection of actions involved in the company to enrich the performance of employees in all departments of a company which is important to improve the effectiveness of the company (DeNisi & Kluger, 2000). According to previous research, the success of a company depends on the performance of employees (Dissanayaka & Hussain Ali, 2013).

PMS is needed to influence employees to assist their strategy (Rudman, 2004). Thus, it should be appropriate for the culture of the company. This system is focused on continuous improvement of the company's performance, which can be achieved by improving the performance of individual employees (Johnson, 2000). With properly designed PMS in organization able to create perceptions of fair treatment among employees, boost the employee motivation and satisfaction and consequently improve their work performance (Idowu, 2017)

2.2. Factors Influencing Employee Perception

According to Miruka (2004), perception influences and moderates the link between practices of PMS and employee performance which related to behavior. The difference in employee perceptions of PMS may exist (Seotlela & Miruka, 2014). With this object in mind, employees usually stick on their beliefs based on experience.

The employee should take part during the development of performance standards, creation of rating format, and their measurement scales (Robert, 2003). He mentioned

that employee participation is more effective when the working environment encourages trust, open communication, and equality of employee treatment. Participation of employee shows the negative result in resistance to change, but it shows a positive result in accomplishment report of intervention goals and commitment towards the organization of employees (Lines, 2004). Therefore, employees who are involving themselves in the plan of the company tend to act less negatively than those who are not involving themselves. According to Onyango (2013), employee perception is controlled by employee knowledge. For instances, clarity about the function of a system, understanding, and acceptance of performance objectives is possible to give a positive perception of PMS. Furthermore, another research confirmed that employee knowledge about the criteria used when setting goals for a system gives a positive perception of the system (Erdogan et al., 2001). Behavioral observation scale which is used to decrease the mistake in PMS (Murphy, 2008). The rater, such as manager or supervisor needs to report the frequency of the certain behavior done by the employees. The advantages of these techniques are improving the level of satisfaction of employee with the system, identifying the exact action to improve performance, and reducing the barriers in the communication process of employees within the company.

2.3. Relationship between Employee Perception and Performance Management System

There is a strong relationship between employee perception and PMS (Brand & Pretorius, 2003). Firstly, this relation involves communication between the management of a company and their employees regarding the vision and objectives of the company and employee perception of their participation in the development of PMS and those implementations in the company. This communication is an effort to change emotions, beliefs, values, and attitudes of employees by increasing knowledge about the process of the system to employees, explaining clearly about the policies when they need to settle a task, organizing meetings with the employees and allowing a further discussion with employees. Next, employee's empowerment during the training in a company is capable of defining jobs and performance standards effectively about PMS. This training guides the manager to give proper feedback on performance areas that need improvement, perceptions about the commitment of the management, and participation in the successful implementation of the PMS. Lastly, the training also allows the manager to speak out about the problems face by the performance management and how well the manager takes advantage of the PMS as a resource to develop performance in the

company. Thus, the managers are allowed to practice their skills and power to state the performance problems during training. The scope of the training provides managers an opportunity to practice their skills and employee perception of the extent to which managers learn to find out how well employees use their skills in the workplace.

3. Methodology

The questionnaire used was related to the research objectives, independent variables, and the dependent variable of this research. The questionnaire was developed in extensive research review which from several sources such as Sharma et al. (2016), Razack and Upadhyay (2017), and Onyango (2013). Besides, it was written in simple English to help employees understand the questions much better. For this research, the questionnaire used closed format questions, which means this tool required respondents to select an answer from the option provided (Sincero, 2012). A five-point Likert scale was used to assess the standpoint in which respondents responded to items in multiple levels of strength. For instances, the scale was from one to five, which from strongly disagree to agree strongly. The questionnaire consists of three sections, which were Section A, Section B, and Section C. Section A touched on the respondent's general information. Respondents need to answer each question regarding the gender, department, and employment period. Meanwhile, Section B asked about the dependent variable of this research, which is PMS. The first research objective is to identify the implementation of PMS in the company. It can be achieved by using questions in Section B. Section C involved questions regarding the independent variables includes employee participation, employee knowledge and skills, and rating techniques. The questions in this section were used to achieve the second and third research objective that aim to analyze the factors that affect employee perception on PMS and to determine the relationship between factors affecting employee perception and PMS. The population of this research is the employees of Company X. A sample of 119 employees used as the sample size for this research. Furthermore, the sample size was decided by using a GPower software, which is a general power analysis program for determining the sample size of a known population. However, only 51 employees responded to the questionnaire. This research used the method of drop and picked later to collect data, so that, the time can be saved. Besides, the questionnaires hand over to the respondents only with the consent and willingness of the respondents. Hence, all the collected data only be used for this research, so that, the data were not being disclosed to any party

for other use. A follow up to the human resources officer was done by using phone calls to make sure all the data collected in the time given.

4. Results

This section presents the background of respondents, implementation of the performance management system, and factors that affect employee perception on the performance management system.

4.1. Background of Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic of respondents include gender, department, and working experience with a response rate of 43% from the total sample. There are about 60.8% of the respondents are male, and 39.2% are female. Next, the randomly chosen of departments in Company X. and the total of respondents from each department participated in this survey. Thus, this sample is representing the population because respondents came from various department. According to the findings, 29.4% of the respondents are working in the company for less than two years. Meanwhile, the employment period between 2 and four years is 33.3%. The highest part of employee period of the respondents is 37.2%, which for respondents who are working over five years. This can be concluded that the respondents are more reliable to answer the questionnaire.

4.2. Implementation of Performance Management System

Table 2 presents the finding of the first research objective, which is to identify the implementation of PMS in the company. It shows the mean and rank for the implementation of PMS in Company X. The levels of agreement consist of strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree. Thus, the implementation of PMS can be identified through the answered questionnaires.

Based on the findings, the implementation of PMS was sorted in ascending order, which is from less implemented to highly implemented. The first implementation of PMS is that the manager updates the employee's goals as business goals change. Thus, this activity in performance planning accuracy considered the least implemented in the company. Next, there is a mean of 3.824 for both implemented activities of performance review and outcomes accuracy. Those activities are annual feedback

TABLE 1: Demographics of the Respondents.

Demographic		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	31	60.8
	Female	20	39.2
	Total	51	100.0
Departments	Finance	4	7.8
	Human resources	6	11.8
	Materials	5	9.8
	Operations	1	2.0
	Production	5	9.8
	Project design engineer	7	13.7
	Quality	5	9.8
	R&D	5	9.8
	Shipping	5	9.8
	Stores	4	7.8
	Warehouse	4	7.8
	Total	51	100.0
	Employment period	Less than 2 years	15
Between 2 and 4 years		17	33.3
Over 5 years		19	37.2
Total		51	100.0

during a performance review is an accurate representation of the ongoing feedback during the performance cycle, and employee outcomes of PMS (compensation/ reward/ recognition) are based on his/her performance rating.

Then, the fourth least implementation is outcome accuracy. It is about the employee annual performance review is directly related to his/her outcomes of PMS (compensation/ reward/ recognition) with a mean of 3.922. The fifth implementation is that the employee updates his/her goals as business goals change, which is considered in the activity of performance planning accuracy.

Respondents also agree that there are retention facilities provided with mean of 3.941. The implementation of ongoing feedback during the performance cycle gives an accurate evaluation of how the employee is performing against planned performance includes in the activity of feedback and coaching has mean 3.961. The eighth implementation of PMS is the areas that employee need to improve are pointed out. Next implementation is that the employee gets the coaching that he/she needs during the year to improve his/her skills to achieve planned performance.

The third and second highest implementation is involving the role of the manager in dealing with employees, which are manager explains employee expected standards

TABLE 2: Descriptive Statistics of Variables.

Questions	Mean	Rank
The performance planning helps the employee to pay attention to his/her efforts through the identification of goals which are relevant to meet organizational goals.	4.118	12
Manager updates employee's goals as business goals change.	3.784	1
Employee updates his/her goals as business goals change.	3.941	5
The ongoing feedback during the performance cycle gives an accurate evaluation of how the employee is performing against planned performance.	3.961	7
The areas that employee needs to improve are pointed out.	3.980	8
The employee gets the coaching that he/she needs during the year to improve his/her skills to achieve planned performance.	3.980	9
Annual feedback during a performance review is an accurate representation of the ongoing feedback during the performance cycle.	3.824	2
Employee outcomes of the performance management system (compensation/ reward/ recognition) are based on his/her performance rating.	3.824	3
Employee annual performance review is directly related to his/her outcomes of the performance management system (compensation/ reward/ recognition).	3.922	4
The manager explains employee expected standards of performance.	4.000	10
The manager monitors employee expected standards of performance.	4.039	11
There are facilities provided for the improvement of the poor performers for retention.	3.941	6
Note numbers of the respondent, N=51.		

of performance and manager monitors employee expected standards of performance. Both have a mean of 4.000 and 4.0392, respectively. Lastly, the performance planning helps the employee to pay attention to his/her efforts through the identification of goals which are relevant to meet organizational goals achieved the highest mean of 4.118. This implementation includes performance planning accuracy.

4.3. Factors that Influence Employee Perception on Performance Management System

The analysis of the factors that affect employee perception of the performance management system is shown in Table 3. It shows the mean for the level of agreement from respondents and the average for each of variables which are employee participation, employee knowledge and skills, and rating technique that influence employee perception on PMS in Company X. The levels of agreement consist of strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree. Thus, the factor that affects employee perception on PMS can be analyzed through the answered questionnaires.

TABLE 3: Descriptive Statistics of Factors that Affect Employee Perception.

Factors	Items	Mean	Average
Employee participation	Employee is willing to participate when developing a new performance management system.	3.922	4.051
	A better performance management system can be created when an employee participating in the development of performance standards.	4.235	
	Employee participation can help the development of useful performance standards.	4.255	
	Employee participation can be enhanced during designing the rating format.	4.000	
	Employee participation can be enhanced during the measurement scales.	3.843	
Employee knowledge and skills	The performance management system can be influenced by employee knowledge.	4.078	4.036
	Knowledge of an employee increases fairness.	3.922	
	Knowledge of an employee increases rating accuracy.	3.922	
	The understanding of performance objectives improved by employee knowledge.	4.157	
	The acceptance of performance objectives improved by employee knowledge.	4.157	
	Individuals with a high openness prefer the control of their work.	3.980	
Rating technique	The employee feels comfortable with the rating scales used to evaluate performance.	3.804	3.416
	The employee feels that the scales allow an accurate assessment of various dimensions of performance.	3.784	
	The existing form is too complex.	2.941	
	The existing form is too long.	2.765	
	The existing form is easy to use.	3.784	

The factors that affect employee perception on PMS in term of employee participation, employee knowledge and skills, and rating technique can be analyzed. The highest factor that affected employee perception is employee participation, which has an average of 4.051. This is influenced by the participation of the employee in the development of performance standards, which can create a better PMS.

The second highest factor that affected employee perception on PMS is employee knowledge and skills, which has an average of 4.036. This is due to the understanding and acceptance of performance objectives improve by employee knowledge. Meanwhile, the lowest factor that affected employee perception on PMS is rating technique, which has an average of 3.416. This is due to the existing form is too long.

Table 4 shows the relationship between factors affecting employee perception and PMS by using a Pearson correlation analysis.

TABLE 4: Relationship between Employee Participation and Performance Management System.

	PMS	EP	EK	RT
PMS	1			
EP	.756**	1		
EK	.607**	.618**	1	
RT	.537**	.218	.353**	1

Note: N= 51. PMS = performance management system; EP= employee participation; EK= employee knowledge and skills; RT= rating technique.
Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) **.

The third research objective is to determine the relationship between the factors that affect employee perception and performance management system. The hypotheses for this relationship are:

H₁: There is a significant relationship between employee participation and PMS

H₂: There is a significant relationship between employee knowledge and skills and PMS

H₃: There is a significant relationship between rating techniques and PMS

These relationships were identified by using the Pearson correlation analysis. To measure the strength of a linear association between two variables, which are the factors that affect employee perception and PMS, this Pearson correlation is used.

There was a strong positive correlation between employee participation and PMS, which was statistically significant, $r = 0.756$. Thus, at $\alpha = 0.01$, there was enough evidence to support that there was a significant relationship between employee participation and PMS. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. This finding similar to Onyango (2013), the researcher states that aspects of employee participation that affects employee perception and PMS have a strong positive correlation. The aspect of employee participation that affects employee perception includes the willingness of an employee to participate in developing a new performance standard.

Meanwhile, there was a strong positive correlation between employee knowledge and skills and PMS, which was statistically significant, $r = 0.607$. Thus, at $\alpha = 0.01$, there was enough evidence to support that there was a significant relationship between employee knowledge and skills and PMS. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. This finding similar to Onyango (2013), the researcher states that employee knowledgeable to increase the fairness and rating accuracy, improve the understanding and acceptance

of performance objectives. Erdogan et al. (2001) also supported that there was a positive effect between employee knowledge and skills and performance management system.

The relationship between rating technique and performance management system also shows a positive correlation with $r = 0.537$. Thus, at $\alpha = 0.01$, there was enough evidence to support that there was a significant relationship between rating technique and performance management system. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. This finding similar to Onyango (2013), stated that employees are comfortable with the rating scales used to evaluate their performance, and the scales allow an accurate assessment of different dimensions of performance.

Overall, the finding supported all hypotheses that have been developed. The summary of hypotheses result is shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5: Summary of Hypotheses Status.

	Hypotheses	Status
H1	There is a significant relationship between employee participation and performance management system	Supported
H2	There is a significant relationship between employee knowledge and skills and performance management system	Supported
H3	There is a significant relationship between rating technique and performance management system	Supported

5. Conclusion and Implications

Most of the respondents agreed that all identified items in the performance management system had been implemented in their company. Employee participation is the highest factor that affecting the employee perception on the implementation of PMS, followed by employee knowledge and skills, and rating techniques. The result found that there is a significant relationship between all factors affecting employee perception and implemented PMS. Therefore, all developed hypotheses for each relationship were accepted. Furthermore, the significant relationship identified among all factors affecting employee perception of PMS.

Based on the findings obtained, the company should give awareness and encourage effective communication between managers and their subordinates related to their work performance. This will ensure that individuals understand how their work performance being assessed. It will also ensure that managers give truly differentiated performance ratings based on an objective review of performance plans. Then, the participation of employee during the development of new performance standards should be improved, so that, employee participation that affecting employee perception on PMS can turn

into a positive perception. It is also recommended to the company, to apply several methods in helping poor performers to improve such as counseling and job rotation should be put in place and strengthen.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Faculty of Industrial Management and FIM's Governance and Integrity Centre, Universiti Malaysia Pahang for the financial support by sponsoring this paper to be presented in the FGIC 2nd Conference on Governance and Integrity 2019.

References

- [1] Asaju, Kayode. (2008). Manpower Training And Development: An Essential For Achieving Organisational Goal.
- [2] Boland, T., & Fowler, A. (2000). A systems perspective of performance management in public sector organisations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 13(5), 417-446.
- [3] Brand, H. E., & Pretorius, O. (2003). Employees' perceptions of performance evaluation in the manufacturing industry. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 6(3), 577-590.
- [4] DeNisi, A. S., & Kluger, A. N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360-degree appraisals be improved? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 129-139.
- [5] Dissanayaka, N., & Hussain Ali, M. (2013). Impact of worklife balance on employee's performance: an empirical study on seven apparel organizations in Sri Lanka.
- [6] Erdogan, B. Z., Baker, M. J., & Tagg, S. (2001). Selecting celebrity endorsers: The practitioner's perspective. *Journal of advertising research*, 41(3), 39-48.
- [7] Gabris, G. T., & Mitchell, K. (1989). Exploring the relationships between intern job performance, quality of education experience, and career placement. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 484-504.
- [8] Guest, D. E. (1999). Human resource management-the workers' verdict. *Human resource management journal*, 9(3), 5-25.
- [9] Hopkins, S. M., & Weathington, B. L. (2006). The relationships between justice perceptions, trust, and employee attitudes in a downsized organization. *The Journal of Psychology*, 140(5), 477-498.

- [10] Jamali, D. R., El Dirani, A. M., & Harwood, I. A. (2015). Exploring human resource management roles in corporate social responsibility: the CSR-HRM co-creation model. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 24(2), 125-143.
- [11] Johnson, E. K. (2000). The practice of human resource management in New Zealand: strategic and best practice? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 38(2), 69-83.
- [12] Idowu, A. (2017). Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal System and its Effect on Employee Motivation. *Nile Journal of Business and Economics*, 3(5), 15-39.
- [13] Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2001b). Transforming the balanced scorecard from performance measurement to strategic management: Part I. *Accounting horizons*, 15(1), 87-104.
- [14] Kohli, A. S. and T. Deb (2008). Performance management, Oxford University Press.
- [15] Landy, F. J., Barnes, J. L., & Murphy, K. R. (1978). Correlates of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 63(6), 751.
- [16] Lawrie, G., Cobbold, I., & Marshall, J. (2004). Corporate performance management system in a devolved UK governmental organisation: a case study. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 53(4), 353-370.
- [17] Lines, R. (2004). Influence of participation in strategic change: resistance, organizational commitment and change goal achievement. *Journal of change management*, 4(3), 193-215.
- [18] Ly, A., Marsman, M., & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2018). Analytic posteriors for Pearson's correlation coefficient. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 72(1), 4-13.
- [19] Mikkelsen, A., Saksvik, P. Ø., & Landsbergis, P. (2000). The impact of a participatory organizational intervention on job stress in community health care institutions. *Work & Stress*, 14(2), 156-170.
- [20] Miruka, O. (2014). Implementation Challenges of Performance Management System in the South Africa Mining Industry. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. MCSER Publishing, Rome Italy*.
- [21] Murphy, K. R. (2008). Explaining the weak relationship between job performance and ratings of job performance. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(2), 148-160.
- [22] Murphy, K. R., & DeNISI, A. (2008). A model of the appraisal process. *Performance management systems: A global perspective*, 81.
- [23] Neely, A., & Adams, C. (2000). Perspectives on performance: the performance prism. *Focus Magazine for the Performance Management Professional*, 4.
- [24] Nytrø, K., Saksvik, P. Ø., Mikkelsen, A., Bohle, P., & Quinlan, M. (2000). An appraisal of key factors in the implementation of occupational stress interventions. *Work & Stress*, 14(3), 213-225.

- [25] Onyango, B. A. (2013). Factors Affecting Employee Perception Of Performance Appraisal Process At National Housing Corporation. *University of Nairobi*.
- [26] Prasetya, A., & Kato, M. (2011). *Employees' perception towards the performance assessment system and salary system*. Paper presented at the Proceeding from ICETD (International Conference on Economics, Trade, and Development)-Bali Island-April 2011.
- [27] Razack, S. S. K., & Upadhyay, D. (2017). Employee Perception of Performance Management Systems in the UAE: An Analysis.
- [28] Roberts, G. E. (2003). Employee performance appraisal system participation: A technique that works. *Public Personnel Management*, 32(1), 89-98.
- [29] Rousseau, D. M., & Greller, M. M. (1994). Human resource practices: Administrative contract makers. *Human Resource Management*, 33(3), 385-401.
- [30] Rudman, R. (2004). *Performance planning and review: Making employee appraisals work*: Allen & Unwin Academic.
- [31] Selden, S., & Sowa, J. E. (2011). Performance management and appraisal in human service organizations: Management and staff perspectives. *Public Personnel Management*, 40(3), 251-264.
- [32] Seotlela, R. P. J., & Miruka, O. (2014). Implementation Challenges of Performance Management System in the South African Mining Industry. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(7), 177.
- [33] Sharma, N. P., Sharma, T., & Agarwal, M. N. (2016). Measuring employee perception of performance management system effectiveness: Conceptualization and scale development. *Employee Relations*, 38(2), 224-247.
- [34] Storey, J. (2005). Human resource policies for knowledge work. *Managing Knowledge: An Essential Reader*, 199-219.
- [35] Tangen, S. (2004). Performance measurement: from philosophy to practice. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 53(8), 726-737.