
Article:
Soltani, E. and Wilkinson, A. orcid.org/0000-0001-7231-2861 (2018) TQM and performance appraisal : complementary or incompatible? European Management Review. ISSN 1740-4754

https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12317

TQM and performance appraisal: complementary or incompatible?

Abstract

Despite the scholarly interest in performance management as a prime determinant of the effectiveness of enterprise process improvement methods such as total quality management (TQM) and its derivatives, few empirical studies have explicitly explored the practice of performance management systems in TQM-focused organisations. In order to redress this imbalance, this study aims to describe how organisational and managerial forces result in performance management systems failing to embrace the core values and principles of process improvement methods such as TQM. Using a qualitative study of six large UK-based automobile and auto parts manufacturers, our results illustrate how manager-controlled, individual-focused, past-oriented, long-cycle, and narrowly defined performance appraisal (PA) systems can intervene to underline the ultimate potential of TQM. The paper concludes with the discussion of implications for theory and practice of TQM and human resource performance management.

Keywords: performance management, performance appraisal, quality management, qualitative study, automotive industry

Introduction

Despite the popularity of total quality management (TQM) as the most celebrated enterprise process improvement method and performance appraisal (PA) as the most ubiquitous and pervasive human resource management (HRM) practice, a review of the extant literature empathically informs us that both practices have consistency faced a battle in justifying their positions in terms of supporting employees' personal development to excel at work and improving organisational performance (Fletcher 2001; Nisen, 2015; Coens and Jenkins, 2000; DeNisi and Murphy, 2017; Adler et al., 2016; Bowman, 1994; Shrivastava et al., 2007; Latham et al., 2007; Grote, 2011; Giangreco et al., 2011; Iqbal et al., 2015). While failure of continuous improvement initiatives and performance management and appraisal systems could be attributed to a myriad of individual and organisational factors, we argue that the overall utility of enterprise process improvement methods such as TQM is linked to a performance management (PM) system that embraces the principles underpinning these improvement initiatives. In short TQM needs PM (see Ghorpade and Chen, 1995).

To date, studies of the adoption and implementation of performance management and appraisal systems in TQM-focused organisations have concentrated on the extent to which either of these practices could achieve their intended objectives but little on the potential links and synergies. This inattention is despite the argument of scholars such as Murphy and Cleveland (1991, p.72) who assert that "the system that is used to appraise performance needs to be consistent with the culture

and principles that guide the conduct of the organisation" (see also Ghorpade and Chen, 1995). In fact, the absence of the necessary congruence between PA systems with those of TQM criteria for performance review has led the most influential quality guru (i.e. Deming, 1986) and several like-minded scholars and practitioners (e.g. Waldman, 1994; Cappelli and Tavis, 2016; Scholtes, 1993; Cardy and Dobbins, 1994; Cardy, 1998; Buckingham and Goodall, 2015) to be particularly vocal in expressing their disapproval of PA systems. Deming (1986) cites traditional PA as a 'deadly disease' which engenders fear than hope and creates more anxiety than motivation. Scholtes (1993) observes that "The two [PA and TQM] approaches represent a fundamental choice for leaders: one or the other; not both". Recently high profile companies such as General Electric, Microsoft, Google, Netflix, Adobe and Accenture (and many other Fortune 500 companies) have jettisoned traditional year-end evaluations for being unfit for purpose of helping and engaging employees and driving performance (McKinsey Quarterly, 2016; Cappelli and Tavis, 2016; Buckingham and Goodall, 2015; Adler et al., 2016).

Despite these pessimistic views about the compatibility of PA systems with enterprise process improvement methods, other TQM and HRM experts defend PA as a mechanism to regularly track progress against goals and an invaluable source of feedback in any management scheme. As Prince (1996, p. 44) has succinctly put it, "presenting a caricature of poor appraisal practices hardly bolsters the argument that all appraisal practices should be eliminated". However, the popularity of enterprise process improvement methods such as TQM and the ubiquitous nature of PA have not been matched by the development of empirical insights which could further advance our understanding of the apparent contradiction between them. Given the centrality of enterprise process improvement methods and PA to an organisation's functioning and long-term survival (see Powell, 1995; Waldman, 1994; Cappelli and Tavis, 2016), it is somewhat surprising to find that little empirical research has explicitly focused on how they might work together (or not) in practice. Hence, the present study is intended to contribute to this debate by examining the manner in which PA systems are actually applied in a sample of quality-focused organisations in the UK.

Our study extends the literature in several ways. First, previous studies have rarely assessed the actual practice of PA systems in quality-focused organisations. In fact, much of the literature on TQM and appraisal is non-empirical enquiries (e.g. Scholtes, 1993; Ghorpade et al., 1995; Murphy and Cleveland, 1991; Bowman, 1994; Waldman, 1994; Petrick and Furr, 1995; Prince, 1996; Cardy, 1998; Bach, 2000; Haines et al., 2004). However, as Brown and Lim (2008) have observed, research in this area should not merely make "theoretical contributions, but also facilitate improvements in practice". In a similar vein, Fletcher (2001, p. 474) observes that while there has been no shortage of research on PA, it would be difficult to argue that previous appraisal research

has led to any significant improvements in actual PA practice. We present the findings from an empirical study and describe the extent to which PA systems and the precepts underpinning TQM are compatible. Second, the absence of recent empirical evaluations of PA in organisational environments with a TQM orientation suggests that prior studies fail to account for developments in contemporary organisations which have been transformed by adopting various enterprise process improvement methods. We draw our conclusions from a cross-case comparison of six TQM-focused firms and describe the ways in which the TQM context influences the nature and extent of PA systems and the extent to which TQM-focused organisations are willing to create a balance between HRM and TQM approaches to PA systems (see Ghorpade and Chen, 1995; Prince, 1996; Wilkinson et al., 1998; Cardy, 1998). In this respect, our study contributes to the literature that highlights the paramount importance of a commitment and enabling (as opposed to control and coercive) HR system (Arthur, 1994; Organ, 1988; Adler and Borys, 1996) . As such, it contributes to the research that treats PA as a communication and development process that occurs in well-defined organisational context (Murphy and Cleveland, 1995, p. 30; Murphy and Cleveland, 1991) such as TQM which requires the best cultural and contextual fit, if the TQM organisation is to succeed. The pursuit of a quality culture and workplace context conducive to employee development and continuous performance improvement comes as organisations try to avoid superficial template applications of TQM, move beyond merely making a fashion statement about TQM, and shift away from an overreliance on traditional quality control tools to a true culture of quality. Hence, under this interpretation, employees are most committed, trusted and enabled to use their discretion to regain control in case of non-compliance and system breakdown and "live" quality in all their actions rather than simply obeying an edict from on high or being coerced into compliance out of fear of being dismissed (see Adler and Borys, 1996; Srinivasan and Kurey, 2014; Arthur, 1994; Organ, 1988; Jiang et al., 2012; Hesseling, 1984; Abrahamson and Fairchild, 1999; van der Wiele et al., 2000; David and Strang, 2006). Fourth, we provide practical insights into PA issues in organisations with a TQM orientation, pointing out ways that TQM-focused organisations can develop a contextually-appropriate PA system that realises TQM's value proposition, and highlighting the expected synergistic effect of both TQM and PA (see Jimenez-Jimenez and Martinez-Costa, 2009).

Performance appraisal and quality management: A review of the literature

As stated in the introduction section, the aim of this study is to explore and describe the current practice of performance management and appraisal systems in organisational environments with a TQM orientation. It is accordingly necessary to examine these constructs at the conceptual and

theoretical levels so it may serve as one critical benchmark against which to interpret the qualitative fieldwork data.

Performance management

Performance management (PM) has been defined as "a continuous process of identifying, measuring, and developing the performance of individuals and teams and aligning their performance with the strategic goals of the organisation" (Aguinis, 2013, p. 2). As a dynamic, year-round way of managing business, PM has been deemed essential for accomplishing organisational strategy. Given its strategic focus, it serves a myriad of purposes, ranging from strategic, administrative, informational, developmental, organisational maintenance to documentational purposes (Aguinis, 2012 pp.13-14). Several HR-related activities assist PM to achieve these different purposes. These include strategic planning (i.e. inputs into what we want to evaluate in our performance management system), method of identifying performance requirements in a particular job (i.e. job analysis and design), training and development, performance appraisal/review, and issues related to compensation and employee motivation. While every HR function plays a part in accomplishing PM intended objectives, PA has been regarded as one of the most common tool for organisations to achieve performance goals. As Aguinis and Pierce (2008) have observed, PM activities (e.g. feedback, goal-setting, training, reward systems) begin with PA as a jumping-off point for improving individual performance in a way that is consistent with strategic goals and with the ultimate goal of improving firm performance.

Performance appraisal

Performance appraisal (PA) refers to "a formal process, which occurs infrequently, by which employees are evaluated by some judge (typically a supervisor) who assesses the employee's performance along a given set of dimensions, assigns a score to that assessment, and then usually informs the employee of his or her formal rating" (DeNisi and Murphy, 2017, p. 1). As one of a number of PM tools, PA aims to ensure employees' performance contributes to business objectives. Unlike PM which is a management-led activity, the responsibility for coordinating the design and implementation of PA systems lies with HR department and the line managers as the implementers of HR functions. As a vital component of PM, PA is inevitable in all organisations for several reasons, namely, the organisation's way of assessing an individual's contribution to the organisation, a necessary tool to account for the differences in individuals' contributions to the organisation, and an essential mechanism to defend the organisation's negative actions against individuals (Ghorpade and Chen, 1995, p. 32).

Despite the many tensions within the multiple agendas and purposes of appraisals, a PA system serves two primary purposes: evaluative/administrative vs. developmental functions (Boswell and Boudreau, 2000). The evaluative function of PA allows managers to make administrative decisions concerning pay raises, promotions, demotions and terminations – to name but a few. As Boswell and Boudreau (2000) have observed, the evaluative function of PA lays stress on the role of appraiser as judge and jury in identifying good and poor performance and differentiating between people. The developmental function, on the other hand, assists managers to make decisions concerning individual training needs, performance feedback and all-round development of the employee for future roles – to name but a few (Ghorpade and Chen, 1995). The developmental function of PA pus the stress on within person analysis and the idea of coaching and mentoring as the main responsibility of the appraiser (Boswell and Boudreau, 2000). In contrast to the traditional annual administrative model of PA, the developmental coaching and mentoring is more conducive to ongoing interaction between an employee and his/her coach or mentor and creating and retaining "actively engaged" employees (Adkins, 2016). Overall, the traditional PA system lays stress on 'individual differences' as the primary point of reference for organisations to make personnel decisions based on the assumption that they have control over their tasks and take personal responsibility for factors influencing their performance (Dobbins et al., 1991; Lam and Schaubroeck, 1999). Despite the many potential benefits of PA to the organisation and employees (see Ghorpade and Chen, 1995; Fletcher, 2001; DeNisi and Murphy, 2017; Aguinis, 2013), the value of traditional (annual, top-down, individual) appraisal systems has increasingly been challenged in favour of enterprise process improvement methods such as total quality management (TQM) and related process and systems thinking approaches to performance improvement.

Total quality management

As the most popular and widely used methodology for improving organisational effectiveness, TQM has become a general heading for a variety of fundamental values, approaches and techniques through which organisations seek to involve all employees to participate in improving processes, products, services, and the culture in which they work (ASQ, 2017). Derived from the works of W. Edwards Deming, Joseph Juran, Kaoru Ishikawa, Armand V. Feigenbaum, Philip Crosby and a few other like-minded scholars and practitioners (see, for a review, Garvin, 2017; Hackman and Wageman, 1995; Oakland, 2014), TQM lays stress on the preservation and health of an organisation so that the organisation can promote the stability of the community, generate products and services that are useful to customers, and provide a setting for the satisfaction and growth of its members (Hackman and Wageman, 1995, p. 310). The TQM way of achieving these normative outcomes in rooted in several fundamental and interlocked orientations, namely, systems (i.e. organisation as

total systems, sub-system co-ordination via top management, sub-system co-ordination via incentive systems, and subsystem co-ordination via teams), customer orientation (i.e. customer focus and customer perceptions), learning orientation (i.e. continuous improvement, benchmarking, and data-driven analysis), and change orientation (i.e. control, change, empowered employees, and organisational survival) (Chiles et al., 2000, p. 188-190; Waldman, 1994). In short, these TQM orientations put the stress on the use of a system or process-based PA which can facilitate organisational goal achievement through enhancing work team effectiveness and improving the performance of the organisation as a whole (Dobbins et al., 1991; Lam and Schaubroeck, 1999).

Despite widespread interest in TQM adoption and becoming 'as pervasive a part of business thinking as quarterly financial results' and as 'a strategic resource' (Powell, 1995, p. 15; Kaynak, 2003), TQM has fallen far short of its potential value (see Redman and Grieves, 1999; 2008; Beer, 2003). While a myriad of internal and external factors have been identified to account for ineffective TQM programmes, a mismatch or lack of fit or congruence between TQM and other management systems such as PA (focus of the current study) has often been cited as a root cause of quality problems. Indeed, the primary authorities of the TQM movement recognise that PA systems are fraught with problems in both measuring individual work performance and improving employee performance (Deming, 1986). In a similar vein, several HRM scholars (e.g. Murphy and Cleveland, 1995; Arthur, 1994; Jiang et al., 2012; Wilkinson et al., 1998) point out that the performance impact of HRM practices such as PA on employee and organisational performance is a function of a good fit, match or congruence between HRM practices and governing principles and values of an organisation and that in the absence of a congruence or fit anything that is developed is liable to be rejected (Murphy and Cleveland, 1991; Ghorpade and Chen, 1995, p. 35; Cardy, 1998; Cardy and Dobbins, 1994).

While many TQM and HRM scholars and practitioners (e.g. Deming, 1986; Cardy, 1998; Schraeder et al., 2007; Jones and Rock, 2015; Latham et al., 2007; Buckingham and Goodall, 2015; Ghorpade and Chen, 1995; Wilkinson et al., 1998) have questioned the efficacy of traditional PA towards successful implementation of TQM, the practice remains ubiquitous and the question of what to replace PA has not been answered with any confidence (see Strebler et al., 2001; Coens and Jenkins, 2002; Aguinis et al., 2011; Jacobs, 2009; Jones and Rock, 2015; Adler et al., 2016; Cappelli and Tavis, 2016; Goler, Gale and Grant, 2016).

TQM critiques of traditional performance appraisal

A review of the writings of QM gurus suggests that there exists a broad consensus recognising the constraints posed by traditional PA for effective TQM implementation. Of these, Deming (1986) has been the most vocal quality guru on the subject. Deming's uncompromising stance on the

traditional PA system has led him to label 'Evaluation of performance, merit rating, or annual review' as the third of his "seven deadly diseases" in terms of barriers to TQM. As Deming (1986, p. 101) observes, "The idea of a merit rating is alluring. The sound of the words captivates the imagination: pay for what you get; get what you pay for; motivate people to do their best, for their own good. The effect is exactly the opposite of what the words promise". Thus Deming notes (1986, p. 102), 'merit rating rewards people that do well in the system. It does not reward attempts to improve the system. Don't rock the boat'. This suggests that appraisals undermine the kind of co-operative, creative, and committed behaviour necessary for continuous improvement. Overall, the following four themes recur in Deming's (1986) call for the elimination of the annual PA: (i) PA systems are unfair since they hold the worker responsible for errors that may be the result of faults within the system; (ii) they promote worker behaviour that compromises quality; (iii) they create a band of discouraged workers who cease trying to excel; and (iv) they rob the workers of their pride in workmanship (Ghorpade et al., 1995, p. 33). And Deming has certainly not been alone in his opinion (see also Scholtes, 1993; Bowman, 1994; Cardy, 1998; Coens and Jenkins, 2000; Nisen, 2015; Culbert and Rout, 2010). For instance, Scholtes (1993, p. 355) argues that PA disregards and, in fact, undermines teamwork; disregards the existence of a system; disregards variability in the system; uses a measurement system that is unreliable and inconsistent; encourages an approach to problem-solving that is superficial and culprit-oriented; tends to establish an aggregate of safe goals in an organisation; creates losers, cynics, and wasted human resources; and seeks to provide a means to administer multiple managerial functions (pay, promotion, feedback communication, direction-setting, etc.), yet it is inadequate to accomplish any of them (see also Bowman, 1994; Coens et al., 2002; Nisen, 2015; Grote, 2011; Pulakos and O'leary, 2011; Buckingham and Goodall; Adler et al., 2016).

A careful examination of the criticisms of quality management gurus and like-minded quality and HR specialists is that they appear to be mainly directed against the type of PA that promotes a highly directive and top down model of performance review in that employees have to comply with hierarchical, management-led work standards and are held responsible for errors that may be the result of faults within the system (Deming, 1986; Cardy, 1998; Bach, 2005; Ghorpade and Chen, 1995; Leffakis and Dwyer, 2014; Scholtes, 1993; Adler et al., 2016; Waldman, 1994; Rock and Jones, 2015). Given the overreliance of traditional PA on tight control procedures and more frequent employee check-ins for (non)compliance, employees are evaluated against a set of predetermined performance criteria (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2004; Grote, 2011) as a basis for the individual employee's pay grade, rewards and related administrative decisions. The traditional appraisal system is designed to impose absolute liability on employees for noncompliance with

workplace standards and requirements. That is, the focus of traditional PA systems is less on identifying root causes of performance variation in the system. Instead, as Scholtes (1997) has pointed out, the focus is more on promoting a "who-based" approach to problem-solving and as such the supervisor's primary concern is to look for culprits in the workforce. The traditional appraisal system is based on the premise that poor employee performance lies largely with the employees' own shortcomings than system level deficiencies which are out of the employee's control (e.g. prior management decisions, defects in raw materials, flaws in the design of the system as well as other management shortcomings). Referred to as common causes of variance in performance within systems, common causes or system-level factors account for over 90 percent of the quality problems. So the traditional performance appraisal assigns the locus of blame on employee weaknesses rather than system-level, managerial and organizational inefficiencies (Deming, 1986; Ghorpade and Chen, 1995). Hence, traditional PA "disregards the existence of a system. It encourages individuals to squeeze or circumvent the system for personal gain rather than improve it for collective gain" (Scholtes, 1993, p. 355; see also Cappelli and Tavis, 2016). The inference to be drawn from the research on ditching formal, annual, rack-and-stack performance review processes is that traditional PA would make a good fit for a control-oriented HR system which aims to improve efficiency by enforcing employee compliance with specified rules and procedures and basing employee rewards on some measurable output criteria (Arthur, 1994, p. 672; Eisenhardt, 1985; Walton, 1985).

Overall, such characterisation of traditional performance appraisal fits Adler and Borys' notion of 'coercive' organisation. In this regard, the rationale for performance appraisal revolves around the idea of task attainment by exercising tight control over the workforce and that employee control is a substitute rather than a complement to work process control and employee commitment to complete their tasks. In the coercive logic of performance appraisal, any noncompliance or variance in work performance is seen as suspect and that performance appraisal serves to highlight to superiors whether subordinate' actions are in compliance. Scholars working within this perspective have theorised a range of undesirable adverse effects of a coercive performance appraisal including output/target driven blame culture, (Carson and Carson, 1992; Deming, 1986; Ghorpade et al., 1995), worker's responsibility for quality/noncompliance errors beyond their control (Deming, 1986; Lam and Schaubroek,1999), compromising quality by focusing on mere task attainment (see Srinivasan and Kurey, 2014), and promoting mediocracy by instructing the workforce to follow the prescribed methods and work procedures to perform their job assignments (Ghorpade et al., 1995). Hence, a coercive approach to performance appraisal places less emphasis on communication and development elements but gives weight instead to the importance of measurement and numerical

relative rankings (see Murphy and Cleveland, 1991), employees' tendency to settle for mediocrity and average performance as well as rewards for compliance and risk-averse behaviour (see Ashkenas and Bodell, 2014). Associated with the tendency to settle for mediocrity and output-based appraisal systems in a coercive organisational environment is the idea that employees are compelled to comply with rigid rules and judged by evidence in support of attaining the assigned goals (completing their normal job assignments). In doing so, performance appraisal systems are designed so as to reduce the possibility of non-compliance and that employees stay the course so as not be punished for non-compliance with quality standards. Furthermore, coercive organisational environments often stress the idea of accurate and valid measurement and performance ratings (using scale formats) as a precondition for evaluation of the individual's contribution to the organisation. For Murphy and Cleveland (p. 30), the standard criticism of treating performance appraisal as a measurement process (mere focus on accuracy and validity of performance ratings and scale) lies in the fact that performance appraisal is viewed as a context-free phenomenon. As they have pointed out, such treatment, however, fails to facilitate the integration of science and practice in performance appraisal. Under such a regime, employees inevitably will not go the extra mile and instead get the bare minimum effort. Numerous studies (Deming, 1986; Cleveland and Murphy, 1989; Ghorpade et al., 1995; DeNisi and Murphy, 2017) in this vein have shown that employees' tendency to start the vicious cycle of doing just enough and cease to exert any extra effort is a symptom of ineffective performance management and appraisal systems that fail to appreciate employees' extra effort and recognize their contributions towards furthering teamwork, cooperation and more specifically the long-term viability of the system. The inference to be drawn is what Vosk (2017) has referred to as "quitting in seat", meaning that employees choose to stay employed while effectively checked out and disengaged from their day-to-day work. In a nutshell, the resulting implication of a coercive approach to performance appraisal systems is that they have made employees so desperate to find a safe rate of output and coast along without a desire to go above and beyond expectations. As such, employees may be reluctant to accept changes required for continuous quality improvement and unwilling to go above and beyond the call of duty (e.g. contributions towards cooperation, teamwork and system improvement) to preserve the wholeness and long-term viability of the system (see Ghorpade et al., 1995, p. 37; Beer, 2003; Murphy and Cleveland, 1991; Mohrman et al., 1989; Etzioni, 1960; Waldman, 1994).

But, there is also a second approach to performance appraisal which aims to develop the employees and improve their future performance. A developmental performance appraisal has the potential to strike an appropriate balance and tackle the apparent conflict between the TQM's focus on system factors and appraisal's focus on individual employees as the major determinant of performance

variation (Grote, 2011; Kuvaas, 2008; Kehoe and Wright, 2013; Jiang et al., 2012). As such, it serves as an effective mechanism to motivate and empower employees, give them honest and timely feedback, develop their skills, and elicit their individual / collective commitment in the longer-term interest of the organisation (see Bretz et al., 1992; Roberts, 2003; Grote, 2015). Overall, proponents of the development model performance appraisal commonly argue that coaching, counselling and aiding the employees to improve their performance has proved effective in staffing decisions, identification of training needs and their alignment with the strategic needs, strengthening of communication, continuous performance improvement, and provision of legal defensibility (see Iles, 2001; Graber et al., 1992, p. 59; Bach, 2005). Interest in the developmental performance appraisal in quality-driven organisations has become enshrined and echoed in the guidelines to the US Baldrige awards for excellence in quality management which suggest that performance reviews need to be restructured in such a way that supports quality improvement (Hart and Schlesinger, 1991). In a similar vein, Europe's most prestigious quality award for organisations (i.e. the European Foundation for Quality Management Excellence Award) distinguishes quality-driven organisations from the rest by the manners in which they reward, recognise and care for people (EFQM, 2017). Schuler and Harris (1992) claim that performance appraisal may play a useful role in quality improvement, so long as the appraisal emphasises behavioural aspects of performance and refers to both short and long-term criteria, and to both individual and group achievements. Their argument is that such appraisals may contribute towards quality improvement by ensuring that employees are aware of the behaviours which contribute to high quality (Snape et al., 1993, p. 7). Hence, a distinguishing feature of a developmental version of PA is that it is congruent with a commitment-oriented HR system The influence of this HR system is particularly evident in the work of Arthur (1992, 1994). The essence of a developmental or commitment-oriented HR system for Arthur (1994, p. 672) means developing committed employees who can be trusted to use their discretion to carry out job tasks in ways that are consistent with organisational goals. Put differently, a developmental, commitment-oriented HR system has the potential to shape desired employee behaviours and attitudes by forging psychological links between organisational and employee goals (see also Organ, 1988; Lawler, 1986; Walton, 1985).

The preceding discussion of a developmental performance appraisal fits what Adler and Borys (1996) called enabling organisation. Indeed, their conceptualisation of enabling organisation is redolent with implications for our attempts in the current study to scrutinise a developmental PA in terms of its congruence with and potential to achieve sustained quality improvement. Based on the insights gained from Adler and Borys' enabling logic, PA policies, procedures and forms are designed to facilitate responses to real work contingencies. PA outcomes signal to the organisation

poor employee performance, identify sources of poor quality (i.e. due to both common and special causes), detail out employee's competency gaps and serve as a platform to reward employees with both formal and informal incentives. In a similar vein, non-compliance errors and quality deviation signal either the need for further worker training or the need to revise the inadequate standardised work methods. Instead of placing blame on individuals for deviation from standardised procedures, the enabling logic of performance appraisal change the basic TQM dictum of 'In the absence of standardization, organisations cannot implement long lasting process improvement strategies' to a philosophy of collaborative learning through building a shared vision, self-improvement and team learning (see Adler, 1993). That is, performance appraisal provides employees with the opportunity to solicit timely, frequent formative feedback on their performance from a variety of sources (upward communication), develop self-regulated and teamwork skills as well as allowing them for moderate risk-taking and voicing their concerns. Such assumptions seem to underlie Edmondson (1999) notion of psychological safety which connotes the belief that an employee won't be punished when s/he makes a mistake or as Delinzonn's (2017) has put it succinctly: "…sticking your neck out without fear of having it cut off" (see also Ghorpade et al., 1995, p. 37). In a similar vein, performance review procedures of an enabling organisation serve the interests of all those who are affected by the activity. In this respect, Murphy and Cleveland (1991) led the way with their hypothesised connection between multi-source assessment (upward feedback and communication as platform for employee voice in shaping the appraisal system) and employees' perceived fairness of appraisal system. To take advantage of performance appraisal, enabling organisations view performance appraisal as one of the core organisational activities that requires ongoing improvement. Working from this premise, Ghorpade et al. (1995, p. 36) argue that performance appraisal has to be revisited and reformed like any other quality improvement effort. In doing so, quality tools such as process flowcharts (locating process flaws), cause and effect diagram (grouping appraisal system problems according to categories such as person, method, policies), and Pareto principle (ranking opinion surveys of the existing appraisal system) have proven to be extremely versatile in revisiting performance appraisal systems to accommodate the requirements of enterprise process improvement methodologies such as TQM and its derivatives (see also Berwick et al., 1991). In an enabling approach to performance appraisal, performance is not measured simply based on input or output criteria. Rather, all performance dimensions of input, output and behaviour are used to judge the worth of the individual's contribution to the organisation over a period of time. This usage is essentially is that of Murphy and Cleveland (1991) and Ghorpade et al. (1995) who argue that the focus of performance appraisal should be primarily on behaviour (the process dimension), with input and output used for diagnostic and developmental purposes. Adler and Borys' (1996) notion of enabling organisation also points to the importance of objective and

absolute (rather than subjective, comparative and relative) standards of performance. The clearest expression of this position is found in Deming's discussion of the faulty management practices of performance appraisal. Unlike relative performance standards which tend to undermine effective teamwork and cooperation and pit workers against each other, absolute performance standards provide definite goals for individuals (see Cummings and Schwab, 1973).

Overall, the preceding review of the extant literature suggests a need to shift focus from the traditional coercive to a contextually-appropriate performance review system that enables the organisation to realise the TQM's value proposition. Our aim is therefore to contribute to the literature by locating and describing how performance appraisal is actually conducted in quality-focused organisations and whether there is a (mis)match between the more prevalent types of performance appraisal in practice and the theoretical underpinnings of enterprise process improvement methods such as quality management.

Research Methods

Rationale for adopting qualitative case study

In the light of the research aim and paucity of previous empirical research on PA in organisational environments with a TQM orientation, it was deemed essential to adopt a case study approach. The case study approach enables in-depth contextual information about the research phenomenon which in turn could provide a description of the current state of performance management and appraisal which is expected to be sensitive to the context (i.e. TQM) in which the research occurs (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007; Yin, 2013). The general process of qualitative research design for the current study followed Yin's (2016) case study process as well as the qualitative methodology described by Miles and Huberman (1994)). For ease of simplicity, this process is schematically depicted in Figure 1.

"INSERT FIGUIRE 1 ABOUT HERE"

As Figure 1 seeks to illustrate, the case study process is composed of six interdependent stages, meaning that the process is highly reflexive (Mauthner, 2003). The rest of the methods section discusses each of these stages in detail.

Strategies for case selection

A frequently contested issue within qualitative research is the selection and number of cases. In this respect, we followed Eisenhardt (1989) argument in that a theoretical sampling was adopted to select cases that were particularly suitable for illuminating and extending relationships and logic among constructs. To provide more accurate and convincing empirical grounding and establish a

stronger base for theory building, we adopted a multiple (as opposed to single) case study design not least because it enabled the research team to clarify whether an emergent finding was simply idiosyncratic to a single case or consistently replicated by several cases (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 537; Yin, 2013). To control extraneous variation and better define the limits for generalising the findings, we chose a sample of 6 cases from auto industry as a suitable number which enabled the research team to effectively cope with the complexity and volume of the qualitative data (Esienhardt, 1989, p. 545). While there is no ideal number of cases, Eisenhardt (1989, p. 545) suggests a number between 4 and 10 cases to generate more convincing empirical grounding for theory building.

In a manner consistent with Crosby's (1979) notion of Quality Management Maturity Grid (QMMG), we selected cases based on the QMMG's measurement categories of management understanding and attitude and quality organization status. We then targeted manufacturing sector with a particular focus on auto industry which has a long history of adopting quality control activities and assisting employees to find a personal fit with the company quality culture (see, for a review, AIAG, 2017). Given the compliance nature of ISO/TS 16949 certificate (either a company is committed to quality or it is not – see Oakland, 2014), we focused on those auto manufacturing firms that have gone beyond quality and regulatory requirements with ISO/TS 16949 and long adopted more comprehensive, non-prescriptive quality management frameworks such as European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) model for continuous improvement (EFQM, 2017). As one of the most popular frontend quality frameworks in the world, the EFQM model has been widely adopted in conjunction with ISO and other continuous improvement methodologies across Europe. In addition to EFQM membership, the selection of the cases was based on several other criteria, namely, the long tenure of top management team (Deming, 1986), long experience with quality management initiatives (Garvin, 1988; Oakland, 2014), and possessing quality and HR departments with their own vice-presidents (VPs). The first criterion is in line with Deming's (1986) argument about a positive relationship between certainty in (top) management position and long-term benefits of quality management initiatives. In respect of the second criterion, Garvin (1988) and Oakland (2014), among others, talk about quality management as a strategic tool which would require several years to be successfully implemented. With regard to the third and final criterion, the VPs quality and HR should be appointed to assist the organization to introduce continuous improvement activities and direct a company's HR strategies to support productive business operations and advance the company's vision, respectively. Our focus on manufacturing firms is attributed to the fact that TQM has its origins in the mass production of components and has been widely used in manufacturing sector. Based on the above criteria and the willingness of companies

to participate in the study, a total number of 6 car manufacturers/auto parts suppliers were selected. Our focus on the automotive sector was to make the sample of cases more homogeneous in terms of potentially relevant contextual variables such as the nature of the work processes involved and the type of technology applied. Also, given the early efforts by Toyota and other Japanese car manufacturers, it is well known that TQM has had a profound impact in this particular sector (see Inman et al., 2010). Further details on case companies are shown in Table 1.

<<INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE>>

Data collection methods

Given the episodic nature of our research phenomenon both with regard to TQM as a strategic tool and PA as an infrequent, non-routine practice, we used semi-structured interviews as primary data source as it is a highly efficient way to gather rich, empirical data (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007). To elicit and reveal useful data and explore the (un)known and interesting avenues (Rubin and Rubin, 2011), interview guides were used (albeit not strictly enforced). In line with Eisenhardt's (1989) and Yin's (2013) recommendations, we utilised other qualitative data collection methods; namely, archival evidence (e.g. PA forms and reports, quality control policies and procedures, observations on the role of external consultants in planning and running quality initiatives, etc.) and plant tours, to provide a stronger substantiation for our research constructs. Table 2 presents demographic profile of research participants and data sources.

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Overall, semi-structured interview were carried out with managers (n = 51) and employees (n = 74) at different hierarchical levels and functional areas. To further probe and explore the implications of TQM adoption for PA during the course of TQM implementation and clarify the responses from face to face interviews and verify the data collected from other sources (e.g. archival sources, plant tour, informal disucssions), we conducted follow-up interviews (5-6 interviews in each case) with both managers and employees at different functional areas after initial phase of data collection (see Patton, 2015). The follow-up interviews allowed adequate time for research informants to capture accounts reflecting the dynamic nature of the interviewees' perceptions and experiences with changes to their performance management systems to accommodate the TQM requirements. With the exception of one of the six cases, there were much fewer mentions of positive amendments to PA systems in favour of TQM requirements. The selection of interviewees conforms to the notion of 'multiple perspectives' of qualitative research methods (Corbin and Strauss, 2014). Selecting research informants from different functional areas mitigated potential bias in interview data (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007). The interview questions were open-ended and covered topics that

included: the characteristics of the current PA systems, changes in PA as a result of TQM adoption, management rationale for conducting PA and in-progress or future plans to revise performance management in accordance with the adopted organisation-wide process improvement methods. Each interview lasted between one and a half to two hours. All interviews were tape recorded and all observations, site visits and data obtained from examining related documents were recorded as written field notes. The interviews were then fully transcribed, leading to the production of large amounts of textual materials.

Data analysis

The main approach to data analysis followed Yin's (2015) five phases of qualitative data analysis (see also Bryman and Burgess, 2002; Miles and Huberman, 1994). As shown in Figure 2, data analysis is an iterative set of processes that involves compiling, disassembling, reassembling & arraying, interpreting data, and finally concluding.

[INSER FIGUIRE 2 ABOUT HERE]

As Figure 2 seeks to suggest, while the sequential nature of the five phases of qualitative data analysis is obvious, the whole process of qualitative data analysis is recursive and occurs in a nonlinear fashion (Yin, 2016). That is, it requires multiple rounds of visiting and revisiting the data to gain new insights and further unearth new connections that can lead to refined focus and deepening understanding of the research evidence (Berkowitz, 1997).

In line with the qualitative data analysis process described by Yin (2015; see also Miles and Huberman, 1994; Bryman and Burgess, 2002), the transcriptions of the text were analysed in terms of content or key themes (Weber, 1990) with the aid of NVivo 10 (see Bazeley and Jackson, 2013). Content analysis refers to any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies, meanings or specified characteristics within the text (Weber, 1990; Patton, 2014). This technique relies on coding and categorising of the data. To aid the analysis, due account was taken of the procedures recommended by Saldaña (2016) as well as similar qualitative case study research (e.g. Harris and Ogbonna, 2002) that adopted open, axial and selective coding. The coding process stated with open coding: deconstructing, conceptualising and labelling data through breaking down the data (the line-by-line analysis of the text) into separate units of meaning and categories. During axial coding, the identified units of meaning and categories that were fractured during open coding were reviewed, re-sorted and re-assembled in terms of their dynamic interrelationships. Finally, selective coding involved the process of selecting the core category through systematically relating it to the other categories and validating their relationships (Corbin and Strauss, 2014). In short, based on the initial

interview topics, two research assistants reviewed the interviewees' responses and provided the principal investigator with a list of important categories. The coding process, categorisation procedures and identified categories were then independently reviewed by two experienced qualitative researchers. In a joint meeting, the initial list of categories were then corroborated and any arising discrepancies discussed and subsequently resolved. To check for internal veracity, a senior qualitative researcher was invited to review the coding process. To perform external veracity, a total of 12 ex-post interviews (2 interviews in each case – one manager and one employee) with research informants were undertaken to check the accuracy of the developed framework in terms of the relationship between concepts, categories and empirical evidence (see Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

As a result of the above procedures, the interviewees' responses were summarised under four main categories and eight sub categories. These include: (i) the prime source of performance appraisal (single vs. multiple sources), (ii) performance appraisal cycle (long vs. short timeframe), (iii) rationale for performance appraisal (control vs develop), and (iv) causal attribution of performance variance (person vs. system). In the following section we shall present the quotations that reflect the emerging pattern of consensus on the main and sub-categories that are used to frame the research findings. Prior to the presentation of the findings, it is useful to provide a brief background information on the research context –i.e. UK automotive industry.

The research setting: UK automotive industry

The Growing importance of QM and related continuous improvement initiatives in the automotive industry goes far beyond its potential benefits. While increased customer satisfaction, adherence to safety standards, higher efficiency and productivity and an increased bottom line are the expected benefits of continuous improvements programmes in manufacturing firms (automotive industry included), the auto industry needs to pay special attention to effective adoption and implementation of QM practices. This is for a variety of reasons, namely, growing environmental concerns such as fuel economy, emissions regulations, growing number of product recalls due to factory error/quality control problems and supplier related non-conformances and corrective actions, the rise in prominence of strategic supply-chain management and the need to extend the quality enterprise to include suppliers and contract manufacturers (AIAG, 2013; PwC, 2013). The impact of these challenges on quality performance in automotive industry is particularly evident in 'Quality 2020' Project by AIAG (2013). According to AIAG (2013), the primary quality concerns facing automakers and their suppliers are three-fold: (i) concerns related to problem solving (i.e. the lack of effective problem solving and prevention activities through shared information and ongoing employee engagement resulting in continually repeating the same problems), (ii) concerns related

to customer specific requirements (i.e. the difficulty of meeting customer specific requirements through compliance with QMS of the OEM or tier 1 customer as well as meeting the third party assurance requirements - e.g. TS 16949, ISO 9001, ISO 14001), and (iii) concerns related to quality management system (i.e. the adverse impact of complex and redundant QMS requirements on standardization procedures, operational efficiencies, relationships, and ability to respond to quality-related events).

In the UK, the automotive industry accounts for 4% of GDP (£60.5 billion) and currently provides employment for more than 700,000 people (KPMG, 2014). The industry is best known for premium and sports car marques (e.g. Aston Martin, Jaguar, and Rolls-Royce) and is regarded as a major centre for engine manufacturing. According to a recent report by the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders (SMMT), the UK automotive manufacturing sector had a turnover of 69.5 billion in 2014 (the highest since 2008), generated some 3.5% more employment opportunities and a 5% year-on-year reduction in CO2 emissions per vehicle produced (SMMT, 2015). Whilst these figures confirm the growing strength and vitality of the UK automotive industry and its ascendancy as a major global player in terms of manufacturing output, vehicle sales, jobs and export values, the UK automotive industry has its own fragilities and faces significant challenges. For example, the general observation of a recent research by the Advanced Institute of Management (Antonacopoulou et al., 2010) was that organizational readiness for change and translation of new management practices into improved performance by UK managers were both slower and less successful compared to their counterparts in France, Germany and the US. Research by the AIM and others (e.g. Porter and Ketels, 2003; McLaughlin, 2013) suggested that UK managers were found ineffective on two grounds: inability to recognise the need to change and an inadequate understanding of appropriate best practices to effectively manage changes (which are deemed essential for improving business performance and suitable for delivering a competitive advantage). Hence, they often fail to engage with the deeper causes of the organization's problems, unable to recognise the scale of change required and quite simply fail to materials the intended objectives of management practices. To enhance the industry productivity and maintain a competitive edge in global market, the management of UK's automotive industry need to identify the appropriate management practices, design effective HR and OM systems to ensure needed competencies, compliance to internal operations, regulations, external requirements and finally effectively translate them into improved performance (see Lawler and Boudreau, 2009). As Voss (1995) has pointed out, the adopted best practice activity needs to be appropriate for the business sector and closely linked to a firm's business level strategy – if it is to deliver a competitive advantage for a firm over its rivals.

Findings

Overall, our findings reveal that the type of PA that is most prevalent in the case study companies (with the exception of only one case) is not easy to square with fundamental principles of enterprise process improvement methods such as quality management expressed by Deming (1986) and like-minded scholars (Scholtes, 1993; Murphy and Cleveland, 1991; Ghorpade and Chen, 1995; Cardy et al., 1998; Grote, 2011; Adler et al., 2016; DeNisi and Murphy, 2017). To facilitate the presentation of the qualitative data and report the findings, we adopt Adler and Bory's (1996) notions of 'enabling' and 'coercive' to differentiate between the case organisations. Based on the data analysis, coercive organisations (5 out of the six cases in our sample) promote a static and fixed mindset approach which appears antithetical to TQM, meaning that they lay stress on manager-controlled, past-oriented, compliance-driven and individual-focused task attainment behaviour and more specifically perceive individual employees as acting primarily as a locus of blame for performance variation. By contrast, the enabling case places emphasis on a growth and development mindset in a sense that they make concerted efforts to enhance employee development and commitment through focusing on both task performance and quality improvement as the prime twin objectives of measuring an employee's performance in a TQM environment.

Sources of performance ratings

Our analysis of the data suggested that all the organizations involved had undergone major change programmes designed to reconcile the TQM's focus on system and HR performance management's focus on individual performance. Despite some similarities, the nature of such reconciliation varied considerably among the case organizations. In tandem with the hard TQM practices and strict adherence to measurable quality outcomes, supervisory level managers became much more heavily involved and acted as the focal point of reference than heretofore in conducting employee performance review. The focus on immediate supervisor as the prime source of PA was evident in coercive cases where the immediate supervisor's role was redefined so that they became quality compliant officer to establish (in the words of an auto electrician) "fault or blame against non-compliant employees". A director of production notes:

> I work with the production and assembly team on a daily basis. Whatever happens in production area comes back to me. So I exactly know who is doing what. I know better than anyone else about employees under my supervision [Director of production control and logistics, 7 years' service, aged 44]

Our analyses suggest that coercive organizations did more than merely holding immediate supervisors responsible for PA or as a source of facilitating organization-employee communication.

In addition to using PA as the organization's way of getting its rightful due from the individual, the exclusive use of manager-controlled appraisal systems was reinforced by two different mechanisms: building various types of work team at both functional and cross-functional levels, and enforcement of top management policies and procedures through bureaucratic structure and hierarchical control. Whilst a central tenet of these mechanisms from a TQM perspective was to support a combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches as a prerequisite for the empowerment of both line managers and employees, a majority of managers viewed these initiatives as vehicles for achieving the TQM's goal of zero defects. To capitalize on these mechanisms, coercive organizations established several functional and cross-functional working groups which were tasked with identifying mistake-proofing methods and desired goals with immediate results and satisfaction. Our analysis of the data suggested that the application of two aforementioned mechanisms began with relatively clear aim and unsullied by significant influences from the top echelon management and the immediate line managers as the lynchpin between the executives and employees. In most of these cases, the quality control department and external consultants were instructed to define detailed procedures and expectations for the assigned tasked to team members.

While our data painted a gloomy picture of supervisor-led PA followed by unilateral management actions in a majority of case organizations, evidence from one of the case companies (referred to as 'enabling organization in this paper) painted a picture of the line manager as the sole evaluator of subordinates as a rather "defunct species" (Storey, 1992, pp. 177). Many upper-, middle- and lower-echelon managers themselves subscribe to the view that they shifted from 'line-manager-controlled appraisal' as a unilateral decision maker and disciplinarian of employees to a system of appraisal in that immediate supervisors and line managers perceived PA as a 'shared responsibility' between immediate supervisor and employees. Perceived as the proper function of the organization and responsibility of immediate supervisors, PA was a (in the words of one senior manager):

> Collaborative effort between the manager and employees for facilitating individual and team goal settings, providing timely goal feedback and sharing information through an effective communication system which is built upon transparency and honesty" [Plant HR manager, 14 years' service, aged 44].

In large measures the brouhaha over immediate supervisor as the sole source of PA information in enabling case organization signaled a considered approval of (i) mutual understanding of the rationale behind PA, (ii) the importance of rule-making interventions through the immediate supervisor and (iii) use of other reliable sources as input to employee performance. Evidence from the archival research and interviews suggests that the case organization pursued the idea of multi-rater in a very limited but focused and developmental manner. The dual forms of immediate

supervisor and other sources of feedback (with a focus on customer satisfaction surveys, feedback from upper echelon managers and peer appraisal) were seen to be the characteristic features of PA in the case organization. The following quotations from two informants at enabling case organization illustrates these points:

> The results of both internal and end-user satisfaction surveys are also part of the feedback system about our performance. In some cases, but not often, we seek other sources of information, for example, for promotion purposes or sometimes to help some individuals realize their full potential and improve their management style or even make some employees more loyal to the organization. [Site accountant, 14 years' service, aged 41]

> We follow the TQM ideas of customer service, employee involvement, shared decision making, teamwork, system thinking and learning orientation at the core of our performance management system. Implementation of all these ideas requires something more than the traditional immediate supervisor-led appraisals. It therefore makes sense for us to include a wide range of sources at different levels such as feedback from customers, peer assessment, self-assessment etc. and incorporate their views to make bias-free decisions reading an employee's performance. [Quality control manager, 17 years' service, aged 49]

Overall, data analysis suggests that although coercive organizations in our sample attempted to introduce a systematic approach to performance appraisal and improvement, the role of immediate supervisor was becoming far more important in determining how performance appraisal criteria were designed and employee performance was measured. Despite the multidimensional nature of performance, the conflicting purposes of performance appraisal and the prime focus of a TQM-driven performance appraisal on helping the employees improve their performance, coercive case organizations appeared reluctant to seek a variety of inputs from other useful sources of information to avoid skewed and incorrect information and accurately rate the employee's performance. However, as our analysis of interviews and informal discussion with the research informants in enabling organization indicated, the appropriate use of immediate supervisors (as the focal point for employees concerns), self-appraisal, peers and customers of the employee were reported to be integral to the performance management system. As such, such multi-level and multi-source appraisal was seen to not only reinforce a culture of open, honest and transparent communication with all employees but also mitigate the bias inherent in traditional immediate supervisor-led appraisals towards a more supportive workplace relationship.

Performance review cycle

There was sufficient commonality in the evidence collected from the coercive cases to enable a broad-brush picture to be drawn. At coercive cases, it was found that the frequency of performance review in no way linked to companies' quality efforts. More specifically, two issues appeared significant in promoting a long-cycle annual performance review and undermining a culture of continuous performance improvement. These included viewing quality planning as a stand-alone activity and too many departmental and unit-level priorities. A long-tenured plant production manager at one of the coercive cases put the point succinctly:

> The truth is that performance management or appraisal has always been the same in particular with regard to performance review timeframe. It is an annual exercise. We also have too many quality teams and too many first line supervisors as a result of adopting improvement programmes such as TQM with too many objectives. But this [adoption of TQM] has not changed the company's approach to performance management and review. [Plant production supervisor, 16 years' service, aged 49]

An assembly line employee reflected on the implications of an unfocused and disintegrated PA from the underlying assumptions of TQM and the predominant role of tightly structured and formalized work procedures as reasons for the popularity of annual or anniversary-date appraisal cycles:

> Quality check and control and quality problems are daily issues and exactly the same as when we did not have TQM perogrammes. But now we have too many and sometimes very vague quality goals and every day we have a lot of time-consuming arguments for why things go wrong or why we deviate from the written procedures and desired goals. We are expected to deliver quality results in a very short time period. Of course we try not to report those undetected deviations by line managers because they are perceived as our failure in the end-year performance review. Most of us prefer only once-a-year review as we already know how demotivating the review results are. [Night shift assembly line operative, 10 years' service, aged 35]

Overall, archival data and our informal discussions with lower echelon supervisors and employees at coercive cases suggested that the adoption of TQM resulted in a system of performance review which can be summarized as follows: a heavy focus on measuring and meeting immediate or short-term output and targets; vague policies and procedures from the top and inability of middle and lower echelon managers and supervisors to effectively deploy them down into the organization

layer by layer, and more specifically, strict adherence to the rules and no tolerance policy for any non-compliance with quality requirements.

However, a combination of multiple assessment modalities in form of quarterly, mid-year and year-end performance review cycles were characteristic features of performance improvement and review at enabling organization. In the enabling case which formed the exception in our sample, the postulated amendments to the PA had a substantive base in the sense that it was built upon a desire for continuous improvement of its operations. Given the paramount role of continuous improvement initiatives in business strategy deployment and execution, middle managers and immediate supervisors made concerted efforts to seek information about employee views and performance throughout the year. Instead of using traditional bureaucratic rule enforcement through annual performance review and ensuring employee compliance with the workplace policies and top management directives, middle managers and immediate supervisors were crucially continuously engaged in retranslation and direct personal delivery of organization's core strategy and business goals (including quality mission statement) coming to them from top levels to their employees. As one middle manager observed:

> If fact, effective communication of performance expectations at the right time and ensuring a mutual understanding of job responsibilities and work assignments are our priority. You cannot create a continuous improvement culture by following a top-down directive approach and yearly performance review. [Head of selection & recruitment department, 11 years' service, aged 39]

Underpinning multiple assessment modalities throughput the year, several long-tenured employees and line managers confirmed that one of the biggest amendments to the company's performance management system had been the increasing practice of holding monthly and quarterly meetings with employees and managers at all levels. Evidence from the interviews and observations revealed that such gatherings became the main avenue for a debate on the interlink between the corporate strategy and quality mission statement with a focus on getting everyone from top to shopfloor subscribe to a quality mission statement and its organization-wide dissemination. In fact, the integration of operations improvement initiatives into the strategic priorities of the firm and follow-up action plans and policies did not seem to crystallize until the company decided to change once-a year performance review cycle to (in the words of a long-tenured HR administrator) "a year-round dialogue and day-to-day coaching and performance feedback". One employee summarized what was happening during monthly or mid-year gatherings:

> Performance review is an ongoing activity in our organization. It tells us whether continuous improvement is taking place and how we are performing our tasks or

> how to further improve our performance... It is more of a participatory activity as managers communicate organizational and quality/operational standards with us and we also discuss improvement related issues in a more objective, honest and relaxed atmosphere with our immediate supervisors at the right time. [Assembly production operative, 9 years' service, aged 33]

Overall, the evidence from enabling case organization points to the fact that expanded and regular performance review and improvement meetings at unit, functional and organizational levels are deemed essential if operations improvement initiatives in their multitude of forms are to be integrated in the strategic business planning process. Indeed, a central aspect of the company's performance management system and its quality efforts was to revisit their employee PA measures and determinants and asking employees about their training needs as a result of ongoing performance review as well as constant instructive and supportive feedback.

Rationale for performance review

Two different but related issues in the case organizations appeared significant in rationalization for the aims and role of PA systems. These include senior management's understanding of enterprise process improvement initiatives and the logic of their adoption and diffusion. Although all research informants at senior management levels extoled the virtues of TQM as a management approach to long–term success of a business as a whole (espoused theory), managers at coercive organizations appeared to operationalize TQM and relevant continuous improvement practices as primarily a means of product and service excellence (theory-in-use). A senior manager reflected on the importance of product and service excellence as the ultimate goal of operations strategy:

> We invest in a range of productivity and quality improvement programmes such as ISO 9000 family standards, six sigma, lean management or Kaizen and we expect to outperform the average industry quality standards. We apply both voluntary and mandatory quality standards to make sure that we as well as our auto parts suppliers manufacture quality products and deliver services which pass quality control tests and meet contractual and regulatory specifications and criteria. [Supplier quality manager, 11.5 years' service, aged 37]

Coercive organizations in our study had sought to take the paramount importance of product and service excellence one step further. Quality control unit in each case adopted a centralized orientation to the planning and monitoring quality control activities. Middle and supervisory level managers were instructed to closely cooperate with the audit team (appointed by the top management) to further obtain absolute assurance that the products and services were free from

errors. In concordance with top management directives, quality control was perceived by many to be an 'obligatory point of reference' or (in the words of one experienced inspection and test specialist, 6 years' service, aged 29) "the bible for quality control and identifying the wrongdoers in the workplace at the right time".

The prime focus of quality control unit on monitoring employee performance carried important implications for the manner in which PA was redesigned and conducted across coercive cases. Our data suggest that there were relatively many more immediate supervisors who were responsible to identify any breach of established quality control rules. The picture built up from the coercive cases was three-fold: (i) the decreased and narrow span of control which greatly expanded the authority of immediate supervisors to exert tight control over the workforce to fully comply with directive managerial activities and top-down, rigid quality control procedures, (ii) tightly focused one-to-one work supervision of employees allowed the immediate managers to easily identify any job performance standards of unsatisfactory work performance or non-compliance to any of the stipulations contained in the quality control policies and procedures; and (iii) existence of a classic blame culture in that failure to meet the pre-determined performance criteria and achieve efficiency goals were perceived to be a (in the words of production operative) "taboo" and that admitting to work errors and mistakes or failure to comply with quality rules was attributed to (as one product packer/assembler succinctly put it), "inefficient, unable and incompetent employee".

As is evident from the above discussion, the rationale for performance review at coercive cases relied, in the main, upon the workforce control rather than process control. In contrast to the TQM's focus on system orientation, performance appraisal and incentive systems at coercive organizations failed to achieve the co-ordination of goals across functional and hierarchical levels. Instead, there appeared to be ambiguity and contradiction in using performance appraisal system as a means of exerting control over the workforce (rather than work processes) to bring about the desired outcomes of TQM. In fact, the promised TQM benefits were seen to be vulnerable to the ineffective performance appraisal and incentive systems of the case organizations in a sense that they did not reinforce the TQM's focus on process thinking and therefore failed to support the implementation of the firms' operations improvement strategies (i.e. lack of internal fit).

However, operations improvement practices across enabling case organization were becoming far more important in determining how performance management and appraisal could be used as a mechanism to improve employees' connection to the organization through aligning their goals with those of the long-term objectives and strategies of the organization. A predominant trend observable in this case had been to recast the traditional, judgmental and command and control-oriented role of

PA systems into a new role which provided employees an avenue for individual growth and development. In this role, managers actively sought to find new ways of utilizing performance management as a means of organizational transformation and business excellence. To allow them to excel, the notion of excellence extended beyond product and services and encompassed a heavy focus on management systems and processes improvement. More specifically, the adopted orientation to business excellence embraced a greater comprehension on relevant performance management practices that could reward overall management excellence and not quality management alone (see Garvin, 1991). A majority of managerial interviewees at different authority levels talked of ensuring that employees had the opportunity to take ownership of their jobs, plan ahead their developmental goals during the performance planning cycle and more specifically strive for personal and professional growth. The recognition that effective development plan for each employee with an eye toward the department's future needs was needed was attributed to several factors, namely, adopting TQM as a participatory management system, the vital importance of employee buy-in to TQM and consequently use of participatory appraisal system as a way to enhance desirable individual and organizational performance outcome. Underlining the focus of performance management on the employee's development, the plant HR manager commented that:

> You cannot keep the right people at the right job forever and make them efficient if you do not engage and motivate them effectively. Good or even average employees will leave your organization if they cannot communicate or do not have the skills to voice their concerns about any personal or organizational issues that influence their performance. [Plant HR manager, 12 years' service, aged 51]

Overall, the rationale underlying the performance appraisal and incentive system at the enabling case study reinforced the TQM's notion of employee development and empowerment. That is, the emphasis was less on exercising control and achieving efficiency in the application of the workforce but the compelling idea of the development of the workforce and giving more weight instead to the importance of unleashing their knowledge and creativity and giving them a sense of purpose and a right to pride of workmanship. The analysis of the data collected from the enabling case organization is starkly indicative of (i) the paramount importance of human or social dimension of a TQM-driven performance management, (ii) recognizing the growing importance of performance management and appraisal as a joint management-employee communication activity that facilitates the implementation of TQMand in particular (iii) the limits to sole and mechanistic reliance upon end-product/service evaluation (poor process thinking or thinking along functional lines). To make the PA a value-added process and an integral part of the TQM mantra of "plan-do-check-act"

(Referred to as Deming's cycle or action plan) the case organization designed the PA in such a way that supported employee personal growth, development and involvement.

Causal attribution of performance variance

At the coercive case organizations, the analysis of the data revealed quite clearly that individual employees and associated person-level factors were known to be the most powerful determinants of product/services quality and overall organizational performance. This increased employee responsibility for quality and organizational performance were found to have two key aspects. Recognition and interpretation of variation in performance, and subsequent employee attitudes and behaviors towards quality and performance review. A predominant managerial priority was to give maximum weight to and attribute poor deficient performance to lower level employees. One of the senior managers made the point starkly, stating, "Our focus on individual achievement of employees as the prime source of performance reflects our commitment to management by objectives". The manager elaborated the point thus:

> We try to ensure that organizational goals are achieved and we also prepare to counteract any potential obstacles that our organization faces in achieving its long-term objectives. So what we do at top management level is to establish the organizational mission and strategic goals. We then seek the views of middle management and finally decide on the tactical goals that are to be assigned to individual employees…The whole system of performance management is designed in such a way to steer and monitor each employee's behavior toward the organization's mission. [Director of strategy and marketing, 13 years' service, aged 41]

The top-down approach to goal-setting and the assumption that quality products and service were a function of person factors carried several ramifications for both immediate supervisors and lower-level employees. On the one hand, line managers and supervisors at different hierarchical levels had a chance to devise job descriptions for lower-level employees that included individual responsibilities for deficient performance. Perhaps, most telling on this point are the remarks made by a middle manager:

> It is our prime responsibility to define those performance objectives and measures which ensure completion of the assigned tasks, goals, and objectives by lower-level employees. So our focus is on lower-level employees and the system has been designed to detect and prevent substandard and poor performance and hold them responsible for errors. [Audit assistant manager, 10 years' service, aged 38]

On the other hand, lower level employees talked about PA to be narrow in scope not least because it only represented the rigid and inflexible priorities of top management and that it was unreceptive to principles and values underpinning the adopted enterprise process improvement methods such as quality management. Data analysis suggested that the results-oriented performance review system resulted in far greater demotivation for the employees than continuous improvement of employee performance. The following example makes the ramifications of an over-emphasis on performance outcomes and attributing the lion's share of variations from the desired goals to individual employees succinctly clear:

> Of course we [lower-level employees] are not involved in the process of choosing goals and objectives. But when things go wrong we are held accountable for any deviation from the planned tactical and operational goals. [Workshop technician, 12 years' service, aged 32]

Hence, at coercive case organisations, managers did not seem to appreciate and were unwilling to distinguish common from local causes of performance variation. In contrast to the TQM's focus on appreciation of a system and understanding of variation (see Deming, 1986), there was an overemphasis on holding employees accountable for all types of operating problems and any deviation from management-defined desired outcome. In a similar vein, the preoccupation of the management with outputs and rating (as opposed to behaviour-based quality improvement process) as well as mistrust led them to believe that employees should be micromanaged and forced to complete their assigned tasks and punished for any mistakes without seeking to understand the root cause of performance variation. As a result, the organisational environment of the coercive cases rested on a workplace culture of blame in a sense that employees were unwilling to voice their concerns, find new ways of doing things or risk failure for fear of blame and ridicule. Out of insecurity and fear over noncompliance and of criticism and retribution, they were reluctant to admit and report failures. Instead, they preferred to only do the bare minimum, and were reluctant to put in extra time and efforts or take on extra responsibility for quality improvement and assure the long-term viability of the system.

In contrast, the stance taken by enabling case organisation was clearly more in tune with the principles underpinning systems-oriented, process-centred and data-driven improvement methods such as TQM. In this organisation, performance review system hinged on the twin objectives of assessing past achievements or failures and more importantly assisting the development of the individual as a primary concern of appraisal activities (see Ghorpade and Chen, 1995). Managers at different hierarchical levels and in particular first line supervisors were seeking to put relations with employees on a new footing – one which addressed both the institutional and employees' needs and

expectations. A considerable number of the managerial interviewees stated that they had shifted the focus away from forced, inflexible, top level goal-setting on the entire organisation to and eschewed the blame culture inherent in traditional performance review in favour of a system which engendered a person's individual influence or sense of control over their professional and personal development and that employees were highly engaged, motivated and prepared to excel and go the extra mile (see Storey, 1992, 2007). In designing a compatible performance management review with the underlying assumptions of continuous improvement initiatives and creating a no-blame culture, both managers and lower-level employees played a far more influential and decisive role. The following quotations illustrate this point:

> We know that human errors are inevitable. So our focus in performance management is less on outputs and outcomes. Instead, we trust our workforce and give them more freedom to find ways to avoid repeating errors. We define those behavioural standards that are consistent with a quality culture and are relatively under the employees' control. We train all of our managers at different hierarchical and functional areas to understand various causes of performance variation and focus on managerial and organisational deficiencies and failure of processes rather than failure of the workforce. [Plant quality manager, 19 years' service, aged 47]

> You cannot create a quality culture without making mistakes. For us quality is about learning from mistakes and avoiding repeating mistakes. We have been trained and empowered to take risk with openness and honesty and display behaviours that aim at quality improvement. At the same time we are not penalised for being honest about quality errors. In fact, reporting errors without punishment is a common practice in our organisation. Because things often go wrong. And when they do, the focus in our organisation is less on mistakes but more on improving processes. [Vehicle design engineer, 9 years' service, aged 36]

Our face–to-face interviews and informal discussions with lower-level employees revealed that they could exercise their capacity and empowerment at both functional and cross-functional levels to contribute to setting realistic and measurable goals in alignment with the mission statement. A majority of lower-level employees at different functional areas made a highly proactive contribution to goal setting and identifying metrics for achieving desired performance at operational and tactical levels – largely owing to receiving ample quality education and training in all aspects of their work and possessing a package of essential skills that encouraged and enabled them to couple skills training with real-time problem solving and feedback (Garvin, 1991, p. 92).

Overall, the instances referred to in the aforementioned quotations indicate that the notion of quality-driven performance appraisal had been taken up seriously by the case organisation and had informed practice. In alignment with the TQM's focus on process and learning orientations, non-managerial employees were empowered to take initiatives and make decisions. More specifically, they had the opportunity to exert influence and voice their concerns through the informal but frequent "management by siting around" conversations. Hence, at the enabling case organisation, employees appeared to have a measure of control over their work and were not held accountable for errors that lied largely with the managerial and organisational shortcomings. The essential nature of such TQM-driven approach to workforce performance management and empowering people to take risks and learn from mistakes at enabling case organisation echoes George Eliot's observation that "the strongest principle of growth lies in human choice" (see Karl, 1995). In a similar vein, hands-off managers of the enabling case organisation gave their employees more autonomy and trust by helping (rather than disciplining) them to develop and recognising that employees come to work to succeed (rather than intending to fail). While, at the enabling case, many of the elements of a TQM approach to performance management were present, the leading edge derived from a culture of no-blame, honesty and transparency. The prevalence of a no-blame culture at enabling case organisation placed emphasis less on outputs or rewarding or penalising employees in terms of results or even looking for culprit. Rather, it gave weight to effective error management, appreciation of various causes of performance failure, allowing employees to take risks and embrace failure within the management-defined guidelines, and encouraging employees to report their own as well as their co-workers' mistakes without fear of reprisal.

Discussion

The review of extant literature pertinent to performance management in quality-oriented organisations uncovered a gap in existing research in that there is a dearth of valid research to substantiate the claims of quality gurus and their advocates to ditch and abolish traditional yank-and-rank PA systems in favour of a quality-focused PA which helps the employees interject their ideas in an appraisal review and enable them to channel their extra efforts productively and deliver superior results (see Scholtes, 1993; Roberts, 2003; Ghorpade and Chen, 1995; Economist, 2016; Welch, 2013). While prior research has made substantial contributions to knowledge, there is still a dearth of empirical studies to robustly corroborate this inference. Indeed, the very few empirical research on the topic has been criticised on two fronts: methodological bias (the dominance of paper-and pencil measures) and a bias in favour of a manager-led PA (i.e. overrepresentation of organisational and managerial perspectives). In consequence, the existing research findings only provide a snapshot of the present or recent past and represent organisational and managerial

interests in performance management – thereby failing to provide information as to how PA could either drive or inhibit progress toward a continuous improvement culture from the perspectives of those who perform appraisal (i.e. managers) and those who are the main subject of appraisal (i.e. employees).

To address the (in)congruity between PA systems and principles underpinning enterprise process improvement methods expressed by Deming (1986) and like-minded scholars, a qualitative case study approach was adopted. Overall, our findings revealed that this state of affairs contrasts markedly with the way in which PA could unlock the continual improvement potential of TQM and unleash the inherent potential of the individuals. In the presence of a gross mismatch between PA and TQM, employees were inclined to voice their dissatisfaction with PA system design and administration (largely due to top-down and micromanager-led PA, explicit locus of blame on individuals, long-cycle appraisal and narrowly defined performance criteria limited to product/service excellence) and management frustration with undesirable TQM outcomes (owing to poor product/service quality and a considerable amount of waste, scrap and reworking, poor corporate performance). The mismatch between TQM and PA was most marked in coercive case organisations but the enabling case organisation was found to be 'most immune from the trend' (see Storey, 1992). Our findings are in concordance with Ghorpade and Chen (1995), Roberts (2003), DeNisi and Pritchard (2006), DeNisi and Murphy (2017), Chiang and Birtch (2010) and Adler et al., (2016) – among others – which delineated a number of compelling arguments against the conventional use of employee PA and suggested possible remedial measures to mitigate many of the dysfunctions of traditional PA systems. The conventional use of PA advocates a control-oriented approach to workforce performance management in that individual job requirements are carefully prescribed, labour is best thought of as a variable cost, management-workforce relationships typically have an adversarial (win-lose) tone, and employees view performance compensation to follow the rubric of "a fair day's pay for a fair day's work" (Walton, 1985, p. 4; Arthur, 1992, 1994). Such control-oriented approach to managing performance which encourage employees to gradually gravitate to the lowest common denominator behaviour characterised PA in the coercive cases. In contrast, PA in the enabling case organisation could be labelled as a commitment-oriented approach. Unlike the control-oriented approach which is inculcated in large part through "the wish to establish order, exercise control and achieve efficiency in the application of the workforce" (Walton, 1985, p. 4), the general thrust of commitment approach hinges on shared goal setting, pay for performance based on group achievement, individual contribution and equity, and cooperative/win-win management-workforce relationships (Arthur, 1992, 1994).

Theoretical implications

The characteristic features of the adopted types of appraisal system and other findings will now be summarised into a model with several associated research propositions. Figure 3 shows a model depicting two types of employee PA system in organisational environments which adopt a myriad of enterprise process improvement methods such as TQM and its derivatives. Based on the proposed model, the remainder of this article is dedicated to discussing the implications of the findings.

"INSERT FIGUIRE 3 ABOUT HERE"

The first implication of the study centres on the extent to which PA systems and the precepts underpinning TQM and its derivatives are congruent. In order to bring PA into sharper focus, several authors (e.g. Bernardin and Villanova, 1986; Bretz et al., 1992; Murphy and Cleveland, 1995) have suggested that it is of paramount importance to better understand the organisational context in which appraisal takes place – if PA research is to effectively inform PA practice. While there is no one standard formula in practice, a review of the extant literature pertinent to performance management and appraisal systems have emphasised on the need to create a balance between HRM and TQM approaches to PA (see Ghorpade and Chen, 1995; Prince, 1996; Wilkinson et al., 1998; Cardy, 1998). Drawing upon earlier studies of PA and TQM, more recent studies stress the importance of (line) management (rater) and employees (ratree) development and the need to follow up on training and development recommendations. For example, Dessler (2015) has argued that since TQM in its multitude of forms has the potential to assist employees to exceed the desired performance standards, managers are therefore required to go beyond the infrequent and narrowly focused task of PA (i.e. completion of the tasks or deliverables during the year). Rather, as he suggests, PA merely serves as the precursor to today's performance management and that follow up recommendations on job design, training and development as well as fair remuneration scheme should receive an equal impetus along with the traditional PA process in the new comprehensive and a much wider framework. In a similar vein, Roberts (2003, p. 89) stresses the importance of a participatory PA system as a platform to depart from using appraisal as managerial "theory X control device" (Deming, 1986) to a system which engenders a more human and an ethical HRM decision making process (see also Roberts, 1992; Murphy and Cleveland, 1995). Overall, four key elements express the essence of a quality-driven PA system: 'measuring employees' contributions to the organisation for further development of the individual, using customer appraisals in employee performance review, employee involvement in the modification of performance appraisal systems, and approaching performance appraisal as a QM improvement effort. As shown in our analysis of the data (with the exception of enabling case organisation), the nature and focus of PA did not seem to change as a result of TQM adoption. Hence a central implication of this study is that the

effectiveness of a contextually performance management system for an organisational context with a TQM orientation should be primarily judged based on the extent to which the expected synergistic effect of both TQM and PA will be realised. In formal terms:

> **Proposition 1.** The stronger the synergistic effect of TQM's focus on system and HRM's focus on individual, the greater the effectiveness of a TQM-focused PA.

Linked to the above is a contribution that centres on the importance of a culture of quality as a prerequisite for creating congruence between TQM and other management systems such as PA. As shown in the coercive cases, our findings point to a more complex and sophisticated picture of PA which could be characterised by the increased emphasis upon 'individual' and judgment based on inadequacies long past. This kind of post-mortems and after-action performance reviews (Edmondson, 2011) laid the base for a pervasive culture of blame in which lower level employees feared to acknowledge their limits and report failure as long as it did not cause immediate or obvious loss. Indeed the mere fact that employees talked about quality only in terms of compliance to or deviation from a prescribed process or practice served to reinforce the measurable hard technical processes of TQM (at the price of softer processes), encourage playing the blame game and victim mentality not least because failure, for whatsoever reason, connoted taking the blame. This in turn inoculated the employees and organisation as a whole "against a culture of psychological safety in which the rewards of learning from failure can be fully realised" (Edmondson, 2011, p. 2). The unfortunate consequence of a lack of 'true culture of quality' across the coercive cases was two-fold: (i) employee's reluctance to admit errors for fear of becoming scapegoat and tendency to report only successes to their line managers and (ii) managers' missed opportunities for enhancing the organisation's quality of learning (see Beer, 2003; Gambi et al., 2015). In sum, we propose that:

> **Proposition 2.** PA systems designed solely in terms of strict compliance to minimum task assignments will result in counterproductive work behaviours that compromise quality (e.g. production deviance).

In contrast, the enabling case organisation appeared to be successful in constructing and shaping a culture that measured up to the challenges of organisational, managerial and TQM vagaries. As our analysis of the data showed, the reality of TQM implementation reasonably matched its aspiration in this exceptional case. The adoption of TQM as a means to leverage a cultural shift stepped up in earnest in a two-fold way. First, the senior management team made a highly proactive and interventionary contribution to institutionalisation of TQM as the leadership's highest priority. "To walk the talk" on quality, the senior management team pursued a persistent and flexible approach to managing quality. While they ensured continual organisational commitment to TQM (e.g.

attendance at intensive quality courses, teaching tailor-made quality courses to lower-level employees), they stepped up their quality campaign through a heavy reliance on fact-based management and decision making and continual evaluation of their TQM efforts that evolved over time. Second, in order to cement the importance of quality in the minds of employees and elevate it above financial and efficiency goals, workers received real-time soft and technical skills training on an on demand and/or as needed basis, they were empowered to build self-managed teamwork, they could comfortably admit and report on quality violations and could challenge directives that detracted from quality. More specifically, 'quality performance' took centre-stage in employee PA (see Garvin, 1991; Ghorpade and Chen, 1995; Srinivasan and Kurey, 2014). In short, we propose that:

> **Proposition 3.** PA systems designed based on TQM practices will lead to employee workplace behaviours that focus on both person-level task attainment and system-level quality improvement.

This study also contributes insights into management fashion theory (Abrahamson and Fairchild, 1999). In this respect, David and Strang's (2006, p. 216) work, which lays stress on the importance of understating the fragile nature and vulnerability of management practices due to superficial template applications of TQM by uncommitted and incapable TQM providers (p. 231) is redolent with implications for our attempt here to understand the failure of organisations to ingrain TQM underlying practices into their performance management system. As they argue, "TQM's fashion boom drew in large numbers of generalist consultants and firms with weak links to TQM's technical roots, while in the fashion bust, TQM consulting swung back toward specialists and firms with expertise in quality control. In our study, support is found in coercive case organisations for their top-down, narrowly focused, procedure-dominated and consultant-led application in that enterprise process improvement methods such as TQM was oversold and adopted as a panacea for counteracting a wide range of organizational problems and in particular regaining lost considerable market share to Japanese automakers. As a result, a virtual alphabet soup of quality and productivity oriented initiatives descended into these organisations. However, the myriad of consultant-induced management practices seemed to operate quality separately and promote a piecemeal approach and 'flavour of the month' initiative which generally failed to go beyond statistical analysis of large volume processes and to hold sway for long. What tended to be missing from the admix of top-down and consultant-led TQM programmes to securing a true continuous improvement culture (see Srinivasan and Kurey, 2014) was the absence of a lucid, coherent, and meaningful managerial vision with respect to TQM or the launch of consultant-led/directive disparate initiatives to counteract specific operational inefficiencies of diffident operational units.

In contrast, while the continuous improvement initiatives such as TQM was also consultant-led in the enabling case organisation, their role appeared to change as quality improvement efforts became more mature over time. To enable TQM to occur and become institutionalized, the consultancy team placed a heavy focus on fulfilling both the required outcomes of TQM and assisting employees to develop "need to have" competencies demanded by the competitive auto industry. A pivotal device in forcing through the effective TQM changes was a heavy emphasis on a combined use of directive and non-directive consultancy approach which was pursued in multitude of ways throughout the process of planning and implementation of continuous improvement initiatives. In fact, the allowance for an admixture of expertise and process consultancy roles appeared to be appropriate in terms of assisting employees to enhance their knowledge, skills, and competence as a platform (i.e. learning orientation) to perform their assigned tasks and achieve the organizational goals (i.e. performance orientation). Moreover, the admix of participative and directive style of TQM management which was reported by both managers and lower-level employees were instrumental in closing the gap between rhetoric and reality of TQM not least because it involved both ongoing learning and continuous performance improvement elements. To this end, an effective employee performance management and appraisal had proved so crucial. Indeed, the need for a contextually appropriate performance management for TQM was accepted and operationalised as continuous improvement efforts evolved overtime. In a similar vein, the diffusion and adoption of both TQM and following changes to PA system had gradually taken root in the attitudes and working behaviour of managers and employees – owing to painstaking quality efforts which helped the employees to go "above and beyond" the rules and a system of performance management that satisfied the dual needs of employee development and organisational performance (see Srinivasan and Kurey, 2014). In short, we propose that:

> **Proposition 4:** PA systems designed to fulfil both learning and performance objectives will lead to synergistic gains from TQM, especially when the adoption of TQM is mediated by the admix of directive (top-down) and participative (bottom-up) styles of TQM management.

Managerial implications

Our findings provide several managerial implications for performance appraisal in TQM-focused organisations. Managers should be aware that the effectiveness of TQM programmes hinges largely on the ability of the organisation to make PA (and other management systems) compatible with TQM's core values. The nature and scope of TQM as an organisation-wide effort to infuse quality into every activity in an organisation suggests that managers should go beyond a mere tampering with the traditional past-oriented, -individual-based appraisal system and avoid symbolic changes to

PA prompted by concerns over rating accuracy. Instead, organisations need to alter the very foundations of the appraisal system through focusing on process and system-level issues (common causes of variation in performance) and measuring both the results and work processes – if TQM is to succeed and PA is to measure the worth of the individual's contribution in a fair and objective manner and encourage employee development. This requires organisations to undergo a paradigm shift particularly in the organisation's culture to create fit between PA (as well as other HRM activities) and TQM's core values. Contextualising PA systems in terms of when (appraisal as an going activity), why (the development of the individual employee), how (behavioural assessment of appraisal in terms of task performance and quality improvement behaviours) as well as judging employee performance based on absolute standards are deemed essential to accomplish the culture shift needed in quality-driven context. Our findings suggest that the coercive cases attributed quality problems and performance deviation to employees' personal dispositions. This is however an antithesis to the TQM's focus on process measurement and control as means of continuous improvement. Hence, managers are advised to differentiate between the common (system related faults out of employee's control) and special causes/local (faults and errors which are traceable directly to individual employees) of performance variation within systems. As our data indicates, employees across the coercive cases were judged based on their output – an indication of gross injustice to employees (see Deming, 1986). It is therefore of utmost importance for managers to fairly and accurately assess the work behaviour of employees through understanding the distinction between common and special causes of performance variation and shifting the locus of blame from primarily employees' personal weaknesses to systems- and organisational levels factors – if the management are to ensure a more highly motivated, engaged and productive workforce.

Limitations and suggestions for further research

Further extensions to this study could explore in details the emerging issues through adopting a mixed-methods research design (Teddlie and Tashakorri, 2009; Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011). Mixed methods research are desirable not least because the efficacy of organisation-wide change management interventions such as enterprise process improvement methods hinges of many soft and hard factors and that collecting reliable data on the impact of these factors necessitates the right method to be correctly applied. Since large-scale operational change (enterprise process improvement methods such as TQM) generally unfolds over time in different stages, a mixed-method approach could provide a more complete view of the research phenomenon by allowing a researcher to combine quantitative and qualitative methods to analyse data from a comparatively large sample of organisations across various economic sectors. In addition, investigating the congruence between TQM and PA in other organizations especially those with a high social

structure or performing mainly non-routine, low-volume tasks, may provide invaluable insights into relevant contingency factors. Finally, despite the optimistic view that the spread of enterprise process improvement methods such as TQM initiatives would encourage moves toward the use of system-driven, process-oriented PA, the evidence we have collected so far does not convincingly support this. Again, a contingency model – taking account, inter alia, of differences in technical and social structures between organisations – may provide a suitable theoretical framework to underpin future empirical research on this question.

Conclusion

Our study has helped to cast light on the (in)compatibility of PA systems with the precepts underpinning enterprise process improvement methods such as TQM. It adds to the knowledge about challenges and opportunities in the drive for creating a PA system that fits enterprise process improvement methods such as TQM. It concludes that it may be time to forego an exclusive reliance on an 'either-or' approach to the adoption of PA and TQM. Instead, the way forward is to go beyond the mere label, by laying stress on improving work systems, processes, and methods as all-consuming focus of a TQM-oriented PA system rather than individual employee per se.

References

Abrahamson, E. and Fairchild, G. (1999). Management fashion: Lifecycles, triggers, and collective learning processes. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44: 708 – 740.

Adler, P. and Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. Administrative Science Quarterly, 41(1), 61-89.

Adler, S., Hewitt, A., Campion, M., Colquitt, A., Lilly, E., Grubb, A., Murphy, K., Ollander-Krane, R. and Pulakos, E. (2016). Getting Rid of Performance Ratings: Genius or Folly? A Debate. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 9(2), pp 219–252.

Aguinis, H. (2013). Performance management (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Aguinis, H., & Pierce, C. A. (2008). Enhancing the relevance of organizational behavior by embracing performance management research. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29, 139–145.

AIAG (2013). Quality 2020: Automotive Industry's View on the Current State of Quality and a Strategic Path Forward. Retrieved: https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/us/Documents/manufacturing/us-manufacturing-quality-2020-report.pdf (29 October 2017).

AIAG (2017). Quality: IATF 16949:2016. Retrieved from: https://www.aiag.org/quality/iatf16949 (accessed 29 October 2017).

Antonacopoulou, E., Caulkin, S., Clarke, I., Delbridge, R., Hodgkinson, G. P., Huxham, C., Voss, C. and Wensley, R. (2010). Delivering the Promise of Management Practices. Advanced Institute of Management Research (AIM), London.

Arthur, J. B. (1994). Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. Academy of Management Journal, 37(3), 670-687.

Bach, B. (2000). From PA to performance management. In Bach S. and Sisson K. (Eds), Personnel Management: A Comprehensive Guide to Theory and Practice (3rd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Beer, M. (2003). Why total quality management programs do not persist: the role of management quality and implications for leading a TQM transformation. Decision Sciences, 34 (4), 623–642.

Bernardin, H. J., and Villanova, P. (1986). Performance appraisal. In Generalizing from Laboratory to Field Settings, edited by E. A. Locke. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books D.C. Heath and Company.

Boswell, W. R., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). Employee satisfaction with performance appraisals and appraisers: The role of perceived appraisal use. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 11(3), 283-299.

Bretz, R.D., Milkovich, G.T. and Read, W. (1992). The current state of PA research and practice: Concerns, Directions, and Implications. Journal of Management, 18: 2, 321-352.

Buckingham, M. and Goodall, A. (2015). Reinventing Performance Management. Harvard Business Review, April.

Cappelli, P. and Tavis, A. (2016). The Performance Management Revolution. Harvard Business Review, October.

Cardy, R. L. and Dobbins, G. H. (1994). PA: Alternative perspectives. Cincinnati, OH: South Western Publishing Company.

Cardy, R.L. (1998). PA in a quality context: A new look at an old problem. In Smither, J.W. (Ed.) PA: State of the Art in Practice, 133-161. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Chiang, F.F.T. and Birtch, T.A. (2010). Appraising performance across borders: and empirical examination of the purposes and practices of PA in a multi-country context. Journal of Management Studies, 47: 7, 1365-1393.

Chiles, T.H. and Choi, T.Y. (2000). Theorizing TQM: An Austrian and evolutionary economics interpretation. Journal of Management Studies, 37(2): 185–212.

Coens, T. and Jenkins, M. (2000). Abolishing PAs: Why they backfire and what to do instead. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. (2014). Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory. SAGE Publications.

Crosby, P.B. (1979). Quality is Free: The Art of Making Quality Certain. New York, NY: New American Library.

David, R.J., and Strang, D. (2006) When Fashion Is Fleeting: Transitory Collective Beliefs and the Dynamics of TQM Consulting, Academy of Management Journal, 49, 2, pp 215-233.

Deming, W.E. (1986). Out of the Crisis. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Centre for Advanced Engineering Study.

DeNisi, A. S. and Murphy, K. R. (2017). PA and Performance Management: 100 Years of Progress? Journal of Applied Psychology, 102(3):421-433.

Dessler, G. (2015). Human Resource Management (14th ed.). Pearson.

Dobbins, G.H., Cardy, R.L. and Carson, K.P. (1991), "Examining fundamental assumptions: a contrast of person and system approaches to human resources management", in Rowland,

K.N. and Ferris, G.R. (Eds), Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management, Vol. 9, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 1-38.

Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Strategies for Learning from Failure. Harvard Business Review, 89 (4).

EFQM (2017). The EFQM excellence model. Retrieved from: http://www.efqm.org/ (accessed 29 October 2017).

Eisenhardt, K. and Graebner, M. (2007). Theory Building from Cases: Opportunities and Challenges. Academy of Management Journal, 50: 1, 25-32.

Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. Academy of Management Review, 14 (4), pp. 532-550.

Fletcher, C. (2001). PA and management: The developing research agenda. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74: 473–487.

Garvin, D. A. (1991). How the Baldrige award really works. Harvard Business Review, 69(6), pp. 80-93.

Garvin, D.A. (1988). Managing quality: the strategic and competitive edge. EUA, New York: Harvard Business School.

Ghorpade, J. and Chen, M. M. (1995). Creating quality-driven PA systems. Academy of Management Executive, 9: 1, 32–40.

Giangreco, A., Carugati, A., Pilati, M. and Sebastiano, A. (2011). PA systems in the Middle East: Moving beyond Western logics. European Management Review, 7 (3), pp. 155–168.

Goler, L., Gale,J. and Grant, A. (2016). Let's Not Kill Performance Evaluations Yet: Facebook's experience shows why they can still be valuable. Harvard Business Review. November.

Gomez-Mejia, L.R., Balkin, D.B. and Cardy, R.L. (2004). Managing Human Resources. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Grote, D. (2011). How to be good at PAs: simple, effective, done right. Harvard Business Review Press.

Hackman J. R. and Wageman R. (1995). Total Quality Management: Empirical, conceptual, and practical issues. Administrative Science Quarterly, 40: 309-342.

Hart, C. and Schlesinger, L. (1991, "Total quality management and the human resource professional: applying the Baldrige framework to human resources", Human Resource Management, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 433-54.

Inman, R. R., Blumenfeld, D. E., Huang, N. and Li, J. (2003). Designing production systems for quality: research opportunities from an automotive industry perspective. International Journal of Production Research. 41 (9), pp. 1953-1971.

Iqbal, M. Z., Akbar, S. and Budhwar, P. (2015). Effectiveness of PA: An integrated framework. International Journal of Management Reviews, 17 (4), 510-533.

Jiang, K. F., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J. and Baer, J. C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. Academy of Management Journal, 55(6), 1264-1294.

Jiménez-Jiménez, D., Martínez-Costa, M. (2009). The performance effect of HRM and TQM: a study in Spanish organizations. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 29 (12), pp.1266-1289.

Johnson, L., & Shields, J. (2007). Lessons from management–union partnership in teacher PA in the New South Wales public education system. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18: 7, 1214–1227.

Karl, Frederick R. George Eliot: Voice of a Century. Norton, 1995. pp. 237–38.Kaynak, H. (2003) 'The relationship between total quality management practices and their effects on firm performance', Journal of operations management, 21, 405–435.

Kehoe, R. R., & Wright, P. M. (2013). The impact of high-performance human resource practices on employees' attitudes and behaviours. Journal of Management, 39(2), 366-391.

KPMG (2014). The UK Automotive Industry and the EU. Available [on line]: http://www.smmt.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/SMMT-KPMG-EU-Report.pdf

Kuvaas, B. (2008). An exploration of how the employee–organization relationship affects the linkage between perception of developmental human resource practices and employee outcomes. Journal of Management Studies, 45 (1):1-25.

Lam, S. S. K., & Schaubroeck, J. (1999). Total quality management and performance appraisal: An experimental study of process versus results and group versus individual approaches. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20(4), 445-457.

Latham G., Sulsky L. and Macdonald H. (2007). Performance Management. In Boxall P., Purcell J. and Wright P. (Eds), The Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lawler, E. E., III. 1986. High involvement management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2011). Qualitative communication research methods (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

McLaughlin, P. (2013). Manufacturing best practice and UK productivity. Future of Manufacturing Project: Evidence Paper 21 (Foresight, Government Office for Science, London.

Mohrman, A. M., Resnick-West, S. M., & Lawler, E. E., III. (1989). Designing performance appraisal systems: aligning appraisals and organizational realities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1991). Performance Appraisal: an Organizational Perspective". Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Nisen, M. (2015). Why GE had to kill its annual performance reviews after more than three decades. Available: http://qz.com/428813/ge-performance-review-strategy-shift/ (accessed 01 May 2016).

Oakland, J. S. (2014). Total Quality Management and Operational Excellence: Text with Cases (4th edn.). New Work: Routledge.

Organ, D. W. 1988. Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research & evaluation methods (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Porter, M. E. and Ketels, C. H. M. (2003). UK Competitiveness: moving to the next stage. DTI Economics Paper No 3, DTI, London.

Powell, T. C. (1995). Total quality management as competitive advantage: a review and empirical study. Strategic Management Journal, 16: 15-37.

Prince, J.B. (1996). Building PA systems consistent with TQM practices. In Knouse, S.B. (Ed.), Human Resources Management Perspectives on TQM, Concepts and Practices, 43–56. Milwaukee: ASQC Quality Press.

Redman, T. and Grieves, J. (1999), "Managing strategic change through QM: learning from failure", New Technology, Work and Employment, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 45-61.

Roberts, G.E. (2003). Employee PA system participation: a technique that works. Public Personnel Management, 32: 1, 89-97.

Scholtes, P.R. (1993). Total quality or performance appraisal: choose one. National Productivity Review, 12: 3, 349–363.

Schraeder, M., Becton, J. and Portis, R. (2007). A Critical examination of PAs: An organisation's friend or foe? The Journal for Quality and Participation, pp. 20-25.

Schuler, R.S. and Harris, D. (1992), Managing Quality: The Primer for Middle Managers, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

SMMT (2015). 2015 Automotive Sustainability Report (16th edition - 2014 data). Available on line: http://www.smmt.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/SMMT-16th-Sustainability-Report-final.pdf (accessed 21 May).

Srinivasan, A. and Kurey, B. (2014). Creating a Culture of Quality. Harvard Business Review. April.

Storey, J. (2007). Human Resource Management: A Critical Text (3rd ed.), London: Thomson Learning.

Voss, C. A. (2005). Paradigms of manufacturing strategy re-visited. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 25 (12), pp. 1223-1227.

Waldman, D.A. (1994). The contributions of total quality management to a theory of work performance. Academy of Management Review, 19 (3), 510-37.

Walton, R.E. (1985). From control to commitment in the workplace. Harvard Business Review (March-April): 77-84.

Weber, R.P. (1990). Basic Content Analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Wilkinson, A., Redman, T., Snape, E. and Marchington, M. (1998). Managing with Total Quality Management: Theory and Practice. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Yin, R. K. (2013). Case Study Research: Design and Methods (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage Publications.