



the Autonomous Management School of  
Ghent University and Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

**Vlerick Leuven Gent Working Paper Series 2009/23**

**LINKING EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM  
CHARACTERISTICS WITH PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM  
EFFECTIVENESS: EXPLORING THE MEDIATING ROLE OF FAIRNESS.**

KOEN DEWETTINCK

Koen.Dewettinck@vlerick.be

HANS VAN DIJK

**LINKING EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM  
CHARACTERISTICS WITH PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM  
EFFECTIVENESS: EXPLORING THE MEDIATING ROLE OF FAIRNESS.**

KOEN DEWETTINCK

Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School

HANS VAN DIJK

Tilburg University

**Contact:**

Koen Dewettinck

Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School

Tel: +32 09 210 97 40

Fax: +32 09 210 97 00

Email: [Koen.Dewettinck@vlerick.be](mailto:Koen.Dewettinck@vlerick.be)

## **ABSTRACT**

Based on expectancy theory, goal-setting theory and control theory we propose a model in which perceived fairness mediates the relationship between characteristics of employee performance management systems and their perceived effectiveness by employees. The model was tested on a sample of 3192 employees, using structural equation modelling. The findings advance research to the role and functionality of performance management systems by showing that (a) the manner in which performance management systems are shaped and executed is of fundamental importance for their effectiveness, (b) fairness partially mediates the relationship between performance management system characteristics and their effectiveness, and (c) the three motivational theories appear useful for understanding the consequences of performance management practices on individual employees.

**Keywords:** performance management, employee performance, fairness.

## INTRODUCTION

Performance management (PM), which refers to the measurement and management of employee performance aimed at increasing organizational effectiveness (Den Hartog, Boselie and Paauwe 2004), is an increasingly prevalent practice in organizations (Aguinis and Pierce 2008). Throughout the past decades single performance appraisal moments in which a line manager discusses the annual report of a subordinate's functioning have changed into subordinates receiving continuous feedback through PM systems, which consist of different elements that each account for a part of the PM process (Fletcher 2001; Levy and Williams 2004). Elements of PM systems typically involve a number of performance standards, methods to measure and evaluate performance based on those standards (i.e. performance appraisal), tools to improve performance (e.g., reward structures), and feedback (e.g., performance reviews) (Armstrong and Baron 2005).

PM research has traditionally examined the relationship between different PM systems and performance improvement, which is the ultimate purpose of PM systems (Levy and Williams 2004; Aguinis and Pierce 2008). Although research on effective configurations of PM systems is progressing (Pritchard, Harrell, DiazGranados and Guzman 2008), there still is much to learn about (a) which elements of PM systems are crucial for the effective management of performance (e.g., Latham, Almost, Mann and Moore 2005; DeNisi and Pritchard 2006) and (b) which factors affect the impact of PM systems on performance (Den Hartog et al. 2004; Dewettinck 2008). In this study we aim to reduce this knowledge gap by (a) examining the relationship between PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness and (b) by testing to what extent this relationship is mediated by the perceived fairness of the performance appraisal. Furthermore, this study answers a broader call for employee reactions in HRM and more specifically PM research (Den Hartog et al. 2004; Purcell and Hutchinson 2007). Since the relationship between PM systems and organizational performance is expected to be mediated by employee attitudes and behavior (Den Hartog et al. 2004), there is a clear need for studies that examine the individual perspective. Finally, we advance a theory-driven framework for the relationship between PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness. Scholars have scrutinized the lack of theoretical embeddedness of most PM research (e.g., Buchner 2007). Our study, however, is guided by three theories of motivation (i.e. expectancy theory, goal-setting theory and control theory) and offers insight in their applicability to the PM literature.

In the following section we discuss how expectancy theory, goal setting theory and control theory explain how PM affects employee performance improvement. Next, we advance hypotheses regarding the relationship between PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness. Subsequently we present the findings from our empirical study and discuss the theoretical and practical implications.

### **Performance management as a tool for performance improvement**

Scholars usually describe the PM *process* to explain how PM leads to performance improvement. For example, Den Hartog et al. (2004) argue that the practices related to PM affect the perceptions and attitudes of employees, which alter employee behavior, employee performance and ultimately organizational performance. Similarly, in their more specific model Purcell and Hutchinson (2007) link PM practices to the perception of those practices, which effect employee attitudes, employee behavior and employee outcomes. These models, however, do not clarify the underlying mechanisms that delineate *why* the specific elements of PM systems lead to performance improvement. DeNisi and Pritchard (2006) and Buchner (2007) therefore advocated more fundamental theoretical reflection in PM research and highlight expectancy theory (e.g., Pritchard et al. 2008), goal-setting theory (Locke, Shaw, Saari and Latham 1981) and control theory (Klein 1989) as promising and useful frameworks for understanding how PM can improve performance.

*Expectancy theory* is based on the assumption that individuals tend to allocate their limited amount of time and energy to actions of which they expect the consequences to maximize their satisfaction (DeNisi and Pritchard 2006). This happens through a series of stages (see Figure 1). First, the actions that individuals undertake create expectations about the results that their efforts will yield (i.e. the action-to-result connection). Second, based on the results that are produced expectations are created regarding how well the results will be evaluated (i.e. the result-to-evaluation connection). Third, the evaluation of the results is expected to lead to certain consequences or outcomes, for example receiving a bonus or promotion (i.e. the evaluation-to-outcome connection). Finally, these outcomes are expected to affect the level of satisfaction of the individual (the outcome-to-satisfaction connection).

---

Insert Figure 1 About Here

---

Based on this causal chain DeNisi and Pritchard (2006) argue that performance improvement can be achieved by managing performance in such a way that the link between each connection is optimized (cf. Pritchard et al. 2008). Expectancy theory provides a general explanation of the relationship between PM practices and performance improvement, while a more detailed explanation is given by goal setting theory and control theory. One question that has received less attention in studies rooted in expectancy theory is how the individual can know what results will lead to positive evaluations, i.e. how the result-to-evaluation connection can be optimized. Goal setting theory and control theory provide adequate explanations for this.

Goal setting theory (GST) was developed to explain how performance goals affect task performance and considers the content of performance goals as a determining factor in how well the task is executed. More specifically, goal specificity and goal difficulty are the central elements of goal setting theory that in particular have been found to positively affect performance (Locke et al. 1981; Donovan 2001). Goal specificity stimulates people to prioritize and focus, while goal difficulty forces people to exploit their knowledge and abilities to the maximum and stimulates them to consciously perform on the task at hand (Buchner 2007). Hence, whereas goal difficulty enhances the potential level of the performance evaluation and stimulates people to perform up to their maximum potential, goal specificity helps people to understand how they can achieve positive evaluations by explicating the criteria on which they will be evaluated.

Locke and Latham (2002) found, however, that the extent to which goals affect performance is moderated by the extent to which there is regular feedback regarding the congruence between the actual results and the result standards. To understand this we must turn to *control theory*, which is also referred to as feedback control and regards the process that reduces the difference between the observed consequences of actual actions and the result standards (Buchner 2007; Donovan 2001). According to control theory people continuously monitor their actions and the consequences of those actions (i.e. results) and compare them to standards or goals that have been set for those actions and results (i.e. result standards). When discrepancies emerge between actual results and their standards and these discrepancies yield negative effects, people will adjust their actions. The more frequently people are able to compare their results with the standards, the better they will be able to live up to that standard and, as a consequence, to yield positive evaluations (Donovan 2001).

Thus, based on control theory PM systems through which employees receive continuous feedback are expected to lead to superior performance as opposed to PM systems that for example provide employees with feedback only by their supervisor through an annual performance review. Moreover, based on control theory it deems preferable for employees to be empowered in such a way that they themselves are capable of assessing the level of discrepancy between results and result standards and of what adjustments are needed to resolve those discrepancies. Rather than providing information on the congruence between results and result standards, the main purpose of supervisory feedback from a control theory perspective is enabling individuals to self-regulate their actions according to the result standards. PM systems are therefore expected to increase performance when they enhance employees' self-regulating ability.

In summary, the relationship between PM practices and performance improvement is qualified by three motivational theories. Expectancy theory provides the more general framework, goal setting theory clarifies how the results-to-evaluations connection can be optimized, and control theory explicates how the action-to-results connection can be optimized. We now turn to the more specific relationship between PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness.

### **PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness**

PM systems consist of a range of activities, engaged in by an organisation to enhance the performance of a target person or group, with the ultimate purpose of improving organisational effectiveness (DeNisi 2000). Roberts (2003) identified several processes and activities that fit this definition including policy deployment, the use of performance appraisal systems, feedback and communication. PM system characteristics that we used to characterize these processes are the number and duration of formal performance reviews, the frequency of informal performance reviews, performance review focus, and the degree of participation in decision making. These elements do not only refer to how PM is formally designed in the organisation, but also regard the way that PM takes shape in daily practice.

### ***Formal performance reviews***

Formal performance reviews refer to the pre-scheduled face-to-face encounters between supervisor and subordinate with the purpose of discussing the subordinate's overall performance and/or development. The role and perceived importance of formal reviews has decreased over the years. While in the 1930s discussions were being held about introducing reviewing programs 'on a large scale or for any long period with the expectation that tangible results for that company will justify the expense and effort' (Ewing 1933, p. 114), after the 1970s the performance review hardly received any attention from the research community (Fletcher 2001). A noteworthy exception is the work of Kikoski (e.g., Kikoski 1999), who argued that the huge amount of work on the means to appraise performance contradicts the neglecting of the delivery of performance appraisal – i.e. the performance review. Because it is in the formal review that employees hear about how the actual results relate to the result standards and about how the results are evaluated, Kikoski and Litterer refer to the performance review as 'the Achilles' heel of the entire process' (1983, p. 33). As control theory denotes that the congruence between result standards and actual results are easier to provide and to understand over a short time than over a longer period, we expect PM system effectiveness to increase with more frequent formal performance appraisals.

*Hypothesis 1a: The frequency of formal performance reviews is positively related to PM system effectiveness.*

In addition, given that understanding evaluations and discussing how to adjust actions to the normative standards takes time, we expect PM system effectiveness to increase with an increased duration of formal performance reviews.

*Hypothesis 1b: The duration of formal performance reviews are positively related to PM system effectiveness.*



### ***Informal performance reviews***

Informal performance reviews refer to unscheduled face-to-face encounters between supervisor and subordinate in which explicitly or more implicitly the subordinate's performance and/or development is discussed. Although PM systems generally do not explicitly refer to informal performance reviews, there is often a notion of the importance to stay in touch with the employee and meet them frequently. One reason for this is that – in contrast to the formal performance reviews - regular interactions provide the opportunity to offer the employee specific, behavioural and timely feedback (Roberts 2003). Hence, where formal performance reviews help the employee to understand the process and the outcome of performance appraisal, informal performance reviews help the employee to live up to the criteria of the performance appraisal system. In other words, while formal performance reviews effect performance improvement through mechanisms described by control theory (i.e. increased insight in discrepancies between result standards and actual results), informal performance reviews enhance performance through a combination of mechanisms as described by goal-setting theory (i.e. enhanced understanding of goal specificity) and control theory (increased insight in discrepancies between result standards and actual results). We therefore expect informal performance reviews to be positively related to PM system effectiveness.

*Hypothesis 2: The frequency of informal performance reviews is positively related to PM system effectiveness.*

### ***Performance review focus***

Next to the frequency and duration of the performance reviews, we also expect the content or focus of the performance reviews to impact PM system effectiveness. As the performance reviews are the HRM delivery moments to the employees, the content of the performance reviews is likely to be determined by the HRM approach within an organization. Researchers have discussed different approaches to HRM (soft versus hard; Guest 1987), different performance appraisal purposes (development versus evaluation; Jawahar and Williams 1997) and different PM purposes (development versus result oriented; Dewettinck 2008), which all reflect the more theoretical discussion on whether the focus in HRM should be placed on the *human* or the *resource* (Truss et al. 1997).

The first regards intrinsic motivation as the key to unlocking human potential and emphasizes that behaviour is primarily self-regulated. In this perspective organizations are expected to create competitive advantage in particular by empowering their employees. In contrast, the more resource-based view on employees tends to regard 'human resources' as a production factor that needs to be directed towards the strategic business objectives and that should be controlled by sanctions and pressures (Dewettinck 2008; Truss et al. 1997).

For our purposes this distinction is highly relevant because the difference between the two approaches can also be understood by contrasting the perspectives of control theory on the one hand and goal-setting theory and expectancy theory on the other. As the development-oriented approach stresses the importance of employee self-regulation, it shares with control theory the assumption that employees will autonomously adjust their actions when they are confronted with dissimilarities between the results of their actions and the results standards. With its emphasis on intrinsic motivation the role of supervisory evaluation and feedback in the development-oriented approach is therefore important less in terms of outcomes but rather for enhancing the employee's ability to autonomously monitor, evaluate and adjust his or her actions. In contrast, with its focus on aligning employees with the business objectives the evaluation-based approach resembles the belief of goal-setting theory that clear, specific and challenging goals are needed to steer employees in the right direction and that they need to be evaluated by supervisors. Moreover, the use of pressures and sanctions reveals the more extrinsic understanding of motivation in the evaluation-based approach that stands somewhat opposite to the more intrinsic understanding of motivation in the development-oriented approach. Whereas the development-oriented approach is thus more concerned with the actions-to-results connection, the evaluation-based approach focuses more on the results-to-evaluations-to-outcomes connection. This suggests that in practice these approaches can be combined when they are applied in the compatible phases, and empirical research has indeed found combinations of these two approaches in practice (e.g., Truss et al. 1997). However, research has also found significant differences in the performance appraisal and management purpose across organizations (Dewettinck 2008; Jawahar and Williams 1997; Milliman et al. 2002; Rao 2009), which indicates that most organizations generally focus more on one of the two approaches.

Since the optimization of the results-to-evaluation connection can largely be accomplished by goal setting but the action-to-results connection has many contingencies and is much more dependent on the motivation of the employee (van Knippenberg 2000), we hypothesize PM systems to be more effective when their focus is developmental rather than evaluational. This is also in line with recent findings of a study among 319 HR-practitioners to the relationship between PM system purpose and PM system effectiveness, which showed that strong development-oriented PM systems were more effective in increasing employee motivation than strong performance-oriented PM systems (Dewettinck 2008). We thus hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 3: Performance reviews that focus more on employee development are associated with higher levels of PM system effectiveness than performance reviews that focus predominantly on performance evaluation.*

### ***Employee participation***

Employee participation on issues that are of importance to them is regarded as an important contributor to employee attitudes and performance (Pritchard et al. 2008). Cawley, Keeping and Levy (1998) found in their meta-analysis that performance appraisal participation is strongly related to, among others, employee appraisal acceptance and appraisal satisfaction. These findings are easily understood in light of goal-setting theory. Participation in goal setting has been associated with increased goal understanding (Erez, Earley and Hulin 1985), increased goal acceptance (Locke 1968; Erez and Kafer 1983), increased commitment to the goal (Lawler and Hackman 1969) and more ambitious goal setting (Latham and Saari 1979). In turn, all these reactions are related to increased task performance (Erez et al. 1985), thereby linking employee participation in goal-setting to PM system effectiveness (cf. Kleingeld, van Tuijl and Algera 2004).

In their review Levy and Williams (2004) emphasize the positive effects of employee participation on employee motivation and call for more empirical research to its consequences. Based on control theory we expect that employee participation enhances employee performance because it increases employees' feelings of self-efficacy (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades and Drasgow 2000).

When employees feel that their information and input is asked and used, the discussions between employees and managers lead to an increased understanding of the job, less resistance to change, and an increased sense of control (Kleingeld et al. 2004). These are essential attitudes for the self-regulating ability of employees that enables them to autonomously control the gap between actual results and result standards.

Hence, both goal-setting theory and control theory provide explanations for the positive impact of employee participation on employee performance. We therefore hypothesize that employee participation enhances PM system effectiveness.

*Hypothesis 4: The level of employee participation is positively related to the level of PM system effectiveness.*

### ***The mediating role of evaluation fairness***

Fairness has recently received a significant amount of attention in performance appraisal research (Lau, Wong and Eggleton 2008; Narcisse and Harcourt 2008; Steensma and Visser 2007; see also Folger, Konovsky and Cropanzano 1992). Fairness was found to be particularly important for enhancing employee understanding about the connection between results and evaluations (i.e. the appraisal process) and between evaluations and outcomes (i.e. the reward process). As it are ultimately employee reactions to the appraisal and reward processes that determine to what extent employees are motivated to improve their performance (DeNisi and Pritchard 2006; Levy and Williams 2004), employee perceptions of fairness are essential for the effectiveness of PM systems. Regarded as such, fairness functions as a mediator of the relationship between PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness. While PM can directly enhance performance by the processes described earlier, PM can stimulate performance more indirectly as well by improving perceptions of fairness, which in turn is positively related to performance improvement.

In a qualitative study among employees representing different hierarchical levels of a public service company, Narcisse and Harcourt (2008) identified (a) the congruence between actual performance and appraisal rating (i.e. the results-to-evaluations connection) and (b) the extent to which appraisal rating resulted in compatible outcomes like pay or promotion (i.e. the evaluation-to-outcome connection) as the main determinants of perceptions of fairness. For evaluations to be perceived as fair, it is thus necessary that both the action-to-results connection and the results-to-evaluations connection are optimized.

As all characteristics of PM systems discussed above are expected to optimize either the connection between actions and results and/or the connection between results and evaluations (cf. DeNisi and Pritchard 2006), we expect all those characteristics of PM systems to positively effect perceptions of evaluation fairness, which in turn is expected to be positively related to PM system effectiveness.

*Hypothesis 5a: The frequency of formal performance reviews, the duration of formal performance reviews, the frequency of informal performance reviews, performance review focus, and the perceived level of involvement in PM are all positively related to the level of perceived evaluation fairness.*

*Hypothesis 5b: Perceived evaluation fairness is positively related to PM system effectiveness.*

*Hypothesis 5c: Perceived evaluation fairness mediates the relationships between the number of formal performance reviews, the duration of formal performance reviews, the frequency of informal performance reviews, performance review focus, and the perceived level of involvement in PM and PM system effectiveness.*

## **METHOD**

### **Sample**

Data was gathered from 3.192 Belgian employees who filled out a web-based survey that was published on the website of a well-known weekly free job advertising magazine.

---

Insert Table 1 About Here

---

Table 1 shows the characteristics and background of the respondents and the organizations the respondents are employed at. The most notable employee sample characteristics are a balanced split in terms of gender and considerable variety in age, educational level, functional experience and seniority. We also note that about 85 % of the sample consists of clerical, professional and middle management employees. Looking at the organizations the respondents are employed at, we see a fairly balanced distribution in terms of company size. 69 % of the employees are from private organizations, of which 33 % are listed on the stock market. Finally, we also asked about the age and gender of the supervisors of our sample respondents. The table indicates that 73 % of the supervisors were male and that 21 % of the respondents had a supervisor who is younger than 36 years old, 22 % had a supervisor between 36 and 40 years old, 36 % between 41 and 50 and 22 % indicated to have a supervisor who is aged over 50.

In the following, we first report on how we operationalized our independent variables (i.e. PM system characteristics), the mediator variable (i.e. fairness) and the dependent variable (PM system effectiveness). Subsequently we explain how we analyzed the data and tested our hypotheses.

### *Measures*

*Formal performance reviews.* The number of formal performance reviews was measured by the open-ended question ‘How often have you discussed your performance with a person from your organisation that was ordered by your organisation? (e.g., appraisal/development/evaluation review)’. The duration of formal performance reviews was assessed by the open-ended question ‘What was the average duration of those reviews?’

*Informal performance reviews.* The frequency of informal performance reviews was measured by the question ‘How often have you discussed your performance with a superior in an informal manner (for example, after departmental meetings with your supervisor, during a move, during an informal lunch or drink, your supervisor who unplanned drops by at your desk, ...)’ on a nine-point Likert scale ranging from daily to once per year.

*Employee participation.* Employee participation was measured by Arnold et al’s (2000) five items of participative decision making on a five-point Likert scale ranging from absolutely disagree to absolutely agree (e.g. my supervisor encourages work group members to express ideas/suggestions) and had an internal reliability of .93 (Cronbach’s *a*).

*Performance review focus.* Performance review focus was measured by two five-point scales that assess the focus of performance reviews from one focal point to another (during the (appraisal) reviews with my supervisor, the focus is on (1) results/development; (2) what I must do/how I do my work(Dewettinck 2008) and had an internal reliability of .63 (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ).

*Perceived fairness.* Perceived fairness was measured by two items on a 5-point scale assessing evaluation fairness (e.g. up till now my performance has been evaluated fairly). The two items of evaluation fairness had an internal reliability of .90 (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ).

*PM system effectiveness.* As the formal and informal performance reviews are the delivery moments of the PM process, we assume their motivational effect to function as a proxy for PM system effectiveness. Based on Dewettinck's (2008) indicator of PM system effectiveness, nine 5-point scale items were used to assess PM system effectiveness (see Appendix 1). The ten items had an internal reliability of .93 (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ).

### ***Analyses***

Measurement properties were assessed by examining the factor structure underlying the items and the correlations between constructs. The hypotheses were simultaneously tested in a structural model, using maximum likelihood estimation in AMOS (Arbuckle and Wothke 1999). Frequency of formal and informal performance reviews and duration of the formal performance reviews were inserted into the model as single indicators. The other constructs in the model (focus, participation, fairness and effectiveness) were represented by latent constructs with each of the variables as indicators (ranging from two indicators for fairness to 9 indicators for PM system effectiveness). Using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) has several advantages. First, it provides a systematic basis for evaluating the 'fit' of the hypothesized model to data based on a  $\chi^2$ -statistic, incremental fit indices (e.g. non-normed fit index, comparative fit index) and other indicators of absolute fit including Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (MacCallum and Austin 2000). Second, it provides control over measurement error that can constitute over 50 percent of the observed variance and that often introduces substantial bias in estimated effects and hypothesis testing (Ping 2001).

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), a variable functions as a mediator when it meets the following conditions: (a) variations in levels of the independent variable significantly account for variations in the presumed mediator, (b) variations in the mediator significantly account for variations in the dependent variable, and (c) when controlling for the relationships between the independent variable and the mediator and for the relationship between the mediator and the dependent variable, a previously significant relation between the independent and dependent variables is no longer significant, with the strongest demonstration of mediation occurring when this path is zero (Baron and Kenny 1986, p. 1176). They further propose that, to test for mediation, one should estimate the three following regression equations: first, regressing the mediator on the independent variable; second, regressing the dependent variable on the independent variable; and third, regressing the dependent variable on both the independent variable and on the mediator. Separate coefficients for each equation should be estimated and tested (Baron and Kenny 1986, p. 1177). We followed their recommendations in our analyses and tested two structural models: one with only the direct effects between the characteristics of PM systems on PM system effectiveness and one model in which indirect effects through evaluation fairness were also specified.

## **RESULTS**

Table 2 reports the mean scores, standard deviations and correlations between the key constructs and control variables in our model. Table 3 shows the underlying factor structure of the latent constructs in our model. Although some of the correlations between key constructs are significant, the exploratory factor analysis indicates a clear factor structure. The four factors together explain 73 % of the variance in the data.

---

Insert Table 2 and 3 About Here

---



### *Direct effects model*

To test hypotheses 1-4 in accordance with Baron and Kenny's (1986) procedure to test mediating effects, we first assessed a structural model with direct relationships between PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness. The regression weights, standard errors and model fit statistics are presented in Table 4.

---

Insert Table 4 About Here

---

In terms of overall fit, Table 4 reveals the following fit statistics:  $\chi^2 = 2166.32$ ,  $df = 198$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $GFI = .94$ ,  $NNFI = .94$ ,  $CFI = .95$ ,  $RMSEA = 0.056$  (90% CI = 0.054 to 0.058). Despite the significant chi-square that indicates a lack of fit, the relative fit indicators exceed .90 and the absolute fit indicators suggest that the residuals are acceptable ( $< .07$ ) and tightly distributed (cf. 90 % confidence interval of  $RMSEA = 0.054$  to  $0.058$ ). Consistent with this, the parsimony fit indicator, NNFI, exceeds .90, indicating that the model has adequate over-identifying restrictions for parsimony. Based on these statistics and the fact that the chi-square statistic easily obtains significance when sample size is large, we conclude that the direct effects model provides an adequate fit to the data.

Table 4 further shows a small but significant positive effect between the number of formal performance reviews and PM system effectiveness ( $B = .05$ ,  $p < .01$ ), thus confirming hypothesis 1a. We also found a positive relationship between duration of formal performance reviews and PM system effectiveness ( $B = .03$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Thus, Hypothesis 1b is also confirmed. In line with Hypothesis 2, we found that the frequency of informal performance reviews was positively related to PM system effectiveness ( $B = .09$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Performance reviews that focus more on employee development were associated with higher levels of PM system effectiveness than performance reviews that focus more on performance evaluations ( $B = .25$ ,  $p < .01$ ), thereby confirming hypothesis 3. Finally, we found a positive relationship between the level of participation and PM system effectiveness ( $B = .47$ ,  $p < .01$ ), providing strong support for Hypothesis 4.

### *Mediation model*

The results of the mediation model that we used to examine if fairness functions as a mediator in the relationship between PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness are presented in Table 5. The fit statistics ( $\chi^2 = 2\,315.13$ ,  $df = 232$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $GFI = .94$ ,  $NNFI = .94$ ,  $CFI = .95$ ,  $RMSEA = 0.053$  (90% CI = 0.051 to 0.055)) indicate that the model provides an adequate-to-good fit to the data. In line with Hypothesis 5a the regression weights indicate that all PM system characteristics are positively related to evaluation fairness. Small effect sizes were found for the number of formal performance reviews ( $B = .04$ ,  $p < .01$ ), the length of formal performance reviews ( $B = .04$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and the frequency of informal performance reviews ( $B = .07$ ,  $p < .01$ ) on evaluation fairness. Large effect sizes were found for PM focus ( $B = .21$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and participation ( $B = .48$ ,  $p < .01$ ) on evaluation fairness. Furthermore, the regression weights showed that evaluation fairness is positively related to PM system effectiveness ( $B = .44$ ,  $p < .01$ ), thereby lending support to Hypothesis 5b.

The finding that all independent variables are positively related to the mediator variable and that the mediator variable is positively related to the independent variable indicate that the relationship between PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness is mediated by evaluation fairness. However, the direct relationship between the independent and the dependent variable in the mediation model needs to be taken into account as well in order to know if it is a full mediating effect (when relationships between the PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness that were significant in the direct effects model are no longer significant in the mediation model) or a partial mediating effect (when the significance of relationships between the PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness has decreased but remained significant). Table 5 shows that the direct relationships between the number of formal performance reviews ( $B = .03$ ,  $p < .01$ ), PM system focus ( $B = .16$ ,  $p < .01$ ), participation ( $B = .26$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and PM system effectiveness in the mediation model are still significant, which rules out the option of a full mediating effect.

However, as all effect sizes of the relationship between these PM system characteristics and PM system effectiveness in the mediation model are smaller than the effect sizes regarding the same relationships in the direct effects model (with effect size differences varying from  $\Delta B = .02$  for the relationship between the number of formal performance reviews and PM system effectiveness to  $\Delta B = .21$  for participation), our results indicate that evaluation fairness partially mediates the relationship between the number of formal performance reviews, the frequency of informal performance reviews, PM system focus, and participation and PM system effectiveness, thereby partially supporting Hypothesis 5c. Finally, Table 6 shows that the mediation model provides a better fit to the data than the direct effects model.

---

Insert Table 6 About Here

---

## **DISCUSSION**

The current cross-functional study among 3 192 employees of Belgian organizations advances our understanding of the relationship between PM systems and their effectiveness in two ways. First, we build on empirical evidence that shows that PM practices enhance individual performance, but in such a way that it is clear what the contribution of each individual PM practice is. PM and – more general – HRM research to the effectiveness or consequences of different HRM systems has relied mainly on composite measures of HRM practices (cf. Pritchard et al. 2008). Recently some authors (Wall and Wood 2005; Paauwe 2009) have argued that such a systems approach falls short in verifying the added value of individual practices. Our finding that performance review focus and employee participation strongly relate to perceptions of evaluation fairness and PM system effectiveness and that the frequency of informal performance reviews is more strongly related to PM system effectiveness than the frequency of formal performance reviews suggests that the manifest expressions of PM have more impact on PM system effectiveness rather than the more latent characteristics of PM systems. Phrased differently, our results indicate that perceptions of evaluation fairness and PM system effectiveness are much more effected by the more informal aspects of PM systems than by the more formal and structural elements.

As these more informal aspects are shaped by the deliverer of the PM system (i.e. the supervisor or manager), these results lend credence to the model of Den Hartog et al. (2004) who proposed that front-line managers mediate the effects of PM practices on employee perceptions and attitudes. Furthermore, it provides further support for Kikoski's (1999) argument that performance reviews are the delivery moments of PM.

Second, with its embeddedness in expectancy, goal-setting and control theory this study progresses our theoretical understanding of the dynamics underlying the relationship between characteristics of PM systems and PM system effectiveness. A general critique of much PM research – but also of HRM research – is the lack of grounded theory and theory development (DeNisi and Pritchard 2006; Buchner 2007). Our study provided indirect evidence of the applicability of the three aforementioned theories of motivation to PM research.

Before we turn to our suggestions for further research and to the managerial implications of our findings, we will discuss the limitations of this study.

### ***Study limitations***

We used a cross-sectional, single-source research design. This enabled us to investigate employee perceptions of PM system characteristics and effectiveness on a large scale, across organizations and industries and thus made it possible for us to build on and to advance the current state of academic research on PM. Such a design has however also limitations. First, although we build on theoretical insights that suggest causality, longitudinal designs are needed for an empirical assessment of the proposed causal relationships. Secondly, common method variance may have biased the validity of the structural relationships, although the anonymous and independent nature of the survey reduces the risk on such bias as compared to a survey that is promoted by and offered in the organization where the respondents are employed (Spector 2006). PM system effectiveness could have been assessed by HR or line managers (and possibly even by quantifiable data) instead of by employees themselves, but our aim was to assess the impact of the PM delivery moments, which, we believe, should be assessed by employees. Furthermore this design offered the possibility to cover many different types of workers and PM practices, thereby enhancing the generalizability of the findings.

Finally, we took a narrow approach to fairness by focusing solely on evaluation fairness because conceptually it could be clearly and directly linked to our model. A study of Narcisse and Harcourt (2008) identified what we coined evaluation fairness together with outcome fairness (i.e. the extent to which evaluations yield compatible outcomes) as the main determinants of employee perceptions of fairness in PM. Future research is needed to investigate how these two types of fairness are related to the more general and established measures of procedural, interactive and distributive justice (see e.g. Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland 2007).

### ***Theory development and avenues for further research into PM***

In this study, three theories on employee motivation showed to be useful in developing specific hypotheses and gaining a better understanding into PM system effectiveness. Expectancy theory provided solid ground to introduce and explore the mediating role of fairness perceptions to link PM practices and PM system effectiveness. Goal-setting theory enabled us to link informal aspects of PM systems (such as the frequency of informal reviews and participation) to PM system effectiveness. Finally, control theory provided a rationale for the hypotheses on the relative importance of informal versus formal PM reviews and for the relevance of PM review focus to better understand the drivers of PM system effectiveness. The applicability of these theories for the conceptual part of our study suggests their usefulness to develop more specific and relevant hypotheses in order to further enhance our understanding of PM dynamics in organizations. One specific suggestion relates to the possible useful role of expectancy theory for further theorizing in linking PM to reward management. We believe that insights into evaluation to outcome linkages could be a useful starting point.

Our study also advances PM theory by delineating the mediating role of fairness in the relationship between PM practices and PM system effectiveness. This opens up opportunities for further examinations into how the broader concept of justice affects the relationship between PM practices and PM system effectiveness.

Finally, as our sample mainly consisted of clerical, professional and middle management employees, generalization of our findings requires other empirical studies involving different target samples. Furthering our insights into PM dynamics for higher level managers seems a very useful avenue in this respect.

### ***Managerial implications***

This study also has some noteworthy implications for PM in practice. First, our findings indicate that PM system effectiveness can be improved by raising the frequency of formal and informal performance reviews and by fostering employee participation into PM. Part of the reason for this is that more frequent PM reviews and stronger employee participation tend to lead to a higher perceived fairness. Also, our study suggests that emphasizing the developmental side of PM will increase its effectiveness in terms of improving employee performance. This is an important finding as several studies confirm that the result-oriented side of PM rather than the developmental side tends to be emphasized in daily PM practice. Recent studies (Dewettinck 2008; Rao 2009) indicate that organisations and managers still predominantly perceive the primary purpose of the PM process to be performance evaluation and control rather than employee development.

More generally, our study confirms the crucial role of line management in shaping PM within the organization. Thus debates on how to change formal characteristics of PM systems should be complemented with discussions on how to maximally involve and support line management into PM activities. Questions on how to create buy-in from line management are difficult to answer, but for sure are key in developing PM systems that maximally improve performance at the employee and organizational level.

### ***Conclusion***

Three major conclusions can be drawn from this study. First, expectancy theory, goal-setting theory and control theory have been found useful for understanding the relationship between PM practices and PM system effectiveness. Second, the manner in which PM practices are shaped and executed appear to be especially important for PM system effectiveness, which implies that the role of the line manager is crucial for effective PM. Third, fairness has been identified as a partial mediator of the relationship between PM practices and PM system effectiveness. While some of these findings provide rather straightforward implications for practitioners wishing to improve their PM system, other findings reveal a clear need for further research into this important and intriguing HR field.

## REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H. and Pierce, C.A. (2008) 'Enhancing the Relevance of Organizational Behavior by Embracing Performance Management Research', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29:139-45.
- Arnold, J.A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J.A. and Drasgow, F. (2000) 'The Empowering Leadership Questionnaire: The Construction and Validation of a New Scale for Measuring Leader Behaviors', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21:249-269.
- Armstrong, M. and Baron, A. (2005) *Handbook of Strategic HRM*. Mumbai: Jaico Publishing House.
- Buchner, T.W. (2007) 'Performance Management Theory: A Look from the Performer's Perspective with Implications for HRD', *Human Resource Development International*, 10:59-73.
- Cawley, B.D., Keeping, L.M. and Levy, P.E. (1998) 'Participation in the Performance Appraisal Process and Employee Reactions: A Meta-Analytic Review of Field Investigation', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83:615-633.
- Cleveland, J.N., Murphy, K.R. and Williams, R.E. (1989) 'Multiple Uses of Performance-Appraisal – Prevalence and Correlates', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74:130-35.
- Den Hartog, D.N., Boselie, P. and Paauwe, J. (2004) 'Performance Management: A Model and Research Agenda', *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53:556-569.
- DeNisi, A.S. and Pritchard, R.D. (2006) 'Performance Appraisal, Performance Management and Improving Individual Performance: A Motivational Framework', *Management and Organization Review*, 2:253-77.
- Dewettinck, K. (2008) 'Employee Performance Management Systems in Belgian Organisations: Purpose, Contextual Dependence and Effectiveness', *European Journal of International Management*, 2:192-207.
- Donovan, J.J. (2001) 'Work Motivation', in: N. Anderson, D. Ones, H. Sinangil and C. Viswesvaran (Eds.) *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology. Volume 2*, 53-76. London: Sage.

- Erez, M., Earley, P.C. and Hulin, C.I. (1985) 'The Impact of Participation on Goal Acceptance and Performance: A Two-step Model', *Academy of Management Journal*, 28:50-66.
- Erez, M. and Kanfer, F.H. (1983) 'The Role of Goal Acceptance in Goal Setting and Task Performance', *Academy of Management Review*, 8:454-63.
- Ewing, D.H. (1933) 'Employee-Attitude Interviews as Tools of Personnel Management', *Harvard Business Review*, 106-115.
- Fletcher, C. (2001) 'Performance Appraisal and Management: The Developing Research Agenda', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74:473-487.
- Folger, R., Konovsky, M.A. and Cropanzano, R. (1992) 'A Due Process Metaphor for Performance Appraisal', *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 14:129-77.
- Guest, D. (1987) 'Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations', *Journal of Management Studies*, 24:503-21.
- Jaffee, D. (2000) *Organizational Theory: Tension and Change*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Jawahar, I.M. and Williams, C.R. (1997) 'Where all the Children are Above Average: The Performance Appraisal Purpose Effect', *Personnel Psychology*, 50:905-25.
- Kikoski, J.F. (1999) 'Effective Communication in the Performance Appraisal Interview: Face-to-face Communication for Public Managers in the Culturally Diverse Workplace', *Public Personnel Management*, 28:301-22.
- Kikoski, J.F. and Litterer, J.A. (1983) 'Effective Communication in the Performance Appraisal Interview', *Public Personnel Management*, 22:33-42.
- Klein, H.J. (1989) 'An Integrated Control Theory Model of Work Motivation', *Academy of Management Review*, 14:150-72.
- Kleingld, A., van Tuijl, H. and Algera, J.A. (2004) 'Participation in the Design of Performance Management Systems: A Quasi-Experimental Field Study', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25:831-51.



- Kuvaas, B. (2006) 'Performance Appraisal Satisfaction and Employee Outcomes: Mediating and Moderating Roles of Work Motivation', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17:504-22.
- Latham, G.P., Almost, J., Mann, S. and Moore, C. (2005) 'New Developments in Performance Management', *Organizational Dynamics*, 34:77-87.
- Latham, G.P. and Saari, L.M. (1979) 'The Effects of Holding Goal Difficulty Constant on Assigned and Participatively Set Goals', *Academy of Management Journal*, 22:163-168.
- Latham, G.P. and Steele, T.P. (1983) 'The Motivational Effects of Participation Versus Goal Setting on Performance', *Academy of Management Journal*, 26:406-417.
- Lau, C.M., Wong, K.M. and Eggleton, I.R.C. (2008) 'Fairness of Performance Evaluation Procedures and Job Satisfaction: The Role of Outcome-based and Non-outcome-based Effects', *Accounting and Business Research*, 38:121-35.
- Lawler, E.E. and Hackman, J.R. (1969) 'Impact of Employee Participation in the Development of Incentive Plans: A Field Experiment', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 53:467-71.
- Levy, P.E. and Williams, J.R. (2004) 'The Social Context of Performance Appraisal: A Review and Framework for the Future', *Journal of Management*, 30:881-905.
- Locke, E.A. (1968) 'Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives', *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3:157-89.
- Locke, E.A. and Latham, G.P. (2002) 'Building a Practically Useful Theory of Goal Setting and Task Motivation. A 35-Year Odyssey', *American Psychologist*, 57:705-17.
- Locke, E.A., Shaw, K.N., Saari, L.M. and Latham, G.P. (1981) 'Goal Setting and Task Performance: 1969-1980', *Psychological Bulletin*, 90:125-152.
- Milliman, J., Nason, S., Zhu, C. and De Cieri, H. (2002) 'An Exploratory Assessment of the Purposes of Performance Appraisals in North and Central America and the Pacific Rim', *Human Resource Management*, 41:87-102.

- Narcisse, S. and Harcourt, M. (2008) 'Employee Fairness Perceptions of Performance Appraisal: A Saint Lucian Case Study', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19:1152-1169.
- Paauwe, J. (2009) 'HRM and Performance: Achievements, Methodological Issues and Prospects', *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 46:129-42.
- Pritchard, R.D., Harrell, M.M., DiazGranados, D. and Guzman, M.J. (2008) 'The Productivity Measurement and Enhancement System: A Meta-Analysis', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93:540-67.
- Purcell, J. and Hutchinson, S. (2007) 'Front-line Managers as Agents in the HRM-Performance Causal Chain: Theory, Analysis and Evidence', *Human Resource Management Journal*, 17:3-20.
- Rao, A.S. (2009) 'Effectiveness of Performance Management Systems: An Empirical Study in Indian Companies', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18:1812-40.
- Roberts, G.E. (2003) 'Employee Performance Appraisal System Participation: A Technique that Works', *Public Personnel Management*, 32:89-98.
- Steensma, H. and Visser, E. (2007) 'Procedural Justice and Supervisors' Personal Power Bases: Effects on Employees Perceptions of Performance Appraisal Sessions, Commitment, and Motivation', *Journal of Collective Negotiations*, 31:101-18.
- Truss, C., Gratton, L., Hope-Hailey, V., McGovern, P. and Stiles, P. (1997) 'Soft and Hard Models of Human Resource Management: A Reappraisal', *Journal of Management Studies*, 34: 53-73.
- Youngcourt, S.S., Leiva, P.I. and Jones, R.G. (2007) 'Perceived Purposes of Performance Appraisal: Correlates of Individual- and Position-focused Purposes on Attitudinal Outcomes', *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 18: 315-43.
- Wall, T.D. and Wood, S.J. (2005) 'The Romance of Human Resource Management and Business Performance and the Case for Big Science', *Human Relations*, 58:429-62.

Williams, K.J., DeNisi, A.S., Blencoe, A.G. and Cafferty, T.P. (1985) 'The Role of Appraisal Purpose: Effects of Purpose on Information Acquisition and Utilization', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 35:314-39.


## APPENDIX 1

### PM system effectiveness items

The performance reviews ....	Fully disagree			Fully agree	
Motivate me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cause me to function better	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarify the expectations regarding my functioning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enhance my self-esteem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contribute to my professional development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide me with more insight in my personal contributions and added value	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have a clear effect on how comfortable I feel in my job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have a clear effect on my performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide me clear insight in my career opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**FIGURE 1**

*Expectancy framework on performance improvement*



**TABLE 1**

**Sample characteristics and background**

<b>Variable and category</b>	<b>%<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Variable and category</b>	<b>%<sup>a</sup></b>
<b>Gender</b>		<b>Years in organization</b>	
Male	48	0<2	31
Female	52	2-5	29
<b>Age (in years)</b>		6-10	20
<25	14	11-15	8
26-30	24	16-20	5
31-35	19	>20	8
36-40	14	<b>Type of organization</b>	
41-50	20	Private	69
>50	9	Public	26
<b>Education</b>		Other	5
Primary	1	<b>Listed on stock market</b>	
Secondary	19	Yes	33
College	48	No	67
University	31	<b>Number of employees</b>	
<b>Functional level</b>		<10	8
Blue-collar	8	10-49	18
Clerical	21	50-199	19
Professional	40	200-499	13
Middle management	24	500-999	11
Senior management	6	1000>	32
Top management	1	<b>Gender of supervisor</b>	
<b>Functional experience</b>		Male	73
0<2	18	Female	27
2-5	26	<b>Age of supervisor</b>	
6-10	25	<25	1
11-15	13	26-30	6
16-20	8	31-35	14
>20	10	36-40	22
		41-50	36
		>50	22

<sup>a</sup> N = 3192.

**TABLE 2****Means, standard deviations and correlations among constructs <sup>a</sup>**

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Age supervisor	4.49	1.21										
2. Job experience	2.96	1.53	-.09									
3. Job level employee	3.96	1.05	.24	-.13								
4. Freq. formal reviews	1.83	1.96	-.10	-.02	-.08							
5. Length formal reviews	45.22	39.3	-.08	-.19	-.03	.13						
6. Freq. informal reviews	4.29	2.55	-.05	-.09	-.09	.19	.12					
7. Focus	2.80	.87	-.04	-.03	-.09	.08	.08	.21				
8. Participation	3.39	.96	-.08	-.14	-.11	.13	.19	.42	.35			
9. Fairness	3.00	1.18	-.02	-.08	-.12	.14	.16	.33	.33	.55		
10. Effectiveness	3.05	.90	-.08	-.07	-.17	.17	.16	.37	.37	.57	.62	

<sup>a</sup>  $N = 3192$ . Construct mean and standard deviation based on average mean and standard deviation of observed items' raw score per construct

<sup>b</sup> correlations  $> .046$ ,  $p < .001$

**TABLE 3****Factor structure of key constructs**

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
Participation1		.789		
Participation2		.944		
Participation3		.886		
Participation4		.915		
Participation5		.786		
Focus1				.863
Focus2				.606
Fairness1	-.116		1.014	
Fairness2			.952	
Effectiveness1	.630		.205	
Effectiveness 2	.697		.143	
Effectiveness 3	.648		.107	
Effectiveness 4	.634		.184	
Effectiveness5	.734			
Effectiveness6	.715			
Effectiveness7	.843		-.254	
Effectiveness8	.939		-.213	
Effectiveness9	.660			

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.  
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.



**TABLE 4****Estimated parameters and fit statistics for the direct effects model**

<b>Independent Variable</b>	<b>Dependent Variable</b>	
	PM effectiveness	
	B (S.E.)	t-value
Age supervisor	.01 (.01)	1.00
Job experience employee	<b>-.08 (.01)</b>	<b>8.00</b>
Functional level employee	.01 (.01)	1.00
# formal performance reviews	<b>.05 (.01)</b>	<b>5.00</b>
Length formal performance reviews	<b>.03 (.01)</b>	<b>3.00</b>
Frequency informal performance reviews	<b>.09 (.01)</b>	<b>9.00</b>
Focus	<b>.25 (.02)</b>	<b>12.50</b>
Participation	<b>.47 (.02)</b>	<b>23.50</b>
$R^2 = .47$		
In bold = $p \leq .01$		
Fit-statistics: $\chi^2 = 2166.32$ , $df = 198$ ( $p < 0.001$ ), GFI = 0.94, NNFI = 0.94, CFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.056 (90 % CI = 0.054 to 0.058).		

**TABLE 5**

**Estimated parameters and fit statistics for the structural model**

<b>Independent Variable</b>	<b>Dependent Variable</b>			
	Fairness		PM effectiveness	
	B (S.E.)	t-value	B (S.E.)	t-value
Age supervisor	<b>-.04 (.01)</b>	<b>4.00</b>	-.01 (.01)	1.00
Job experience employee	<b>-.05 (.01)</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>-.06 (.01)</b>	<b>6.00</b>
Functional level employee	-.01 (.01)	1.00	.00 (.01)	0.00
# formal performance reviews	<b>.04 (.01)</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>.03 (.01)</b>	<b>3.00</b>
Length formal performance reviews	<b>.04 (.01)</b>	<b>4.00</b>	.01 (.01)	1.00
Frequency informal performance reviews	<b>.07 (.02)</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>.06 (.01)</b>	<b>6.00</b>
Focus	<b>.21 (.02)</b>	<b>10.50</b>	<b>.16 (.02)</b>	<b>8.00</b>
Participation	<b>.48 (.02)</b>	<b>24.00</b>	<b>.26 (.02)</b>	<b>13.00</b>
Fairness	---	---	<b>.44 (.02)</b>	<b>22.00</b>
	$R^2 = .40$		$R^2 = .59$	

In bold =  $p \leq .01$   
 --- = relationship not hypothesized / specified  
 Fit-statistics:  $\chi^2=2315.13$ ,  $df = 232$  ( $p < 0.001$ ), GFI = 0.94, NNFI = 0.94, CFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.053 (90 % CI = 0.051 to 0.055).

**TABLE 6****Comparison of the fully and partially mediating models**

	$\chi^2$	df	$\Delta\chi^2$	Conclusion
Baseline model: Fully mediating model	2813.3	240		
Alternative model: partially mediating model	2315.1	232	498,2	Significantly better fit than baseline model