



International Journal of Man

**Employee Performance Management: Charting the Field
from 1998-2018**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Manpower</i>
Manuscript ID	IJM-10-2019-0483.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Performance management, Employee behaviour, Employee productivity, Human resource management

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Employee Performance Management: Charting the Field from 1998-2018

Abstract

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to study the development and consider the future of one of the most controversial areas of human resource development - employee performance management (PM).

Design

Through bibliometrics, a multiple correspondence analysis identifies the main research directions of PM studies and provides a map of descriptors and a list of authors, along with a framework to track PM literature over 20 years (1998-2018).

Findings

Scholars have attempted to address some of the questions raised by earlier researchers. However, critical questions remain unanswered, and there is increasing dissatisfaction with the process. The most glaring yet unaddressed problem with PM is poor employee acceptability of the process.

Practical Implications

If the research gaps are addressed, the lack of acceptability of the PM could be resolved, and more effectively managed in the future.

Originality

The study particularly addresses poor employee 'acceptability' of the PM process, a subject that has received limited attention by scholars.

Employee Performance Management: Charting the Field from 1998-2018

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to study the development and consider the future of the employee performance management (PM) process. In order to do this, the PM literature extensively examines the leading management and psychology journals over a 20 years period. The paper focuses on the broad and comprehensive topic of employee PM as opposed to the narrow approach of the performance appraisal (Claus and Briscoe, 2009). There is a distinct and essential difference in these two processes, yet they are frequently confused by both practitioners and academics alike.

Performance appraisal refers explicitly to the supervisor-employee interview where employees are typically evaluated once a year using a given set of dimensions and assigned a score to that assessment (DeNisi and Murphy, 2017). Moreover, performance appraisal has a very chequered history associated with control, hierarchical management and, more recently, complex information technology processes that have resulted in mounting dissatisfaction in both supervisors and employees (Adler, Campion, Colquitt, Grubb, Murphy, Ollander-Krane, and Pulakos, 2016).

PM was introduced in the early 1990s to address the well-documented limitations of performance appraisal (Arvey and Murphy, 1998). The process of PM encompasses a much broader range of management practices, including career management, training and development, regular feedback and reimbursement considerations (Aguinis, 2007). PM is a continual process, as opposed to the once-a-year event of appraising performance expectations. At the same time, "PM is seen as an integrated process in which managers work

1
2
3 with their employees to set expectations, measure and review results, and reward
4 performance,” (Den Hartog, Boselie and Paauwe, 2004, p 4).
5
6
7
8
9

10 This study explicitly examines the comprehensive process of PM and, therefore, includes the
11 role of employee performance appraisal as a subset of PM. The study organises, reviews,
12 critiques and synthesises representative literature on PM in an integrated way so that new
13 frameworks and perspectives on the topic can be generated (Torraco, 2005). The study takes
14 an innovative and rigorous bibliometric approach. To the best of our knowledge is the first
15 bibliometric PM literature review of its kind. The study responds to the call for research on
16 the current state of PM practices in established and influential academic journals (Gorman,
17 Meriac, Roch, Ray and Gamble, 2017). Ultimately, we identify and address poor employee
18 ‘acceptability’ of the PM process and make a compelling case that despite its present-day
19 mounting adverse publicity (Cappelli and Tavis, 2016; Buckingham and Goodall, 2015), PM
20 can have a valuable place in the contemporary organisation. Thus, this study tackles poor
21 employee ‘acceptability’ of the PM process, a subject that only been indirectly identified by
22 scholars but not unpacked and resolved. The review also leads to the generation of an
23 empirical-based model for future research that rejects an exclusive yet flawed performance
24 appraisal approach and demands a return to a more inclusive, systematic approach to PM
25 research.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The paper is structured as follows: First, we present a brief overview of the historical
50 development of PM literature between 1970 and 1998 (see Table 1). Second, we present a
51 detailed description of the methodological approach utilised to uncover PM research trends
52 and gaps. Third, we offer a detailed description of the analysis and the resulting trends of PM
53 content and its evolution between 1998 and 2018. Fourth, we offer a discussion surrounding
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the contributions of our review and conclude with a model focused on avenues for
4 broadening the breadth and scope of future research on PM.
5
6

7
8 ***** *Insert Table 1 About Here* *****
9

10 Table 1: Historical Trends of PM Research 1970–1998
11
12
13
14

15 **2. Historical Background of Extant PM Literature**

16
17 Over the past half-century, researchers and practitioners have written an enormous amount on
18 PM research. It is useful to provide a brief overview of some of the traditional treatments and
19 models. Typically, most early researchers focused on performance appraisal. However, the
20 appraisal is just one activity of the PM process (Claus and Briscoe, 2009). The early literature
21 established a vast quantity of conceptual thinking is categorised into measurement thinking
22 (i.e. Landy and Farr, 1980) later cognitive characteristics of the appraisal interview (i.e.
23 DeNisi, Cafferty and Meglino, 1984; Feldman, 1981; Landy and Farr, 1980). Early social
24 cognitive research helped to clarify and refocus research from measurement to information
25 processing and cognition (Landy and Farr, 1983). However, the models adopted at this time
26 made few contributions to the practice of appraisals in organisations (Murphy and Cleveland,
27 1991).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Following the interest in cognitive studies, researchers looked at the issues surrounding a
46 deficiency of trust, fairness and feedback and the negative impact of politics on performance
47 appraisal. In general, a good appraisal system increased the level of acceptability, which
48 established trust and fairness as a crucial component of the appraisal process. However,
49 Longenecker and Gioia (1988) claim that interview research has been micro-analytic and
50 unitary. Nevertheless, by the mid-1990s, an effective appraisal system was considered as
51 being a continuous process and a tool for managing future performance, not just for scoring
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 past performance. PM is the answer to the limitations of the narrow performance appraisal,
4
5 by increasing both employee and management acceptance. Thus, the early literature solicits
6
7 the following questions: 1) *To what extent has PM research developed beyond the narrow PA*
8
9 *accuracy?* and 2) *Has the broader PM increased the acceptability of the process?*
10
11
12
13
14

15 **3. Methodological Approach**

16
17 First, a content analysis of the published articles dealing with PM took place. Content analysis
18
19 provides for an objective, systematic and quantitative consideration of published articles. It
20
21 also allows for an interpretation of the direction in which journal editors, reviewers and
22
23 authors are taking the field as it reflects the evolution of their priorities over time (Furrer and
24
25 Sollberger, 2007; Furrer, Thomas and Goussevskaia, 2008).
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 In terms of bibliometrics, scholars consider the Web of Science (WoS) to be one of the
33
34 leading academic databases for studying research contributions. WoS covers more than
35
36 16,000 journals and 70,000,000 articles and, in general, expectations are that the material
37
38 included in WoS holds the highest quality standards. However, many other databases exist,
39
40 some of them internationally known (e.g., Scopus, Econ Lit and Google Scholar). Following
41
42 the systematic search methods found in the review articles (Terjesen, Hessels and Li, 2013),
43
44 we searched for relevant literature in online databases in the WoS Core Collection.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Bibliometric studies use a wide range of methods, the most popular being those that consider
52
53 the number of publications and the number of citations. We read the first collection of 312
54
55 articles and exchanged notes among three co-authors to reach a consensus on the articles for
56
57 exclusion from our final sample. We have focused on full-length articles published in WoS
58
59
60

1
2
3 Core Collection indexed academic journals, as they are considered knowledge-certified by
4
5
6 peers.
7
8
9

10 *Data Sources*

11
12 The first step in our analysis was to select the articles to be analysed. Because of the specific
13
14 focus on PM, we selected every article published between 1998 and 2018. We decided to
15
16 study articles that had the most impact on the field and, therefore, focused on what Ramos-
17
18 Rodríguez and Ruíz-Navarro (2004) call ‘certified knowledge’. To do so, we decided to only
19
20 retain articles from journals indexed in the WoS database, as they can be considered certified.
21
22 Indeed, the WoS database comprises the most relevant journals for PM research. For
23
24 example: *International Journal of Human Resource Management*; *Personnel Review*; *Human*
25
26 *Resource Management*; *Public Personnel Management*; *International Journal of Manpower*;
27
28 *European Journal of International Management*; *Human Resource Management Review*;
29
30 *Performance Management Systems: A Global Perspective*; *Journal of Applied Psychology*;
31
32 and *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. In addition, we referred to
33
34 other high-level outlets for PM scholars in management and psychology journals. It is
35
36 pertinent to note here that while the certified knowledge technique (Rodríguez and Ruíz-
37
38 Navarro, 2004) is well established in bibliometric methodology and typically, a good paper
39
40 could likewise be located in a high impact leading relevant journal (Barney, 1991;
41
42 Venkatraman, 1989); there can be exceptions. For example, on some occasions, a worthy and
43
44 well-cited contribution can be found in a journal of less impact.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Articles in the database were retrieved using the search function and the lexemes
54
55 ‘performance’ and ‘performance appraisal’. The first search returned 103 articles; the next
56
57 search, which used the lexemes ‘performance’, ‘performance management’, ‘performance
58
59
60

1
2
3 appraisal', 'performance planning', 'monitoring', 'evaluation', and 'employee performance
4 management', raised over 900 articles. However, this string of lexemes raised a substantial
5 and unmanageable per cent of spurious manuscripts; two researchers checking the abstracts
6 verified this. The subsequent search used three lexemes: 'performance'; 'performance
7 management'; and 'performance appraisal', and raised 120 articles, all of which were
8 relevant and deemed by the research team to be the most accurate research stream. We
9 performed a secondary content analysis and discovered another ten significant articles. We
10 also did a final manual check of late-entry 2018 papers in May 2019. Thus, the total number
11 of relevant articles extended to 140.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 *Themes Selection and Coding Procedure – Descriptors*

27
28 We used WordStat software for content analysis in order to obtain the list and frequency of
29 nouns, verbs and compound forms extracted from the articles' content. In order to code and
30 analyse the content of the articles, and following the procedure proposed by Dabic, González-
31 Loureiro and Furrer (2014), a list of descriptors was derived from the keywords provided by
32 the authors of the articles. The outcome of this process was a list of 38 descriptors most
33 commonly used in research on PM (see Table 2).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 ***** *Insert Table 2 About Here* *****

46 47 List of Descriptors

48
49 The top five most cited descriptors were '*Across borders*' (f208), '*PM*' (f191), '*Research*
50 '*Schema*' (f177), '*Effectiveness*' (f163) and '*Quantitative*' (f157). The three most common
51 descriptors included 35.8% of the occurrences; the top ten included 57.6%, and the top 20
52 included 84.0%. The average number of descriptors per article was 9.75, and thus a
53 multivariate approach to data analysis is likely to be more meaningful and valid than
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 univariate analyses (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black, 1998). Thus, following the
4
5 recommendations of Furrer and Sollberger (2007) and Furrer and colleagues(2008), a
6
7 multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) was conducted. Following the methodology
8
9 described by Hoffman and De Leeuw (2011), a matrix with the 38 descriptors was
10
11 constructed, computing a '1' when each of the latter topics was present in each of the 102
12
13 articles, and '0' otherwise.
14
15

16
17
18
19 The MCA provided coordinates in a two-dimensional space for each descriptor. Representing
20
21 a figure with a large number of words would not be interpretable and, therefore, each of the
22
23 38 descriptors represents several keywords (see Table 2). The coordinates of each descriptor
24
25 correspond to its relative position based on the number of its co-appearances with other
26
27 descriptors in the sample (Bendixen, 1995).
28
29

30
31
32
33 In order to relate the content and method of research on PM, additional insights emerged, as
34
35 proposed by González-Loureiro, Dabic and Furrer (2015), by mapping descriptor frequency
36
37 and distance from quantitative and qualitative research markers. The quantitative marker was
38
39 designed by using keywords such as: *quantitative, statistical distribution, performance*
40
41 *appraisal meta-analysis, models, model, predicting turnover, Promethee method, quasi-*
42
43 *experiment, item cluster subcomponents, questionnaires, questionnaire, surveillance, survey,*
44
45 *5- factor model, interpretivism, meta-analysis, patterns, alignment research agenda, ANP,*
46
47 *AHP, Promethee, system factors, systems, fit, MCDA, visual techniques analytic hierarchy*
48
49 *process, measurement organisational behaviour, variables, predictors ratio reinforcement*
50
51 *schedules, response rates, internal consistency, dimensions, distribution weighting systems,*
52
53 *surveillance, validity, benchmark, inventory, comparison orientation, analytic hierarchy*
54
55 *process, multilevel model.* The qualitative marker was designed by using keywords such as:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *qualitative, interpretivism, concept maps, Foucault, visual techniques, paradigm, schemata,*
4 *and comparative.* The larger the distance between the descriptor and the marker indicates that
5
6 fewer articles use the specific approach, either quantitative or qualitative. Mapping this
7
8 distance with the occurrence of each descriptor indicates the nature of the research on PM.
9
10
11

12 13 14 15 *Themes Selection and Coding Procedure – Clusters*

16
17 Finally, the descriptors were distributed straightforwardly into clusters. As a way of
18
19 validating the clustering technique, the classification of clusters was initially performed
20
21 independently by two researchers. Then the clusters were compared and found to be very
22
23 similar. When creating the clusters, the researchers expended the qualitative coding method
24
25 described by Glaser (1978), which considers the Six C's – causes, contexts, contingencies,
26
27 consequences, co-variances, and conditions. As a cross-check, to increase the reliability of
28
29 the cluster, the newly labelled clusters were compared with the extreme labelled descriptors
30
31 as described Dabic *et al.* (2014) and González-Loureiro *et al.* (2015). According to these
32
33 authors, the cluster should be labelled concurring to the most-extreme-located descriptors.
34
35 Therefore, our clustering technique combined two methods.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Clusters represent themes of articles in a literature network, and a cluster can be seen as a
44
45 group of well-connected articles in a research area with limited connection to papers in
46
47 another cluster or research area (Leydesdorff, 2011). Clustering permits the topological
48
49 analysis of networks, identifying topics, interrelations and collaboration patterns. The
50
51 researchers agreed their two clustering techniques correlate and generated four significant
52
53 groups or clusters from the data: 1) Accuracy; 2) Firm-level; 3) Across borders, and 4)
54
55 Employee acceptability (see Table 3).
56
57
58
59

60 ***** *Insert Table 3 About Here* *****

The 4 Major Clusters

The PM literature reveals a steady increase from 1998 onwards with two peaks in publications, in 2007 and 2011. In their recent 100-year review of PM in *Journal of Applied Psychology (JAP)*, DeNisi and Murphy (2017) consider that the literature had its heyday between 1970 and 2000. However, their review is largely confined to I/O Psychology Journals (in particular *JAP*), which have traditionally focused on the measurement aspect of performance appraisal. We believe their article to be a comprehensive historical review rooted in performance appraisal research and grounded from an I/O psychology perspective. While the DeNisi and Murphy (2017) study take an independent subject review of performance appraisal over 100 years in *JAP*; the present study takes a broader subject approach of the PM literature over a narrow period within the broader scope of management and I/O psychology journals.

4. Analysis and Key Results

Connection Among Descriptors

The ultimate goal of this analysis is to find a low-dimensional representation of the original high-dimensional space (i.e. the matrix of articles and descriptors). The MCA provided a pair of coordinates in this two-dimensional space for each of the 38 descriptors. On the map of Figure 1, the sizes of the points are proportional to the number of articles associated with a descriptor, and the proximity between descriptors corresponds to their shared content (Bendixen, 1995; Hoffman and Franke, 1986). Descriptors are close to each other when they share a large proportion of articles discussing them and are distant from each other when they appear together in a small number of articles (Furrer *et al.*, 2008). The centre of the map represents the core of PM research in the field. For example, the descriptors ‘*Across Borders*’, ‘*Research Schema*’, ‘*Effectiveness*’ and ‘*Quantitative*’ are close to the centre. Conversely, the descriptors ‘*capabilities*’, ‘*360*’, ‘*TQM*’, ‘*ethics/CSR*’ and ‘*crisis*’ are located

1
2
3 away from the centre, indicating that issues related to these subjects have perhaps only
4 recently or marginally attracted research attention (i.e. CSR and crisis). An alternative view is
5 that they could be declining (i.e. TQM, 360).
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 The dimensions of the map (Figure 1), which resulted from the MCA, have also been
13 interpreted using the four 'major codes.' The first, horizontal, dimension separates the code
14 'Firm-level' (on the left) to the horizontal dimension on the right 'Across Borders'. The
15 vertical dimension separates the code 'Accuracy' (on the top) from those focusing on the
16 major code 'Employee acceptability' (at the bottom).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 ***** *Insert Figure 1 About Here* *****
26

27
28 Figure 1 Structure of Selected Research
29
30
31

32 **5. Most Influential Papers**

33
34 In every scientific field, some publications assume fundamental roles in the evolution of the
35 field. These articles, owing to their impact, are accelerating factors in the development of the
36 field (Berry and Parasuraman, 1993). Therefore, in order to gain a better understanding of the
37 directions of the future development of research in the field, it is critical to identify which are
38 the most influential articles on PM published between 1998 and 2018. To measure the impact
39 of an article, we used the generally accepted method of summed citation counts (Bergh, Perry
40 and Hanke, 2006; Furrer *et al.*, 2008). The top 10 most influential papers were initially
41 identified based on the number of appearances in the Social Science Citation Index, accessed
42 through WoS (see Table 4).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56
57 In an attempt to further examine and increase our understanding of the trend, we split the
58 most influential papers into two periods. In the period 1998–2005, five papers were
59
60

1
2
3 represented in the most influential papers: 1.) Levy and Williams (2004); 2.) Fletcher (2001);
4
5 3.) Den Hartog *et al.* (2004); 4.) Poon (2004); and 5.) Latham, Almost, Mann and Moore
6
7 (2005). The leading three papers in this period focused on literature reviews and research
8
9 agendas that could indicate the need at this time for researchers to reflect on the early
10
11 literature and may be symptomatic of the perplexity of the early literature, driving researchers
12
13 to seek guidance for future PM research efforts. For example, Levy and Williams (2004)
14
15 suggested a trend of increasing awareness of the importance of social context, while Fletcher
16
17 (2001) advocated the need for more practical guidance. In addition, Den Hartog *et al.* (2004)
18
19 determined that front-line managers play a crucial mediating role in the implementing of PM
20
21 and affect employee performance, which in turn affects firm performance. Their model also
22
23 addresses a concept of reversed causality. In other words, the model proposes that besides
24
25 PM influencing performance, there is also a reverse loop and a healthy bottom-line may have
26
27 a positive effect on the willingness to invest in PM practices. The authors conclude that
28
29 unravelling 'cause' and 'effect' is challenging. The remaining papers in this period include a
30
31 conceptual paper by Latham *et al.* (2005), which creates a model that spotlights the benefits
32
33 of management coaching, and an empirical paper. For instance, Poon (2004) surveyed the
34
35 influence of politics on turnover intention.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 On the other hand, in the period 2006–2018, there is evidence of an increased tendency to
46
47 focus on employee-level issues. For instance, Kuvaas (2006; 2007), using a data set from the
48
49 Norwegian banking sector, set out to explore alternative relationships between PM
50
51 satisfaction and employee outcomes in the form of self-reported work performance,
52
53 organisational commitment and turnover intention (Kuvaas, 2006) and the relationship
54
55 between employee perceptions of developmental PM and self-reported work
56
57 performance (Kuvaas, 2007). Also focusing on the employee, Gruman and Saks (2011)
58
59
60

1
2
3 address the lack of employee acceptability of the PM process by fostering and managing
4 employee engagement to increase job performance through PM. This conceptual paper
5 presents a coherent model and process for promoting the engagement of employees that goes
6 beyond the use of engagement surveys focusing on aggregate levels of psychological
7 engagement as self-reported by employees. Gruman and Saks (2011) argue that there is very
8 little conceptual and empirical work on how the PM process can enhance performance by
9 fostering employee engagement and identify the importance of motivating the employee in
10 the PM process, perhaps representing significant progress in the field. Likewise, Brown,
11 Hyatt and Benson (2010) discover that employees with low-quality PM experiences are more
12 likely to be dissatisfied with their job, be less committed to the firm and have an increased
13 intention to quit.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Similarly, Bouskila-Yam and Kluger (2011) create a model to address the lack of stakeholder
32 acceptability in the PM process by creating a strength-based and goal-setting process. This
33 method incorporates ideas both from PM practitioners' and from psychology scholars'
34 perspectives using a variation of the feedforward interview reflecting a positive self-
35 perception. Chang, Ferris, Johnson, Rosen and Tan (2012) consider employee acceptability of
36 the PM process from the perspective of how the process considers the importance of
37 employee self-worth, capabilities and job satisfaction. In order to improve these outcomes,
38 they create a practical core self-evaluation model. Hence, splitting the analysis into two
39 sections is useful in that it suggests that the most recent highly cited articles suggest a change
40 may be imminent from a firm-level approach to an employee-level approach.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 ***** *Table 4 About Here* *****

57
58 Top Ten Papers
59
60

6. Where to Now?

PM Research Development beyond PA Accuracy

Our first research question inquired: *To what extent has PM research developed beyond the narrow PA accuracy?* As denoted earlier, our findings emerged in four distinct clusters, viz

1) Firm-level, 2) Across borders, 3) Accuracy and 4) Employee acceptability. The first research question will be addressed in relation to firm-level, across borders and accuracy – three of the chief clusters. The fourth of the clusters, that is, employee acceptability, will be discussed in response to the second research questions.

1) Firm-Level

Our investigation shows that generally, the PM literature emphasis over the 20-year period has been geared toward a Firm-level analysis and that this research has expanded in various areas. For example, more research attention is given to the importance of the purpose of PM in terms of a strategic alignment and business outcome, and the emerging theme from this literature is that the PM purpose must be apparent and support the strategic goals of the firm (Maley and Kramar, 2014) and be clear to all relevant stakeholders (Biron, Farndale, and Paauwe 2011; Bouskila-Yam and Kluger, 2011; Dewettinck and van Dijk, 2013; Iqbal, Akbar and Budhwar, 2015).

2) Across Borders

Research has also advanced 'Across borders' and shows evidence of the growing importance of global PM and all its nuances. For instance, autonomy orientation is argued to be imperative for optimal performance of global managers (Kuvaas, 2007) and perceptions of global employees strongly link to fairness (Dewettinck and van Dijk, 2013). Individual country contextual studies support these claims, for example in India (Gupta and Kumar,

1
2
3 2012), Vietnam (Stanton and Pham, 2014), Botswana, (Migiro and Taderera, 2011) and
4
5 China (Fee, McGrath-Champ and Yang, 2011), suggesting the ineptitude of merely utilising
6
7 the PM system for administrative purposes such as pinpointing employees for promotion and
8
9 salary decisions.
10
11

12
13
14
15 Moving the field forward, Engle, Dowling and Festing (2008) propose a research domain that
16
17 further differentiates PM systems by considering the complexity embedded in the extent of
18
19 global standardisation and local customisation in global PM. Likewise, Claus (2008) argue
20
21 for PM global integration and local responsiveness. Responding to this, Maley and Kramar
22
23 (2014) offer suggestions for multinational corporations to maximise the effectiveness of PM
24
25 and profit simultaneously during times of global crisis by applying a Real Options approach.
26
27 A four-level framework has also been conceptualised to explain how individual performance
28
29 results are aggregated in multinational corporations (Engle, Festing and Dowling, 2015).
30
31
32

33
34
35 The importance of cultural sensitivity concerning PM is apparent in many studies and the
36
37 significance of cultural sensitivity when implementing PM practices across borders is an
38
39 essential and dominant theme (i.e. Cooke and Huang, 2011; Buchelt, 2015; Kang and Shen,
40
41 2016). Thus, in response to the first research question, the analysis and our resultant
42
43 discussion suggest that the literature is now centring on Firm-level performance, albeit
44
45 perhaps at the expense of an Employee-Level focus. At the same time, the Across Borders
46
47 theme is alive and well, but there remains the need for more attention on the expatriate (Claus
48
49 and Briscoe, 2009) and other forms of emerging global managers such as inpatriate
50
51 managers, flexi-patriate managers and host country managers.
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 3) *Accuracy*

59
60

1
2
3 On the other hand, the 'measurement' research is far from dead and buried as predicted by
4 Lawler (1994), and there remains a captivation with performance appraisal, accuracy and
5 ratings (Adler *et al.*, 2016; Chiang and Birtch, 2010; Iqbal *et al.*, 2015). Issues such as
6 conscious rating bias (see Spence and Keeping, 2011) and rater accountability (Harari and
7 Rudolph, 2017) have once again emerged. According to Brutus (2010), the process of
8 evaluating individual performance in organisations hinges on the use of numerical ratings, a
9 proven yet relatively narrow operationalization of this process. Landy and Farr (1980) claim
10 that there is nothing more to find in the measurement theme appraisal research and we
11 propose that they may have a very valid point – nothing remarkable has appeared after
12 another almost four decades of measurement research effort.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 4) *Acceptability*

29
30 The second research question probes: *Has the more extensive PM increased the acceptability*
31 *of the process?* By acceptability, we refer to acceptability in terms of all stakeholders – but
32 namely the employee. The second research question will be addressed in relation to the final
33 chief clusters: acceptability. The answer to the second research question is an obvious 'no',
34 and this is by far one of our biggest surprises. In this light, it is indeed not surprising that
35 there remain much conflict and tension in PM in the workplace that leads to the PM process
36 remaining essentially unacceptable, and this issue deserves more attention (Rosen, Kacmar,
37 Harris, Gavin, & Hochwarter, 2017). Another contributing factor to the lack of employee
38 acceptability is the huge degree of intolerable politics throughout all aspects of the process
39 (Poon, 2004). A lack of employee development may also be another area that has contributed
40 to a lack of acceptability of the PM process. The latest stream of literature points to the
41 neglect of employee development as detrimental (i.e. Rabenu and Tziner, 2016). For
42 example, when a firm does invest in employee development, employees perceive that the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 firm is supportive of their long-term career aspirations (Chiang and Birtch, 2010;
4
5 Kuvaas, 2006) and the resultant outcome is increased employee commitment (Iqbal *et al.*,
6
7 2015) and engagement (Gruman and Saks, 2011).
8
9

10
11
12 A shortfall in supervisor-employee feedback also emerged as pivotal to a more agreeable and
13
14 acceptable PM process (i.e. Aguinis, Gottfredson and Joo, 2012; Dahling and O'Malley,
15
16 2011; Fletcher, 2001; Kuvaas, 2007; McCarthy and Garavan, 2007; Maley and Kramar,
17
18 2014; Tuytens and Devos, 2012). Nonetheless, new evidence points to authentic feedback
19
20 being potentially perceived as harsh, generating adverse employee reactions (Bouskila-Yam,
21
22 and Kluger. 2011; Luffarelli, Gonçaves and Stamatogiannakis, 2016) and being highly
23
24 problematic for managers (Brown, Kulik, and Lim, 2016), a further factor that will surely
25
26 negate the acceptability of PM.
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 It is evident that, to date, not enough is known about precisely why PM is not acceptable in
34
35 the workplace. Multinational corporations such as Adobe, Colorcon, Dell, Deloitte, Gap,
36
37 Google, Microsoft and PwC discard their PM processes, claiming they are no longer
38
39 acceptable to their employees (Cappelli and Tavis, 2016) – yet this lack of tolerability
40
41 emerges as vague and non-specific. At the same time, there is a repeated call to either scrap
42
43 or reinvent the entire process (Buckingham and Goodall, 2015). Despite years of research –
44
45 'discontent with PM may be at a record high' (Adler *et al.* 2016 p 219; Pulakos, Hanson,
46
47 Arad and Moye, 2015; Pulakos and O'Leary, 2011).
48
49
50
51

52
53
54 Consequently, evidence strongly implies that PM is not acceptable to many key stakeholders
55
56 of today's organisations. Albeit, while management consultants and practitioner journals such
57
58 as the *Harvard Business Review* have been tracking the declining dilemma of stakeholder
59
60

1
2
3 acceptance; (*cf* Cappelli and Tavis, 2016; Buckingham and Goodall, 2015), scholarly
4
5 researcher appears to have been behind the eight ball. Notwithstanding, recent evidence
6
7 (Levy, Cavanaugh, Frantz and Borden, 2015; Pulakos *et al.*, 2015) may buck that tendency
8
9 and could signify that academia may be beginning to wake up to the significant gap that
10
11 exists between practice and research. The jury is out!
12
13
14
15
16

17 In summary, in our central analysis 20-year period of PM publications, we have identified the
18
19 main research directions in the field and conclude that PM studies are yielding some new
20
21 information. Additionally, we conclude that the extant PM literature has contributed to the
22
23 field over the past 20 years, albeit in a limited capacity. However, there remain many areas
24
25 for improvement, with several critical gaps still existing in the literature. The abundance of
26
27 literature reviews and future research agenda offerings across the 20-year period are surely an
28
29 indication of past and present ambiguity and a quest for knowledge? Accordingly, several
30
31 suppositions can be drawn from this study. First, the literature is still mostly conceptual, and
32
33 though it has developed some noteworthy models, these tend to be untested propositions. It is
34
35 true that the empirical studies over the past two decades have moved away from student
36
37 populations, but they have remained generally quantitative, and there still remains a scarcity
38
39 of qualitative studies. Our findings support those of McKenna, Richardson and Manroop
40
41 (2011), who make a case that PM research is a one-dimensional approach dominated by a
42
43 positivist ontology. Rectifying the shortfall in qualitative industry studies could be another
44
45 way to encourage more interaction between scholars and industry. Second, a key problem is
46
47 that research centres on only a segment of the PM – the appraisal. As a result, the accuracy
48
49 and performance appraisal take up a large amount of research time and effort. It is perhaps
50
51 worth considering if this is disproportionate to its relevance and weighting. Thus, a PM
52
53 process is needed that expands the discussion on accuracy to the wider domain of PM. It is
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 not only a question of doing enough empirical research, it is also the importance of its
4
5 perceived value and relevance. Third, evidence suggests that enhancing the influence of
6
7 research on PM practice will require much more collaboration between PM scholars and
8
9 practitioners.
10

11 12 13 14 15 *Limitations*

16
17 This study is not without limitations. While we consider through our content analysis and
18
19 rigorous bibliometric method that we have captured the majority of PM papers over the past
20
21 20 years, our method is not infallible. The bibliometric databases do not cover all research
22
23 areas and do not index all publications – and one of the explicit challenges in examining the
24
25 PM literature is that it is spread widely across management and I/O psychology journals. The
26
27 second limitation is related to the selected database. Probably by selecting Scopus or Google
28
29 Scholar, we could achieve a much bigger sample, but we decided to use the most influential
30
31 and more focused database in WoS. Additionally, there can also be issues with citation bias,
32
33 such as inappropriate citation of an individual's own work, that of their colleagues, or the
34
35 journals in which they publish. A number of bibliometric tools allow the exclusion of self-
36
37 citations; however, it is not failsafe. Lastly, as mentioned earlier, worthy and well-cited
38
39 articles could on occasion be found in non-leading journals with lower impact factor.
40
41 Nonetheless, we feel confident that our approach has captured the spirit of the trends in PM
42
43 literature.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **7. Conclusion**

52
53 In terms of practice, there are several important implications emerging from this study. Top
54
55 management must understand the benefits of an efficient PM process clearly and show
56
57 understanding and support for the procedure. A first and desirable step would be for CEOs to
58
59
60

1
2
3 lead by example, for instance by conducting exemplary PM processes with direct reports.
4
5 This then encourages her/his executives and offers direct and concise assistance s to achieve
6
7 the greatest benefit from the PM process. The firm's PM process should be a feature of the
8
9 annual report and a regular board room topic. An effective way to perpetuate successful PM
10
11 system processes is for the CEO to identify and invest in senior executives' and managers'
12
13 PM system training. As we have established PM as a time-intensive yet immensely rewarding
14
15 process, it is understood that a reward system is needed as a complementary feature to
16
17 successful PM system processes.
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 We consider that the problem of making a manager more proficient in managing the PM
25
26 process and the problem of obtaining better employee acceptability of the process are
27
28 conceptually and practically distinct. Although it makes sense to attack the problem of
29
30 capability first, firms must also consider factors which affect each manager's willingness to
31
32 faithfully and proficiently manage the PM. One way to encourage managers disposition
33
34 towards PM is to include as part of their key performance indicators. For example,
35
36 measurable improvements in the 'acceptability' of the PM over time could make one such
37
38 objective. Achieving an 'acceptable' PM for all stakeholders should be written into the
39
40 company mission statement and form part of the annual report.
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Furthermore, clarity of the purpose of the PM should be a priority in what Bowen and Ostroff
48
49 (2004) term 'HR climate strength.' The construct 'strength of the HR system' refers to a
50
51 strong organisational climate in which individuals share a common interpretation of what
52
53 behaviours are expected and rewarded. The rationale here is that when the purpose of the PM
54
55 is clear and communicated to everyone involved in the process, the strength of the HR system
56
57 can help explain how employee behaviour positively affects organisational effectiveness.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 We side with the argument for practice not to slay the PM system, but to create more value in
7
8 the process (see Pulakos, Mueller-Hanson, and Arad, 2019; Goler, Gale and Grant 2016;
9
10 Levey, Tseng and Rosen, 2017). We also determine the viewpoint that PMs can and do serve
11
12 a fundamental purpose in most organisations and, despite the challenges and controversy,
13
14 they should remain in situ. Having said that, we also determine ways to improve the PM
15
16 process in order to lead to enhanced employee satisfaction and motivation. Consequently, our
17
18 standpoint is that PM research must now go beyond the narrow measurement arena. A final
19
20 comment on implications for practice is that an 'acceptable PM' starts and finishes at the top
21
22 with the CEO - she/he is paramount to its success.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 In terms of future direction for research, having examined the different approaches of PM
30
31 designs and their potential, as well as trends, we do see the need for future studies to have a
32
33 wider perspective and concede that PM researchers need to extend the scope of discussion in
34
35 regard to the future of performance evaluation in general. For example, future PM research
36
37 should consider the implications of continuing changes in the nature and function of the firm,
38
39 teamwork, working from home, flexible working hours, virtual employees, and the
40
41 casualization of the workforce would be a good starting point. Another consideration for
42
43 future PM studies is innovation in HR. For instance, how should PM change in the advent of
44
45 the increasing impact of artificial intelligence (AI). Indeed, AI permits a computer to perform
46
47 jobs that generally require human reasoning and rely primarily on the increased availability
48
49 of data for prediction tasks. Cappelli, Tambe, and Yakubovich, (2019) report that 22 per cent
50
51 of firms say they have adopted analytics in HR; but how this impacts PM is not at all clear
52
53 and evidently an area for future investigation.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While we remain cautious, at the same time, we are optimistic concerning the future of PM.
4
5 Although the attention on firm-level performance is important, it should not result in
6
7 employee-level neglect. It is perhaps time that researchers make an audacious decision and
8
9 divert their attention to more empirical research, in particular qualitative studies that
10
11 incorporate alignment with the industry practitioners. For too long, the PM research field has
12
13 been detached from industry. By following these steps, stakeholder 'acceptability' will
14
15 almost certainly be given more attention.
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 Conclusively, beyond its practical content and contribution to the literature, this paper calls
23
24 for more focused empirical research across academic and practitioner boundaries that will
25
26 help to bridge the gap created by the early PM literature. Forty years ago, Meyer, Kay and
27
28 French (1981), in their landmark study commented that everybody talks and writes about
29
30 PM, but nobody has done any real scientific testing of it; we still agree with this reaction.
31
32 This paper also calls for originality in scholarship, rather than further incremental
33
34 development of rigid conceptual prototypes. This formula will not only enable researchers to
35
36 respond to the PM abandonment crusaders by both justifying and defending PM's role in the
37
38 contemporary organisation but will also make a positive contribution to long-term
39
40 organisational success. Indeed, there is still much to be done, and the field has far from
41
42 plateaued.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Adler, S., Campion, M., Colquitt, A., Grubb, A., Murphy, K., Ollander-Krane, R. & Pulakos, E.D. (2016). Getting rid of performance ratings: Genius or folly? A debate. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 219–252.
- Aguinis, H. (2007). *Performance Management (2nd ed.)*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Aguinis, H., Gottfredson, R.K. & Joo, H. (2012). Using performance management to win the talent war. *Business Horizons*, 55(6), 609–616.
- Arvey, R. & Murphy, K. (1998). Performance evaluations in work settings. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 141–168.
- Bednall, TC, Sanders, K., and Runhaar, P. (2014). Stimulating informal learning activities through activities through perceptions of performance appraisal quality and human resource management system strength a two-wave study. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 13(10), 45-61.
- Bendixen, M.T. (1995). Compositional perceptual mapping using chi-squared trees analysis and correspondence analysis. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11(6), 571–581.
- Bergh, D.D., Perry, J. & Hanke, R. (2006). Some predictors of SMJ article impact. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(1), 81–100.
- Berry, L.L. & Parasuraman, A. (1993). Building a new academic field – the case of services marketing. *Journal of Retailing*, 69(1), 13–60.
- Biron, M., Farndale, E. & Paauwe, J. (2011). Performance management effectiveness: Lessons from world-leading firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(6), 1294–1311.
- Borman, W. C. (1994). Performance evaluation in organizations. *London School of Economics: The International Library of Management*.
- Bouskila-Yam, O. & Kluger, A.N. (2011). Strength-based performance appraisal and goal setting. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(2), 137–147.
- Brown, M., Hyatt, D. & Benson, J. (2010). Consequences of the performance appraisal experience. *Personnel Review*, 39(3), 375–396.
- Brown, M., Kulik, C.T. & Lim, V. (2016). Managerial tactics for communicating negative performance feedback. *Personnel Review*, 45(5), 969–987.

- 1
2
3 Brutus, S. (2010). Words versus numbers: A theoretical exploration of giving and
4 receiving narrative comments in performance appraisal. *Human Resource Management*
5 *Review*, 20(2), 144–157.
6
7
8 Buchelt, B. (2015). Performance management in Polish companies internationalizing
9 their market activities. *The International Journal of Human Resource*
10 *Management*, 26(15), 1965–1982.
11
12 Buckingham, M. & Goodall, A. (2015). Reinventing performance management. *Harvard*
13 *Business Review*, 93 (4), 40–50.
14
15 Cappelli, P. & Tavis, A. (2016). The performance management revolution. *Harvard*
16 *Business Review*, 94 (10), 58–67.
17
18 Cappelli, P., Tambe, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2019). Artificial intelligence in human
19 resources management: challenges and a path forward. *Available at SSRN 3263878*.
20
21
22 Chang, C.H., Ferris, D.L., Johnson, R.E., Rosen, C.C. & Tan, J.A. (2012). Core self-
23 evaluations: A review and evaluation of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 38(1), 81–
24 128.
25
26
27 Chiang, F.F. & Birtch, T.A. (2010). Appraising performance across borders: An empirical
28 examination of the purposes and practices of performance appraisal in a multi-country
29 context. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(7), 1365–1393.
30
31
32 Claus, L. (2008). Employee performance management in MNCs: Reconciling the need
33 for global integration and local responsiveness. *European Journal of International*
34 *Management*, 2(2), 132–152.
35
36 Claus, L. & Briscoe, D. (2009). Employee performance management across borders: A
37 review of relevant academic literature. *International Journal of Management*
38 *Reviews*, 11(2), 175–196.
39
40
41 Cooke, F.L. & Huang, K. (2011). Postacquisition evolution of the appraisal and reward
42 systems: A study of Chinese IT firms acquired by US firms. *Human Resource*
43 *Management*, 50(6), 839–858.
44
45
46 Dabic, M., González-Loureiro, M. & Furrer, O. (2014). Research on the strategy of
47 multinational enterprises: Key approaches and new avenues. *Business Research*
48 *Quarterly*, 17(2), 129–148.
49
50
51 Dahling, J.J. & O'Malley, A.L. (2011). Supportive feedback environments can mend
52 broken performance management systems. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology:*
53 *Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 4(2), 201–203.
54
55
56 Day, D. V., & Sulsky, L. M. (1995). Effects of frame-of-reference training and
57 information configuration on memory organization and rating accuracy. *Journal of*
58 *Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 158.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Den Hartog, D.N., Boselie, P. & Paauwe, J. (2004). Performance management: A model
4 and research agenda. *Applied Psychology*, 53(4), 556–569.
5
6
7 DeNisi, A.S. & Murphy, K.R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance
8 management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 421–433.
9
10 DeNisi, A.S., Cafferty, T.P. & Meglino, B.M. (1984). A cognitive view of the
11 performance appraisal process: A model and research propositions. *Organizational*
12 *Behavior and Human Performance*, 33(3), 360–396.
13
14
15 Dewettinck, K. & van Dijk, H. (2013). Linking Belgian employee performance
16 management system characteristics with performance management system effectiveness:
17 Exploring the mediating role of fairness. *The International Journal of Human Resource*
18 *Management*, 24(4), 806–825.
19
20
21 Engle, Sr, A.D., Dowling, P.J. & Festing, M. (2008). State of origin: Research in global
22 performance management, a proposed research domain and emerging
23 implications. *European Journal of International Management*, 2(2), 153–169.
24
25
26 Engle, Sr, A.D., Festing, M. & Dowling, P.J. (2015). Gaining altitude on global
27 performance management processes: A multilevel analysis. *The International Journal of*
28 *Human Resource Management*, 26(15), 1955–1964.
29
30
31 Fee, A., McGrath-Champ, S. & Yang, X. (2011). Expatriate performance management
32 and firm internationalization: Australian multinationals in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of*
33 *Human Resources*, 49(3), 365–384.
34
35
36 Feldman, J.M. (1981). Beyond attribution theory: Cognitive processes in performance
37 appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66(2), 127–148.
38
39
40 Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research
41 agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4), 473–487.
42
43
44 Furrer, O. & Sollberger, P. (2007). The dynamics and evolution of the service marketing
45 literature: 1993–2003. *Service Business*, 1(2), 93–117.
46
47
48 Furrer, O., Thomas, H. & Goussevskaia, A. (2007). The structure and evolution of the
49 strategic management field: A content analysis of 26 years of strategic management
50 research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(1), 1–23.
51
52
53 Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of*
54 *grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: The Sociology Press.
55
56
57 Goler, L., Gale, J & Grant, A. (2016). Let's not kill performance evaluations yet. *Harvard*
58 *Business Review*, November.
59
60 Gonzalez-Loureiro, M., Dabic, M. & Furrer, O. (2015). A content and comparative
analysis of strategic management research in the Baltic area: A research agenda for
qualitative studies. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 10(2), 243–266.

- 1
2
3 Gorman, C.A., Meriac, J.P., Roch, S.G., Ray, J.L. & Gamble, J.S. (2017). An exploratory
4 study of current performance management practices: Human resource executives'
5 perspectives. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 25(2), 193–202.
6
7
8 Gruman, J.A. & Saks, A.M. (2011). Performance management and employee
9 engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(2), 123–136.
10
11 Gupta, V. & Kumar, S. (2012). Impact of performance appraisal justice on employee
12 engagement: A study of Indian professionals. *Employee Relations*, 35(1), 61–78.
13
14
15 Hair, J.H. Jr, Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate Data*
16 *Analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
17
18 Harari, M.B. & Rudolph, C.W. (2017). The effect of rater accountability on performance
19 ratings: A meta-analytic review. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(1), 121–133.
20
21
22 Hoffman, D.L. & de Leeuw, J. (2011). *Geometrical Aspects of Multiple Correspondence*
23 *Analysis: Implications for the Coordinate Scaling Debate*. California: Department of
24 Statistics, UCLA.
25
26 Hoffman, D.J. & Franke, G.R. (1986). Correspondence analysis: graphical representation
27 of categorical data in marketing research. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23(3), 213–
28 227.
29
30
31 Ilgen, D. R., Mitchell, T. R., & Fredrickson, J. W. (1981). Poor performers: Supervisors'
32 and subordinates' responses. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 27(3),
33 386-410.
34
35
36 Iqbal, M.Z., Akbar, S. & Budhwar, P. (2015). Effectiveness of performance appraisal: An
37 integrated framework. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17(4), 510–533.
38
39
40 Kang, H. & Shen, J. (2016). International performance appraisal practices and approaches
41 of South Korean MNEs in China. *The International Journal of Human Resource*
42 *Management*, 27(3), 291–310.
43
44
45 Kuvaas, B. (2006). Performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes:
46 Mediating and moderating roles of work motivation. *The International Journal of Human*
47 *Resource Management*, 17(3), 504–522.
48
49
50 Kuvaas, B. (2007). Different relationships between perceptions of developmental
51 performance appraisal and work performance. *Personnel Review*, 36(3), 378–397.
52
53
54 Landy, F.J. & Farr, J.L. (1980). Performance rating. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87(1), 72–
55 107
56
57
58 Landy, F.J. & Farr, J.L. (1983). *The measurement of work performance: Methods, theory,*
59 *and applications*. Academic Press.
60
61
62 Latham, G.P., Almost, J., Mann, S. & Moore, C. (2005). New developments in
63 performance management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 34(1), 77–87.

1
2
3
4 Latham, G.P. & Wesley, K.N. (1977). Behavioral observation scales for performance
5 appraisal purposes *Personnel Psychology*, 30(2), 255–268.

6
7
8 Lawler, E.E. (1994). From job-based to competency-based organizations. *Journal of*
9 *Organizational Behavior*, 15(1), 3–15.

10
11 Lawler, E. E., & Rhode, J. G. (1976). Information and Control in Organisations
12 (Goodyear). *Pacific Palisades, CA*, 1976.

13
14
15 Levey, P., Tseng, S., Rosen, (2017). Performance Management: a marriage between
16 practice and science-just say I do, *Research in Personnel and Human Resource*
17 *Management*. 35. 155-213.

18
19 Levy, P.E., Cavanaugh, C.M., Frantz, N.B. & Borden, L. A. (2015). The role of due
20 process in performance appraisal: A 20-year retrospective. In: *The Oxford Handbook of*
21 *Justice in the Workplace*.

22
23
24 Levy, P.E. & Williams, J.R. (2004). The social context of performance appraisal: A
25 review and framework for the future. *Journal of Management*, 30(6), 881–905.

26
27 Leydesdorff, L. (2011). Bibliometrics/citation networks. In G.A. Barnett (Ed.), *The*
28 *Encyclopedia of Social Networks* (72–74). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

29
30
31 Longenecker, C. O., Sims Jr, H. P., & Gioia, D. A. (1987). Behind the mask: The politics
32 of employee appraisal. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 1(3), 183-193.

33
34
35 Longenecker, C.O. & Gioia, D.A. (1988). Neglected at the top: executives talk about
36 executive appraisal. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 29(2), 41–47.

37
38 Luffarelli, J., Gonçalves, D. & Stamatogiannakis, A. (2016). When feedback
39 interventions backfire: Why higher performance feedback may result in lower
40 self-perceived competence and satisfaction with performance. *Human Resource*
41 *Management*, 55(4), 591–614.

42
43
44 Maley, J. & Kramar, R. (2014). The influence of global uncertainty on the cross-border
45 performance appraisal: A real options approach. *Personnel Review*, 43(1), 19–40.

46
47
48 McCarthy, A.M. & Garavan, T.N. (2007). Understanding acceptance of multisource
49 feedback for management development. *Personnel Review*, 36(6), 903–917.

50
51 McKenna, S., Richardson, J. & Manroop, L. (2011). Alternative paradigms and the study
52 and practice of performance management and evaluation. *Human Resource Management*
53 *Review*, 21(2), 148–157.

54
55 Migiros, S.O. & Taderera, M.M. (2011). Evaluating the performance appraisal system in
56 the bank of Botswana. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(10), 3765–3776.

57
58
59 Milliman, J., Nason, S., Zhu, C. & De Cieri, H. (2002). An exploratory assessment of the
60 purposes of performance appraisal in North and Central America and the Pacific Rim.

1
2
3 *Human Resource Management*, 41(1), 87–102.

4
5
6 Murphy, K.R. & Cleveland, J. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social,*
7 *organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

8
9
10 Murphy, K.R. & Cleveland, J.N. (1991). *Performance appraisal: An organizational*
11 *perspective*. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

12
13
14
15
16 Murphy, K. R., Garcia, M., Kerkar, S., Martin, C., & Balzer, W. K. (1982). Relationship
17 between observational accuracy and accuracy in evaluating performance. *Journal of*
18 *Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 320.

19
20
21 Poon, J.M. (2004). Effects of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction and
22 turnover intention. *Personnel Review*, 33(3), 322–334.

23
24
25 Pulakos, E.D. & O’Leary, R.S. (2011). Why is performance management broken?
26 *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 4(2), 146–164.

27
28
29
30 Pulakos, E.D., Hanson, R.M., Arad, S. & Moye, N. (2015). Performance management can
31 be fixed: An on-the-job experiential learning approach for complex behavior
32 change. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 51–76.

33
34
35 Pulakos, Mueller-Hanson, and Arad, (2018). The evolution of performance management:
36 searching for value. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational*
37 *Behaviour*.6, 249-271.

38
39
40 Rabenu, E., & Tziner, A. (2016). Performance appraisal in a constantly changing work
41 world. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 370–377.

42
43
44 Ramos-Rodríguez, A.R. & Ruíz-Navarro, J. (2004). Changes in the intellectual structure
45 of strategic management research: A bibliometric study of the *Strategic Management*
46 *Journal*, 1980–2000. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(10), 981–1004.

47
48
49 Rosen, C. C., Kacmar, K. M., Harris, K. J., Gavin, M. B., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2017).
50 Workplace politics and performance appraisal: A two-study, multilevel field
51 investigation. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 24(1), 20-38.

52
53
54 Spence, J.R. & Keeping, L. (2011). Conscious rating distortion in performance appraisal:
55 A review, commentary, and proposed framework for research. *Human Resource*
56 *Management Review*, 21(2), 85–95.

57
58
59 Stanton, P. & Pham, H.T. (2014). Managing employee performance in an emerging
60 economy: perceptions of Vietnamese managers. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 20(2),
269–285.

Terjesen, S., Hessels, J. & Li, D. (2013). Comparative international entrepreneurship: A
review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 299–344.

Torraco, R. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples.
Human Resource Development Review, 4(3), 356–367.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Tuytens, M. & Devos, G. (2012). Importance of system and leadership in performance appraisal. *Personnel Review*, 41(6), 756–776.

Woehr, D. J. (1994). Understanding frame-of-reference training: The impact of training on the recall of performance information. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 525.

Woehr, D. J., & Huffcutt, A. I. (1994). Rater training for performance appraisal: A quantitative review. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 67(3), 189-205.

Woehr, D. J., & Feldman, J. (1993). Processing objective and question order effects on the causal relation between memory and judgment in performance appraisal: The tip of the iceberg. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 232.

	>1970	>1980	>1985	>1995
Landmark Studies	Latham & Wesley (1977); Lawler & Rhode (1976)	Ilgen <i>et al.</i> (1981); Landy & Farr (1980; 1983); Feldman (1981); Murphy <i>et al.</i> (1982); De Nisi <i>et al.</i> (1984)	Longenecker <i>et al.</i> (1987); Longenecker & Gioia (1988)	Borman (1994); Woehr & Huffcutt (1994); Woehr & Feldman (1993); Woehr (1994); Day & Sulsky (1995); Arvey & Murphy (1998)
	Measurement	Cognitive	Interview	Training
PA Methods	<p>Subjective appraisals →</p> <p>Increasing psychometric sophistication →</p> <p>Hybrids and system approaches →</p>			
PA Purpose	<p>Administration →</p> <p>Counselling and development →</p> <p>Planning →</p> <p>Legal →</p>			

Adapted from Murphy & Cleveland (1995)

Table 1: Historical Trends of PM Research 1970–1998

<i>Descriptor</i>	<i>x1</i>	<i>x2</i>	<i>F</i>
<i>ACROSS BORDERS</i>	,085	,390	208
<i>PM</i>	,146	,512	191
<i>RESEARCH SCHEMA</i>	,100	,207	177
<i>EFFECTIVENESS</i>	-,016	-,066	163
<i>QUANTITATIVE</i>	-,103	,137	157
<i>ASSESSMENT</i>	-,028	,442	142
<i>PERCEPTIONS</i>	-,263	-,452	113
<i>STRATEGY</i>	,284	,050	107
<i>EMPLOYEES</i>	-,204	-,181	94
<i>FEEDBACK</i>	-,219	,245	88
<i>ENGAGEMENT</i>	-,363	-,899	82
<i>HRM</i>	,780	,051	80
<i>RATER ACCURACY</i>	-,990	,261	76
<i>TENSIONS</i>	-1,016	-,538	72
<i>DEVELOPMENT</i>	-,116	-,290	71
<i>PUBLIC SECTOR</i>	-,062	-,251	68
<i>THEORIES</i>	-,759	-,580	59
<i>MNC</i>	1,170	-,339	58
<i>FAIRNESS</i>	-,698	-1,018	51
<i>GOALS</i>	-,255	,939	44
<i>COMPENSATION</i>	1,485	-,725	39
<i>KNOWLEDGE MGT</i>	,624	-,448	37
<i>ETHICS/CSR</i>	-,475	1,800	30
<i>JOB</i>	-1,326	-1,070	30
<i>CONTROL</i>	-,273	-,114	28
<i>EXECUTIVE PM</i>	,193	-,437	27
<i>GLOBALISATION</i>	2,107	-,659	27
<i>HR PROCESSES</i>	1,817	,429	25
<i>QUALITATIVE</i>	,138	,129	25
<i>ACADEMIC</i>	1,842	-,340	24
<i>BOTTOM-LINE</i>	1,965	-,092	20
<i>PSYCHOLOGICAL</i>	-1,947	-1,080	17
<i>MANAGING</i>	-2,356	-,137	16
<i>CRISIS</i>	,839	-1,664	14
<i>360</i>	-1,344	-,377	13
<i>CAPABILITIES</i>	,935	-1,562	11
<i>TQM</i>	-1,022	2,200	10
<i>IR</i>	1,711	-,175	7

Table 2: List of Descriptors

Cluster	Descriptors
Accuracy	Assessment, Quantitative, Goals, Rater Accuracy, 360, Control, Goals, Quantitative, Research Schema, Managing, Appraisal, TQM, Ethics/CSR, Goals
Firm-level	Control, Effectiveness, Bottom-line, Executive PM, HR, IR HR Processes, Managing, PM
Across borders	Strategy, Across Borders, Knowledge Management, MNC, Globalisation, HR processes, Crisis
Employee acceptability	Development, Feedback, Employees, Perceptions, Engagement, Tensions, Theories, Compensation, Psychological, Job, Capabilities, Compensation, PM, Psychological

Table 3: The 4 Major Clusters


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

International Journal of Manpower

Rank	Article	Title	Journal	Method	Findings	Citations*
1	Levy & Williams, 2004	The Social Context of Performance Appraisal: A Review and Framework for the Future	<i>JOM</i>	Literature review 1994–2004	This review of over 300 articles suggests field is more cognizant of the importance of the social context within which the performance appraisal operates.	806
2	Gruman & Saks, 2011	Performance management and employee engagement	<i>HRMR</i>	Conceptual	Examines critical key drivers of employee engagement and suggests a new perspective for fostering and managing employee engagement to increase job performance.	732
3	Fletcher, 2001	Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda	<i>JOOP</i>	Conceptual	The impact of multi-source feedback systems and? of cultural differences is likely to attract the research effort. However, research is needed to give practical guidance on conducting appraisals.	676
4	Den Hartog, Boselie & Paauwe, 2004	Performance management: A model and research agenda.	<i>Applied Psychology</i>	Conceptual	This paper presents a model for PM combining insights from strategic HRM and I/O psychology and adds to previous models by explicitly incorporating employee perceptions, the role of direct supervisors and possible reversed causality.	464
5	Kuvaas, 2006	Performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: mediating and moderating roles of work motivation	<i>IJHRM</i>	Quantitative	PA satisfaction was directly related to effective commitment and turnover intention.	433
6	Poon, 2004	Effects of appraisal politics on job satisfaction and turnover intention	<i>PR</i>	Quantitative	Results indicated that when employees perceive performance ratings as being manipulated they express reduced job satisfaction that leads to increased intention to quit.	340
7	Brown, Hyatt & Benson, 2010	Consequences of performance appraisal experience	<i>PR</i>	Quantitative	Employees with low-quality PA experiences were more likely to be dissatisfied with their job, be less committed to the firm and have increased intention to quit.	227
8	Latham, Almost, Mann & Moore, 2005	New developments in PM	<i>Org Dynamics</i>	Conceptual	Finds that coaching ensures a highly trained, highly motivated workforce.	220
9	Kuvaas, 2007	Different relationships between perceptions of developmental performance appraisal and work performance	<i>PR</i>	Quantitative	Autonomy orientation moderated the relationship between perceptions of developmental PA and work performance.	155
10	Biron, Farnsdale & Paauwe, 2011	Performance management effectiveness: lessons from world-leading firms	<i>IJHRM</i>	Qualitative	Creates a framework proposing to improve PM involving: strategic elements; senior managers' involvement in communicating and training performance raters.	137

Table 4: Top Ten Papers

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Abbreviations in map:
Aborders- across borders; Caps-capabilities; Develop-development; Effective- effectiveness; Exec PM- executive PM; HR -human resource processes; Percept- perceptions; Pub Sec- public sector; Schema- research schema; Strat-strategy; Qual-qualitative; Quant - quantitative.

Figure 1 Structure of the Selected Research Area