

IMPACT OF DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE ON THE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT OF RELIGIOUS SECTOR

Ivan Vas

The Graduate School, University of Santo Tomas, Philippines
Email: ivanvsvd@gmail.com

Dr. Hector M. Aguilung

Professor
The Graduate School, University of Santo Tomas, Philippines

CITATION: Vas, I, & Aguilung, H. M (2015) Impact of Demographic Profile on the Performance Measurement of Religious Sector. *International Journal of Human Resource and Procurement* 4 (5), 1-13.

ABSTRACT

Performance measurement is one of the most important keys to the success of an organization and its people. It is fundamental to high performance, improvement, decision making, problem solving and ultimately finding success in any human endeavour.

Effective management is built on the foundation of effective measurement and in turn measurement creates the most fundamental management system. It works as roadmap to navigate where one is going or verify how one is performing. It has predictive capabilities to discover whether a position is improving or worsening or whether it can be sustained. Moreover, people tend to do well what management measures and focuses attention to rather than what management expects. Performance measurement acts as eyes to see how well an employee is performing against commitments and determines whether an employee has actually accomplished what he is supposed to do.

In this study the researcher identifies the significant differences in the demographic profile of the respondents on the performance dimensions of religious sector.

Keywords: Performance Measurement, Dimensions, Demographic profile

INTRODUCTION

Performance measurement does not accomplish anything by itself. Different purposes require different measurements (Behn, 2003). The question is why measure performance? What is it that we are attempting to achieve by measuring performance? What is the rationale that connects measurement to some higher performance? How are people actually using these measures?

“Tell me how you measure me, and I will tell you how I will behave” writes Goldratt Eliyahu, the author of business classic, *The Goal*. According to him, all behavior can be predicted by what is being measured (Eliyahu, 2012). Organizations are faced with analogous situations where employees do something that is inconsistent with the values or goals of the organization, and many can’t understand why they did it (Spitzer, 2007).

Performance measurement is a lot more than technical aspects of measurement such as collecting data, calculations, analyzing data, statistics, etc. It is about perception, understanding, and insight that will drive positive and transformational impact on an organization and its people (Spitzer, 2007). In this study the researcher explores the perceptions of the respondents on different dimensions of performance of religious sector.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Franco-Santos et al. (2007), there is a lack of agreement on a definition of performance measurement across different disciplines. The U.S. General Accounting Office (1998) defines performance measurement as “the ongoing monitoring and reporting of program accomplishments, particularly progress towards pre-established goals.” It is conducted on an ongoing basis by the program or agency management, expressed as measurable performance standards to address whether a program has achieved its objectives. It serves as an early warning system to management and as a vehicle for improving accountability to the public (Longo, 2002). Here, a program may consist of any activity, project, function, or policy that has an identifiable purpose or set of objectives. It determines the type or level of program activities conducted (process), the direct products and services delivered by a program (outputs), and/or the results of those products and services (outcomes) (Artley, 2001).

Neely, Gregory and Platts (1995) define performance measurement as “the set of metrics used to quantify both the efficiency and effectiveness of actions.” They hold effectiveness as the extent to which customer requirements are met and efficiency as the measure of how economically the firm’s resources are utilized when providing a given level of customer satisfaction.

Some of the researchers hold that performance measurement in itself is quite incomplete because measurement alone cannot lead to improved performance. Slizyte and Bakanauskiene (2007) argue that performance measurement must be linked to the organizational strategic plan so that organizations can compare the actual levels of performance to pre-established target levels of performance and use performance measurement information to manage, improve and demonstrate what has been accomplished.

A performance measurement system, therefore, can be seen as a subsystem within a performance management system because performance management integrates measurement information with the business processes, the organizational and environmental contexts and the behaviors of various stakeholders to achieve desired outcomes (Bititci et al., 1997; Halachmi, 2005).

Performance measurement is a critical enabler for better understanding, managing, and improving Performance (Neely et al., 2005; Harbour, 2011). According to quality expert James Harrington, “if you can’t measure something, you can’t understand it. If you can’t understand it, you can’t control it. If you can’t control it, you can’t improve it” (Harrington, 2000).

Effective management is built on the foundation of effective measurement, and almost everything else is based on this (Frederick, 2001). Moreover, people tend to do well what

management measures and focuses attention to rather than what management expects. Performance measurement acts as eyes to see how well an employee is performing against commitments and determines whether an employee has actually accomplished what he is supposed to do (Artley, 2001). However, “the most powerful purpose of measurement is to improve, not to prove” (Spitzer, 2009).

According to Dean Spitzer, the author of *Transforming Performance Measurement* (2007), effective measurement serves several functions. Performance measurement clarifies performance expectations; increases the visibility of performance; enables goal-setting; forges increased strategic agreement and alignment; increases the holistic perspective at all levels; focuses attention on what is most important; promotes accountability; provides timely early-warning signals and facilitates prompt and appropriate corrective actions; increases the frequency and accuracy of feedback; motivates improvement and increases objectivity and the perception of fairness.

Robert Behn, a lecturer at Harvard University, has listed eight uses of performance measurement (Behn, 2003), namely: to evaluate; control; budget; motivate; promote; celebrate; learn; and improve. Correspondingly, he has identified the key concepts that the performance measurement can help to answer, namely: How well the organization is performing! How to ensure that the employees are doing the right thing! Where the management should allocate its resources! How to motivate all the stakeholders to do the things that are necessary to improve performance! How to promote visibility of good works! What accomplishments are worthy of celebrating as success! Why one thing works and another doesn't! What one thing should one do differently to improve performance! He states that the real purpose behind performance measurement is to improve performance. All other purposes are subordinate or means to achieve this ultimate purpose.

Performance measurement has strategic, administrative and developmental importance. It links individual goals with organization's goals and thereby reinforcing behaviors that are consistent with the attainment of organizational goals. It is a source of valid and useful information for making administrative decisions about employees, including promotions, employee retention or termination, recognition of superior performance, identification of poor performers, layoffs, and merit increases.

It allows employees to be informed about how well they are doing, to receive information on specific areas that may need improvement, and to learn about the organization's expectations and priorities. It includes feedback, which allows managers to coach employees and help them improve performance on an ongoing basis. Performance measurement yields information about skills, abilities, promotional potential, and assignment histories of current employees to be used in workforce planning as well as assessing future training needs, evaluating performance achievements at the organizational level, and evaluating the effectiveness of human resource interventions (Aguinis, 2009).

A recent opinion poll in the USA asked a group of individuals what they thought should be the government's top priority. Majority of them emphasized better management. In a world of diminishing resources, improving management of programs and services is critical. Performance measurement improves the management and delivery of services and also helps to justify programs and their costs (Artley, 2001).

In another study on 99 recently-published papers on the impact of performance measurement on organizational performance by Franco and Bourne (2004) revealed that the majority of

papers found that the performance measurement had a positive impact on organizational performance.

Through performance measurement, the continuous learning that occurs in the individuals to learn, adapt, and change can be embedded into systems, structures, procedures and strategy to make the organization a learning organization (Watkins and Marsick, 1997; Crossan et al., 2011); “where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together” (Senge, 1990).

Paul Rogers and Marcia Blenko (2006) opine that “the hallmark of any highly effective organization is making good decisions and making them better, faster, and more consistently than their competitors.” Measurement is the key to unlock high performance. Therefore, performance measurement is said to be the heart and soul of the performance-based management process. Drawing from the organizational mission and the strategic planning process, it provides the relevant data that will be collected, analyzed and reported to make sound decisions (Artley, 2001; Spitzer, 2007).

METHODOLOGY

Research Objectives

To explore the perceptions of respondents on the dimensions of performance measurement according to their demographic profile.

Research Design

This study adapted the mixed method approach with an exploratory design using stratified random sampling. The size of the sample was disproportionate because of the nature of the study.

RESULTS and DISCUSSIONS

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Classification		
Priests	274	33.1%
Religious (Brothers)	24	2.9%
Laymen	191	23.1%
Laywomen	339	40.9%
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	431	52.1%
Master's Degree	323	39%
Doctoral Studies	74	8.9%
Assignment		
Parish	214	25.8%
Institutional/ Administration	388	46.9%
Support Service	226	27.3%
Length of Service		
1 – 3 Years	300	36.23%

4 – 6 Years	131	15.82%
7 Years or More	397	47.95%

Tab.1 Demographic Profile

The study covered two hundred and seventy four (274) SVD religious priests, twenty-four (24) finally professed religious brothers, one hundred and ninety one lay men (191) and three hundred and thirty nine (339) lay women who are formal employees and beneficiaries of the services of SVD institutions/mission centres; comprising parishes, schools and mission animation and development centres in the three SVD provinces of Philippines namely, central, south and north.

The Perceptions of Respondents on the Dimensions of Performance Measurement According to Demographic Profile

To determine whether there is any significant difference at the level of 0.5 in the perceptions of respondents regarding the duties and expectations in each of the dimensions when grouped according to classification, educational attainment, assignment and length of service, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used.

		Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision	Description
DIM1 (Priestly)	Between Groups	4.480	20.106	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	223				
DIM2 (Prophetic)	Between Groups	3.766	17.518	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	215				
DIM3 (Kingly)	Between Groups	4.756	18.586	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	256				
DIM4 (Religious)	Between Groups	4.262	15.480	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	275				

Table 2. Consolidated Difference in the Perceptions of the Duties and Expectations in Each of the Dimensions

As shown in Table 2, the test results for DIM1 to DIM4 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA. The findings show that there is significant difference in the perceptions of the respondents (all p-value < .000) when grouped according to Classification, Educational Attainment and Assignment. This implies that the variances of the four (4) groups for DIM1 to DIM4 are not the same. The decision rule is reject the null hypothesis whenever the significant value is lower than the significant level (0.05). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected.

CLASSIFICATION

Therefore, the researcher conducted another Post Hoc Analysis (Multiple Comparison) to determine which group is significantly different. The participants were classified into four groups: group1_Priests (n = 274), group2_Religious Brothers (n = 24), group3_Laymen (n = 191), and group4_Laywomen (n = 339).

In terms of classification, the Post Hoc Analysis confirms that in the perceptions of priests and religious, there is no significant difference. However, difference between priests and religious and laymen/women is significant. In the Table 3 the significance is marked with asthars. Findings point out that priests and religious seem to have a better understanding of duties and expectations than laymen and lay women as they are the key performers of those functions. Mean value suggests laypeople have lower mean. This supports the idea of Smit (2000) that people in the top positions in the hierarchy of an organization desire good perceptions about the practices in order to meet the needs of the organization.

Dependent Variable	(I) Classifctn	(J) Classification	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	Decision	Description
DIM1 (Priestly)	Priests	Rel. Brothers	.02545	.800	Reject the Null	Significant
		Laymen	.25768 [*]	.000		
		Laywomen	.20983 [*]	.000		
	Rel. Bros	Priests	-.02545	.800	Reject the Null	Significant
		Laymen	.23223 [*]	.023		
		Laywomen	.18438	.064		
	Laymen	Priests	-.25768 [*]	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Rel. Brothers	-.23223 [*]	.023		
		Laywomen	-.04785	.262		
	Laywomen	Priests	-.20983 [*]	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Rel. Bros	-.18438	.064		
		Laymen	.04785	.262		
DIM2 (Prophetic)	Priests	Rel. Brothers	.12321	.209	Reject the Null	Significant
		Laymen	.26834 [*]	.000		
		Laywomen	.21078 [*]	.000		
	Rel. Bros	Priests	-.12321	.209	Reject the Null	Significant
		Laymen	.14514	.146		
		Laywomen	.08757	.368		
	Laymen	Priests	-.26834 [*]	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Rel. Brothers	-.14514	.146		
		Laywomen	-.05756	.167		
	Laywomen	Priests	-.21078 [*]	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Rel. Brothers	-.08757	.368		
		Laymen	.05756	.167		
DIM3 (Kingly)	Priests	Rel. Brothers	.06452	.549	Reject the Null	Significant
		Laymen	.25640 [*]	.000		
		Laywomen	.20071 [*]	.000		
	Rel. Bros	Priests	-.06452	.549	Reject the Null	Significant
		Laymen	.19187	.080		
		Laywomen	.13618	.203		
	Laymen	Priests	-.25640 [*]	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Rel. Brothers	-.19187	.080		
		Laywomen	-.05569	.224		
	Laywomen	Priests	-.20071 [*]	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Rel. Brothers	-.13618	.203		
		Laymen	.05569	.224		
DIM4 (Religious)	Priests	Rel. Brothers	.08993	.414	Reject the Null	Significant
		Laymen	.33603 [*]	.000		
		Laywomen	.23945 [*]	.000		
	Rel. Bros	Priests	-.08993	.414	Reject the Null	Significant
		Laymen	.24610 [*]	.028		
		Laywomen	.14952	.172		
	Laymen	Priests	-.33603 [*]	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Rel. Brothers	-.24610 [*]	.028		
		Laywomen	-.09657 [*]	.039		
	Laywomen	Priests	-.23945 [*]	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Rel. Brothers	-.14952	.172		
		Laymen	.09657 [*]	.039		

Table 3. Post Hoc Analysis of the Difference of Perceptions according to Classification

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

In order to trace the difference in the perceptions of the respondents in terms of educational attainment, the participants were classified into three groups: group1_Bachelor's degree (n = 431), group2_Master's degree (n = 323) and group3_Doctorate degree (n = 74).

		Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision	Description
DIM1 (Priestly)	Between Groups	1.963	8.584	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	.229				
DIM2 (Prophetic)	Between Groups	1.554	7.058	.001	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	.220				
DIM3 (Kingly)	Between Groups	1.530	5.809	.003	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	.263				
DIM4 (Religious)	Between Groups	.736	2.594	.075	Do not Reject the Null	Not Significant
	Within Groups	.284				

Table 4. Overall Significant Difference in the Perceptions according to Educational Attainment

The one-way ANOVA analysis test results as shown in Table 4 on the perception of respondents on the duties and expectations in terms of educational attainment indicates that DIM1 ($F = 8.58$, $p = .000$), DIM2 ($F = 7.06$, $p = .001$), and DIM3 ($F = 5.81$, $p = .003$), the scores point out that there is a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected in the first three dimensions of educational attainment.

This suggests that at least one or more group means differs from each other but cannot classify a specific group that differs from other groups. Moreover, the test result for DIM4 ($F = 2.59$, $p = .075$) indicates that there is no significant differences between the mean groups of the educational attainment.

Post Hoc test was performed according to the respondent's educational attainment groups to test the variances across responses for DIM1 to DIM4. The Post Hoc Analysis further validated the differences in perceptions according to their educational attainment. The test reveals that the probability value for DIM1 to DIM3 was smaller than the threshold significance level of .05 and suggests that there is a statistically significant difference. However, the probability value for DIM4 ($p < .075$) exceeds the threshold value of .05, which shows that there is no significant difference in the variance of the groups.

As seen in Table 5 the means for the Master's degree level is higher than the Bachelor's degree and all the more higher when it comes to the Doctorate degree. The Master's and Doctorate degree group have given higher ratings in their perceptions of duties and expectations than those with Bachelor's degree. Those with Master's and Doctorate degree are also found to be assigned in the institutions. This implies that the higher the education achieved by the respondents, the better understanding of their duties and expectations.

One's educational attainment affects a person's perception of things (Gutek, 2005). Hill et al. (2005) also found that those individuals with higher educational attainment or superior cognitive ability have a wider horizon in deciphering things. This may be attributed to the fact that these individuals have been trained in the higher education to look at things in different perspectives and angles.

Dependent Variable	(I) Educ.Atta	(J) Educ.Atta	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	Decision	Description
DIM1 (Priestly)	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	-.07604 [*]	.031	Reject the Null	Significant
		Doctorate Degree	-.23852 [*]	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
	Master's	Bachelor's	.07604 [*]	.031	Reject the Null	Significant
		Doctorate	-.16248 [*]	.009	Reject the Null	Significant
	Doctorate	Bachelor's	.23852 [*]	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Master's	.16248 [*]	.009	Reject the Null	Significant
DIM2 (Prophetic)	Bachelor's Degree	Master's	-.07984 [*]	.021	Reject the Null	Significant
		Doctorate	-.20345 [*]	.001	Reject the Null	Significant
	Master's	Bachelor's	.07984 [*]	.021	Reject the Null	Significant
		Doctorate	-.12362 [*]	.041	Reject the Null	Significant
	Doctorate	Bachelor's	.20345 [*]	.001	Reject the Null	Significant
		Master's	.12362 [*]	.041	Reject the Null	Significant
DIM3 (Kingly)	Bachelor's Degree	Master's	-.09563 [*]	.012	Reject the Null	Significant
		Doctorate	-.18368 [*]	.005	Reject the Null	Significant
	Master's	Bachelor's	.09563 [*]	.012	Reject the Null	Significant
		Doctorate	-.08805	.184		
	Doctorate	Bachelor's	.18368 [*]	.005	Reject the Null	Significant
		Master's	.08805	.184		
DIM4 (Religious)	Bachelor's Degree	Master's	-.05834	.137		
		Doctorate	-.13684 [*]	.041	Reject the Null	Significant
	Master's	Bachelor's	.05834	.137		
		Doctorate	-.07850	.253		
	Doctorate	Bachelor's	.13684 [*]	.041	Reject the Null	Significant
		Master's	.07850	.253		

Table 5. Post Hoc Analysis of the Difference according to Educational Attainment

ASSIGNMENT

There is a significant difference in the perceptions when grouped according to assignment. The participants were grouped into: group1_Parish (n = 214), group2_Institution and Administration (n = 388), and group3_Support Service (n = 226).

The one-way ANOVA analysis test results shown in Table 6 regarding the perception of respondents on the duties and expectations in terms of assignment presents that the probability value for DIM1 to DIM4 is less than the .05 level of significance and shows there is a statistically significant difference (all p-value < .000). This implies that the variances of the four (4) classification groups for DIM1 to DIM4 were different factor from each other. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected.

		Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision	Description
DIM1 (Priestly)	Between Groups	4.933	22.220	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	.222				
DIM2 (Prophetic)	Between Groups	4.564	21.569	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	.212				
DIM3 (Kingly)	Between Groups	5.325	20.708	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	.257				
DIM4 (Religious)	Between Groups	5.785	22.018	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
	Within Groups	.263				

Table 6. Overall Significant Difference in the Perceptions According to Assignment

Further, Post Hoc test was conducted to navigate the exact differences. It certifies that there is a marked difference in perceptions while in different positions. When one is assigned to different positions, his or her opinion about expected duties differs.

Dependent Variable	(I) Pres.Assi	(J) Pres.Assi	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	Decision	Description
DIM1 (Priestly)	Parish	Institution/Adm	.20064	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Support Service	-.05825	.242		
	Institution/Adm	Parish	-.20064*	.000		
		Support Service	-.25888	.000		
DIM2 (Prophetic)	Parish	Institution/Adm	.18081	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Support Service	-.07756	.111		
	Institution/Adm	Parish	-.18081*	.000		
		Support Service	-.25837*	.000		
DIM3 (Kingly)	Parish	Institution/Adm	.19586	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Support Service	-.08281	.123		
	Institution/Adm	Parish	-.19586*	.000		
		Support Service	-.27866	.000		
DIM4 (Religious)	Parish	Institution/Adm	.20538	.000	Reject the Null	Significant
		Support Service	-.08421	.120		
	Institution/Adm	Parish	-.20538*	.000		
		Support Service	-.28959*	.000		
Support Service	Parish	.08421	.120	Reject the Null	Significant	
	Institution/Adm	.28959*	.000			

Table 7. Post Hoc Analysis of the Difference in the Perceptions of the Duties in each of the Dimensions according to Assignment

According to the mean level, in all the dimensions, those in the institutions have better understanding of their duties and expectations. This can be attributed to the higher education of the individuals as observed in the previous results in educational attainment groups. According to Schein (2004), leaders have the best perspective because of their position in the organization and that they are able to see the dynamics working within and around.

This result may be also explained by the fact that those who are performing the duties are required to faithfully know, understand and live up to the calling. According to Weisbord (2000), organizations need to continually monitor their environment and their functions to assess whether or not their purposes are still relevant. In addition, the test results indicate that the higher the position, the better the perception of one's duty. It can be also said that the group with higher level of education is also the group which holds higher positions in the institution.

LENGTH OF SERVICE

		Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision	Description
DIM1 (Priestly)	Between Groups	.256	1.100	.360	Do not Reject the Null	Not Significant
	Within Groups	.233				
DIM2 (Prophetic)	Between Groups	.206	.923	.504	Do not Reject the Null	Not Significant
	Within Groups	.224				
DIM3 (Kingly)	Between Groups	.144	.539	.847	Do not Reject the Null	Not Significant
	Within Groups	.268				
DIM4 (Religious)	Between Groups	.292	1.025	.418	Do not Reject the Null	Not Significant
	Within Groups	.285				

Table 8. Overall Difference in the Perceptions according to the Length of Service

The above data in the Table 8 reveals that regardless of how long one has stayed in the service, his/her understanding of duties and expectations remains the same. This means that individuals whether they have already been long in the service (7 years or more), or have just been there for a shorter period of time (1-3 years), have the same perceptions of duties and expectations. It does not have an effect on how the respondents perceive priestly duties. Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

This is contrary to the claim of Lewin (2003) and Wells (2005) that employees who have reached an ample number of years serving an institution are completely adjusted and have a higher grasp of the things. However, this is partly in support to the account of Riordan and colleagues (2001) that employees in the lower level of the hierarchy and those who are newly-hired use socialization or any other forms of recreation to get to know things faster.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings show that there is a significant difference (all p-value < .000) in the perceptions of the respondents on the duties and expectations in each of the dimensions when grouped according to Classification, Educational Attainment and Assignment.

In terms of duties and expectations the perceptions differ in each dimension when grouped according to demographic profile of the respondents. The Post Hoc Analysis confirms that in the perceptions of priests and religious, there is no significant difference. However, difference between priests and religious and laymen/women is significant. Findings point out that priests and religious seem to have a better understanding of duties and expectations than laymen and lay women as they are the key performers of those functions.

In the category of educational attainment, the means for the Master's degree level is higher than the Bachelor's degree and all the more higher when it comes to the Doctoral degree. This implies that the higher the education achieved by the respondents, the better understanding of their duties and expectations.

When one is assigned to different positions, his or her opinion about expected duties differs. Those in the institutions have better understanding of their duties and expectations. This can be attributed to the higher education of the individuals as observed in the previous results in educational attainment groups.

Findings suggest that regardless of how long one has stayed in the service, his/her understanding of duties and expectations remains the same.

REFERENCES

- Aguinis, Herman. (2009). An Expanded View of Performance Management. In Smither, James W. and London, Manuel (Eds.), *Performance Management: Putting Research into Action* (pp.1-703). Jossey-Bass Pub.
- Artley, W. and Stroh, Suzanne. (2001). *The Performance-Based Management Handbook* (2). California: U.S. Department of Energy and Oak Ridge Associated Universities.
- Behn, R. D. (2003). Why Measure Performance? Different Purposes Require Different Measures. *Public Administration Review*, 63 (5), 586-606.
- Bititci, U.S., Carrie, A.S., and Mc Devitt, L. (1997). Integrated performance measurement systems: a development guide. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 17 (5), 522-534A. (2014).
- Crossan, M.M. Clark., Maurer, C. C., and White. (2011). Reflections on the 2009 AMR decade award: Do we have a theory of organizational learning? *Academy Management Review*, 36, 446-460.
- Eliyahu, Goldratt. (2012). *The Goal*. North River Press.

- Franco, M. and Bourne, M. C. S. (2004). Are strategic performance measurement systems really effective: a closer look at the evidence. *Proceedings of the EurOMA Conference, INSEAD*, 2, 163-174.
- Franco-Santos, Monica, Mike Kennerley, Pietro Micheli, Veronica Martinez, Steve Mason, and Andrew Neely. (2007). Towards a Definition of a Business Performance Measurement System. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 27 (8), 784-801.
- Frederick, Reichheld. (2001). *The Loyalty Effect*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Gutek, G.L. (2005). History of Education. Microsoft@Encarta (CD).
- Halachmi, A. (2005). Performance measurement is only one way of managing performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 54 (7), 502-516.
- Harbour, J. L. (2011). The Three "D's" of Successful Performance Measurement: Design, Data, And Display. *Performance Improvement*, 50 (2), 1-9.
- Harrington, H. J. (2000). *Business Process Improvement: The Breakthrough Strategy for Total Quality, Productivity, and Competitiveness*. Mc Graw-Hill Inc., New York.
- Hill, C.E., Hoffman, M.A., S.E., and Freitas, G.F. (2005). Supervisor Perspective on the process and outcome of giving easy, difficult, or no feedback to supervisees. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 52,3-13.
- Lewin, D. (2003). Incentive Compensation in the Public Sector, Evidence and Potential. *Journal of Labor Research*, (pp. 597-621).
- Longo, Paul J. (2002). *The Performance Blueprint: An Integrated Logic Model Developed To Enhance Performance Measurement Literacy: The Case of Performance-Based Contract Management* (pp. 1-20). Arlington: EDRS.
- Neely, A., Gregory, M., and Platts, K. (1995). Performance measurement system design: A literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 15(4), 80-116.
- Neely, A., Gregory, M., and Platts, K. (2005). Performance measurement system design: a literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 25 (12), 1228-1263.
- Paul Rogers, and Marcia, Blenko. (2006). The high-performance organization: making good decisions and making them happen. *Handbook of Business Strategy*, 7 (1), 133-142.
- Riordan, C.M., Weatherly, E. W., Vandenberg, R. J., and Self, R. M. (2001). The effects of pre-entry experiences and socialization tactics on newcomer attitudes and turnover. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13 (2), 159-177.

- Schein, E. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: the art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Slizyte, Asta., and Bakanauskiene, Irena. (2007). Designing Performance Measurement System in Organization. *Organizacija Vadyba*, 43, 135-148.
- Smit, M.E.T.H. (2000). HR, Show Me the Money, Presenting an Exploratory Model that can Measure if HR Adds Value. *HR Focus*.
- Spitzer, D. R. (2007). *Transforming Performance Measurement: Rethinking the Way We Measure and Drive Organizational Success*. Washington, D.C.: AMACOM Pub.
- Spitzer, D. R. (2009). Rethinking the Way We Measure and Drive Organizational Success. *Business Performance Conference* (pp. 1-55). Miami, Florida: ITPMG.
- Watkins, K. E., and Marsick, V. J. (1997). *Dimensions of learning Organization* (DLOQ) Warwick, RI: Partners for the Learning Organization.
- Weisbord, M. (2000). Organisational Diagnosis: Six Places to Look for Trouble with or without the Theory. *HR Matters Newsletter*, 1 (2), 430-447.