

Division Head Supervision and Employee Performance at the Majalengka Regency Transportation Agency

Alvin Gilang Nugraha¹, Aceng Jarkasih²

^{1,2} Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Majalengka, Majalengka, Indonesia
alvinsergio023@gmail.com¹, acengiarkasih@unma.ac.id²

Submit: 2024-11-26	Accepted: 2024-12-24	Published: 2024-12-30
--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes supervision by the Head of Division in an effort to improve employee performance in the Traffic Division of the Majalengka Regency Transportation Agency, identifies implementation barriers, and explains the corrective measures undertaken. A descriptive method with a quantitative approach supported by qualitative data was applied. All 67 employees in the Traffic Division were included as respondents using total sampling. Data were collected through questionnaires, a structured interview with the Head of Division, non-participant observation, documentation, and literature review. Questionnaire data were analyzed using percentages, while interview and observation results were used to interpret the findings. The average score for supervision was 69.55%, categorized as moderately good. Direct supervision reached 66.67%, while indirect supervision reached 73.88%. Employee performance averaged 72.57%, also categorized as moderately good; work quality reached 75.38%, quantity 70.90%, reliability 73.13%, and attitude 70.90%. The main constraints were the supervisor's limited time and differences in employees' ability to understand instructions and communicate reports. Corrective efforts included delegation of authority, supervision scheduling, communication training, and opportunities for further education. The findings underline the need for balanced supervision combining field observation, reporting, feedback, and employee development. The relationship between supervision and performance is interpreted descriptively rather than causally because no inferential test was conducted.

Keywords: employee performance; performance management; public organizations; supervision; traffic

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31949/fbmj.v2i2.19524>

Copyright © 2024 Finance and Business Management Journal, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Majalengka. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

Employee performance is an important prerequisite for the success of public organizations in translating authority, programs and service standards into work results that are felt by the public. In local government organizations, performance quality is not only assessed by the amount of work completed, but also by accuracy, thoroughness, reliability, work behavior, compliance with procedures, and the ability to respond to field needs. Because public sector work takes place in an environment full of rules, diverse goals, and demands for accountability, performance management must link organizational goals to individual work behavior and outcomes.

Performance management cannot be narrowed down to an assessment at the end of the period. Brown et al. (2019) indicate that performance management is a series that includes setting expectations, monitoring, feedback, assessment, and development. Kroll (2015) also emphasized that performance information will be useful if it is used in decision making, is supported by leadership, has clear objectives, and comes from an adequate measurement system. Thus, supervision is part of the performance

management cycle which functions to ensure conformity between plans, implementation and corrective actions.

In organizational practice, supervision can be carried out directly or indirectly. Direct supervision allows leaders to observe work processes, check factual conditions, clarify deviations, and provide corrections as work progresses. Indirect supervision relies on written or verbal reports to assess work progress and results. These two forms should complement each other. Direct supervision provides context that is often not apparent in reports, while indirect supervision provides administrative traces and information that can be compared over time.

The effectiveness of a performance management system is also determined by how employees perceive the clarity, accuracy, fairness and usefulness of the system. Sharma, Sharma, and Agarwal (2016) developed a measure of the effectiveness of a performance management system based on employee perceptions and placed process clarity and consistency of implementation as important elements. Van Waeyenberg et al. (2017) found that satisfaction with the performance management system and affective commitment play a role in explaining civil servants' attitudes towards the organization. This means that supervision that only emphasizes finding mistakes risks losing the coaching function and does not automatically result in improved performance.

Feedback and assessments that are perceived as fair can encourage employee engagement. Vidè et al. (2023) show that performance appraisal in public organizations becomes more meaningful when it is understood to have developmental goals and is carried out with interactional justice. Awan et al. (2020) also found that the effectiveness of the performance management system is related to performance through work engagement. Therefore, supervision findings should be followed up with clear communication, opportunities to improve work, and support for competency development.

The literature also warns that control instruments can have undesirable consequences if applied mechanically. Franco-Santos and Doherty (2017) explain that the relationship between performance management and employee welfare is complex; the pressure of poorly managed targets and measurements can impact the work experience. Van Waeyenberg, Peccei, and Decramer (2022) show that performance management can be related to performance through commitment, but can also be related to burnout. Therefore, the intensity of supervision needs to be accompanied by realistic priorities, dialogue and work support.

In the public sector, aspects of behavior, ethics, leadership and organizational context have as important a role as formal measures. Asif and Rathore (2021) emphasized that the performance of public organizations is not sufficiently explained through measurement indicators, but is also influenced by motivation, leadership, culture, commitment and employee behavior. Khaltar and Moon (2020) found that performance management and ethics management are related to the performance of public organizations, including through organizational commitment and reduced unethical behavior. In the context of supervision, objectivity, consistency and exemplary leadership are the foundations for control to be accepted as an improvement mechanism.

Excessive or non-value-added procedures can also reduce the benefits of monitoring. Blom, Borst, and Voorn's (2021) meta-analysis shows that red tape is associated with various negative consequences for employees and organizations. These findings are relevant to distinguishing supervision that produces useful information from simply adding to the report. Written and oral reports must be designed to be concise, verifiable, timely, and actually used to provide decisions or corrections.

Competency development is an important part of supervisory follow-up. Siraj and Hågen (2023) show that a performance management system that is integrated with planning, assessment and development can support employee performance. Differences in ability to understand instructions and submit reports therefore cannot be adequately handled by intensifying control, but require training, mentoring, appropriate division of tasks, and two-way communication.

The Traffic Division of the Majalengka Regency Transportation Agency carries out administrative and field work that requires accuracy, coordination, discipline and quick response. The Head of Division has the function of planning activities, dividing tasks, supervising implementation, and reporting traffic matters. The nature of field work means that report-based information alone is not always sufficient. Initial observations in the research manuscript show that there are still employees who have not carried out maximum regulation, guarding, guiding and monitoring of traffic as well as traffic operational control targets that have not been achieved according to plan.

This problem is thought to be related to the lack of optimal supervision in the workplace and the tendency for supervision to emphasize written and verbal reports without consistent field inspections. On the other hand, limited leadership time and variations in employee abilities become operational obstacles. This condition requires an analysis that not only presents the value of supervision and performance, but also explains the form of supervision, obstacles to implementation, and corrective steps that have been taken.

This research aims to analyze the implementation of supervision by the Head of Division in an effort to improve the performance of employees in the Traffic Division of the Majalengka Regency Transportation Agency, identify obstacles to the implementation of supervision, and explain the efforts made to overcome these obstacles. The practical novelty of the research lies in mapping the balance between direct and indirect supervision in government units that have field activities. Academically, the research places local data in the latest performance management discussions for the 2015–2023 period.

METHODS

The research was carried out in the Traffic Division of the Majalengka Regency Transportation Agency for six months, namely January to June 2023. The research used a descriptive method with a quantitative approach supported by qualitative data. This approach was chosen to describe the conditions of supervision and employee performance based on respondents' responses, then interpret the results using interviews, observations and organizational documents.

The research population was all 67 employees in the Traffic Division, not including the Head of the Division because he was the subject of supervision being assessed. All members of the population were used as respondents using total sampling technique. The use of the entire population allows the research to obtain an overview of employee responses in the units studied without sampling.

The supervision variable is operationalized through two dimensions. Direct supervision includes direct inspections, on-the-spot observations and requests for on-site reports while work is in progress (on-the-spot reports). Indirect supervision includes written reports and oral reports. Employee performance variables are measured through four dimensions, namely work quality, quantity of work, reliability and attitude. Quality of work includes accuracy and thoroughness of results; quantity includes suitability of results to targets and work volume; reliability includes the ability to work together as well as diligence; while attitude includes sincerity and determination in work.

Data was collected using questionnaires, structured interviews, non-participant observation, documentation, and literature study. Questionnaires were given to 67 respondents. Interviews were conducted with Head of the Division to obtain explanations regarding supervisory practices and the obstacles faced. Observation is used to compare respondents' answers with work implementation conditions, while documentation is used to understand tasks, structures, targets and activity reports.

Questionnaire data processing is carried out through checking the completeness of answers, tabulation, frequency calculations and percentages. The percentage results were grouped into the assessment categories used in the original study: 76–100% good, 56–75% fair, 40–55% poor, and less than 40% not good. Interviews and observations were analyzed thematically to provide context for the numbers and identify barriers and improvement efforts.

The research analysis is descriptive. The comparison of the supervision value of 69.55% and performance of 72.57% is used to read trends in unit conditions, not to prove causal influence. No test results for correlation, regression, effect size, or control of other variables are available. This limitation of interpretation is important so that conclusions are consistent with the design and available evidence.

The validity of the interpretation is strengthened through a comparison of three sources of information, namely questionnaire responses, statements from the Head of Division, and field observations. Discrepancies between sources are not removed, but are used to explain why some indicators are considered moderately good by the majority of respondents while observations still reveal late reporting, limited inspections, or lack of discipline in behavior.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research results showed that the implementation of supervision by the Head of Division obtained an average score of 69.55% and was included in the moderately good category. This value shows that the supervision element has been implemented, but its consistency and depth still need to be strengthened. These findings are in line with the views of Brown et al. (2019) that performance management must be understood as an ongoing process, not a series of stand-alone administrative activities.

Direct supervision reached an average of 66.67%. In the direct inspection indicator, the value obtained was 64.18%. Interview results showed that inspections had been carried out, but their frequency was limited by the amount of work and time constraints of the Head of Division. Observations found that inspections were not always present when field work was taking place, so there was still lack of discipline in behavior and the implementation of duties was not optimal. These findings show that there is a gap between the existence of monitoring procedures and the consistency of their implementation.

Workplace observations reached 65.67%. A total of 44 respondents or 65.67% stated that the Head of Division always made direct observations when the task was in progress; Other respondents gave answers often, rarely, or never. This value shows that observation has become a supervisory practice, but not evenly distributed in every activity. Delays in submitting reports and non-compliance with implementation with provisions are still found through research observations.

The on-site report when the work was in progress received a score of 70.15%. A total of 47 respondents stated that the Head of Division always asked for reports on the spot. The practice helps leaders know progress, obstacles, and interim results without waiting for work to be completed. However, on-site reports still need to be verified with field conditions. Kroll (2015) emphasizes that performance information is useful if the data quality is adequate and can actually be used in managerial decisions.

Indirect supervision obtained an average score of 73.88%, higher than direct supervision. These findings indicate that written and verbal report mechanisms are easier to implement routinely than inspections and field observations. This efficiency is beneficial for the continuity of information, but the dominance of reports can create weaknesses if leaders do not have the opportunity to check the context and accuracy of the data.

The difference in value between direct and indirect supervision reinforces the main problem stated in the source text, namely that supervision tends to rely on reports. The reporting system does not need to be reduced, but needs to be combined with risk-based inspection. Work that has safety impacts, complaints, targets that are not achieved, or indications of irregularities needs to receive inspection priority. This approach can reduce the burden on leaders without eliminating supervisory presence in the field.

Table 1. Recapitulation of Supervision Implementation

No.	Dimensions/indicators	Score (%)
-----	-----------------------	-----------

1	Direct inspection	64.18
2	Workplace observation	65.67
3	On-site reporting	70.15
	Average direct supervision score	66.67
4	Written reporting	—
5	Oral reporting	—
	Average indirect supervision score	73.88
	Overall average supervision score	69.55

Source: Research results, 2023.

Khaltar and Moon (2020) show that the performance of public organizations is influenced by the relationship between performance management, ethics, leadership and commitment. In the context of this research, field inspections are not just an activity to check employee attendance, but also a means of clarifying standards of behavior, demonstrating exemplary behavior, and emphasizing the consequences of deviations. Supervision will be stronger if leaders explain the reasons behind work standards and link them to safety and the quality of traffic services.

Employee performance received an average score of 72.57% and was included in the moderately good category. This value shows that most performance indicators have run at an adequate level, but have not consistently reached the good category. Asif and Rathore (2021) explain that public sector performance is influenced by a combination of measurement factors and behavioral factors. Therefore, improvements are not simply made through adding indicators; Organizations also need to pay attention to motivation, communication, ability, discipline and working conditions.

The work quality dimension obtained an average of 75.38%, the highest among the performance dimensions. The accuracy of work results reached 74.63%, while precision reached 76.12%. These results indicate that accuracy has entered the good category, but accuracy remained at the moderately good threshold. Precision should be maintained through checklists, result verification, and feedback, while accuracy should be reinforced through clarity of instructions, time standards, and work priorities.

The quantity of work dimension reached 70.90%. The conformity of results with the target amount reached 71.64%, while the volume of work that exceeded the target reached 70.15%. This finding is consistent with the initial problem in the form of traffic operational control targets that have not been fully achieved. Target discussions need to take into account resources, variations in field load, and changes in the situation, so that targets function as work directions and not just administrative numbers.

Reliability dimensions reached 73.13%. The ability to work together and craft each got 73.13%. Traffic work requires coordination between personnel, division of areas, obedience to command, and readiness to face changes in the field. A fairly good score indicates that the basis for cooperation is in place, but strengthening briefings, division of roles, and evaluation after activities are still needed.

The attitude dimension obtained an average of 70.90%. Seriousness in work reached 70.15% and determination in work reached 71.64%. Attitude is a dimension that is sensitive to the way leaders give direction, treat employees, and follow up on the results of supervision. Vidè et al. (2023) show that developmental goals and interactional justice in performance appraisal are related to public employee engagement. Corrections therefore need to be delivered specifically, respectfully, and oriented towards actions that can be corrected.

The data shows that the supervision value of 69.55% and performance of 72.57% are in the same category. The similarity of these categories supports the practical assumption that the quality of

supervision goes hand in hand with performance conditions. However, this study did not perform statistical testing to assess the strength of the relationship or confirm causation. Performance can also be influenced by competence, facilities, leadership, workload, motivation, culture and environmental factors. Therefore, findings should be interpreted as descriptive associations.

Table 2. Recapitulation of Employee Performance

No.	Dimensions/indicators	Score (%)
1	Quality of work	75.38
	Accuracy of work results	74.63
	Precision of work results	76.12
2	Quantity of work	70.90
	Conformity of results to targets	71.64
	Volume of work	70.15
3	Reliability	73.13
	Ability to work together	73.13
	Diligence	73.13
4	Attitude	70.90
	Commitment to work	70.15
	Perseverance at work	71.64
	Overall average employee performance	72.57

Source: Research results, 2023.

Awan et al. (2020) found that an effective performance management system can be related to performance through work engagement. The implication is that supervision in the traffic sector should not stop at recording deficiencies. Inspection results and reports need to be turned into feedback, improvement agreements, resource support, and follow-up monitoring. This mechanism helps employees see supervision as a support for work achievement.

The first obstacle is the limited time of the Head of Division. The large number of responsibilities means that on-site inspections and observations cannot be carried out on all activities. Efforts that have been made are delegation of authority and preparation of more efficient schedules. This step is appropriate, but delegation requires clarity on the party monitoring, the indicators being examined, the limits of authority, and how to report findings.

Supervision priorities can be set based on risks and performance deviations. Activities with high safety impacts, targets not achieved, complaints, repeated errors, or new personnel need to receive a higher frequency of observation. Routine, low-risk activities can be monitored through concise reports and random inspections. This approach supports the more targeted use of performance information as emphasized by Kroll (2015).

The second obstacle is differences in individual abilities. Some employees have not been able to convey clear verbal reports or understand the leadership's instructions while on duty in the field. Efforts made include communication training, participation in seminars, and providing opportunities to continue education. Siraj and Hågen (2023) place employee development as an important component of the

performance management system, so this step needs to be linked to competency needs discovered through supervision.

Organizations can use simple briefing and reporting formats. Field instructions can include objectives, location, time, role division, standard results, risks, and escalation mechanisms. Oral reportings can follow a sequence of situations, actions, results, and follow-up needs. Written reportings can use consistent data fields to make them easier to verify. This simplification is important because Blom et al. (2021) show that procedures that are perceived as burdensome can result in negative consequences for employees and the organization.

Supervision also needs to pay attention to welfare and workload. Franco-Santos and Doherty (2017) and Van Waeyenberg et al. (2022) warn that performance management systems can produce both commitment and fatigue, depending on their design and implementation. Increasing the frequency of inspections without resourcing or prioritizing improvements can add stress but does not address the root of the problem. Therefore, supervisory findings must differentiate between disciplinary problems, unclear procedures, lack of competence, and limited resources.

Fairness and accuracy are conditions for acceptance of supervision. Sharma et al. (2016) show the importance of employee perceptions of system effectiveness, while Van Waeyenberg et al. (2017) emphasized the role of system satisfaction and affective commitment. The Head of the Division needs to ensure that indicators are known in advance, evidence is checked, employees have the opportunity to provide explanations, and follow-up is implemented consistently. This process can reduce subjective impressions and strengthen the legitimacy of supervision.

Overall, the findings demonstrate the need for an integrated supervision model. The model includes standard setting, pre-task briefings, direct risk-based monitoring, concise written and verbal reporting, information verification, immediate feedback, improvement plans, development support, and follow-up evaluation. This cycle is in line with the understanding of performance management as a continuous process proposed by Brown et al. (2019).

The practical contribution of the research is to provide an empirical picture of the relative imbalance between direct and indirect supervision. Indirect supervision scored higher, but initial problems demonstrated the need for field verification. Therefore, the main recommendation is not to replace reports with inspections, but rather to organize a combination of the two based on risks, targets and history of deviations.

The research has limitations. Data comes from one field in one agency, uses perception assessments, and is analyzed descriptively. The instrument is not accompanied by validity and reliability test information in the source text. Additionally, cross-sectional designs cannot assess changes in performance before and after supervision interventions. Future research could use validated instruments, objective performance indicators, correlation or regression analysis, and longitudinal designs.

Employee acceptance of supervision is an important aspect that has not been specifically measured in this research. Technically sound supervision will not necessarily result in changes in behavior if employees view the process as inconsistent, nontransparent, or irrelevant to the job. Harrington and Lee (2015) showed that psychological contract fulfillment plays a role in shaping perceptions of the fairness of performance appraisals in federal agencies. In the context of the Traffic Division, the psychological contract can be reflected in the expectation that the division of tasks is carried out fairly, facilities are available, leaders are present when difficulties arise, and achievements and shortcomings are assessed based on evidence. Therefore, supervision should start with an explanation of standards, objectives, indicators and follow-up. Employees also need to know that supervision data will be used for coaching, process improvement and accountable decision making.

Kim and Holzer (2016) found that public employees' perceptions of the assessment process were influenced by various factors that preceded it, including process characteristics and the organizational

environment. These findings emphasize the importance of building the legitimacy of everyday supervision. Legitimacy does not only come from the structural authority of the Head of Division, but also from the consistency between directions, actions and decisions. If similar violations are handled differently or targets change without communication, employees may perceive monitoring as subjective. In contrast, if leaders use the same criteria, examine evidence, listen to explanations, and provide proportional follow-up, supervision is more likely to be accepted as a normal part of the job. The practical implication is the need for concise guidelines that contain the object of supervision, schedule, person in charge, evidence examined, classification of findings, and deadline for completion.

The quality of supervision is also determined by the use of the results. Iqbal et al. (2019) emphasized that the effectiveness of performance appraisal must be seen from the criteria for its use, not just from the existence of the instrument. In the Traffic Division, every finding should be directed to a clear form of follow-up, for example immediate correction, improving procedures, coaching, training, adjusting targets, providing facilities, or recognizing achievements. Without follow-up, inspections and reports only result in an accumulation of information. Organizations can use a simple follow-up checklist that records findings, initial cause, agreed actions, person responsible, deadline, and completion status. This list also helps the Head of the Division manage time constraints because attention can be focused on findings that are incomplete, repetitive, or have a high risk to safety and service.

The balance between control and development objectives needs to be formulated explicitly. Hajnal and Staroňová (2021) show that civil service appraisal systems cannot always be simply separated into incentive-oriented and development-oriented models; both can exist as different dimensions. For the Traffic Division, supervision is necessary to ensure compliance, discipline and target achievement, but the results of supervision must also identify learning needs. Errors caused by negligence need to be differentiated from errors resulting from unclear instructions, lack of practice, or inadequate facilities. This distinction determines the managerial response. Disciplinary violations may require rule enforcement, while competency deficiencies require re-demonstration, mentoring, training, or gradual assignment.

Leadership behavior during the performance management process is related to employees' sense of fairness and involvement. Stankevičiūtė and Savanevičienė (2021) show a link between leader behavior in performance management, organizational justice, and work engagement in the public sector. This is relevant to the communication barriers found. When employees have difficulty understanding instructions or conveying verbal reports, leadership responses need to be diagnostic. Leaders can ask employees to repeat key instructions, use example situations, provide reporting formats, and ensure operational terms are understood equally. This kind of communication reduces mistakes while showing support. Feedback should also discuss observable behavior and results, not label the employee's personality, so that correction remains firm without being condescending.

Based on the findings, strengthening supervision can be implemented in three stages. The first stage is basic standardization which includes determining indicators, briefing formats, report formats, risk classification and follow-up recording. The second stage is the implementation of priority-based supervision through scheduled inspections, random checks and observations of high-risk activities. The third stage is a monthly evaluation that compares targets, findings, corrective actions, and performance changes. Evaluations don't have to add to long meetings; organizations can use short meetings with summarized data. This gradual approach keeps supervisory reform realistic and does not unnecessarily increase administrative burdens.

Indicators of improvement success also need to go beyond inspection frequency. Organizations can monitor the percentage of follow-up actions completed on time, the reduction in repeated errors, the accuracy of reporting, the achievement of operational targets, the number of training needs that are followed up, and employee perceptions of the clarity and fairness of supervision. A combination of

outcome, process and perception indicators will provide a more complete picture. The data can be compared between months to see trends, but interpretation must take into account changes in workload and field conditions. Thus, increased supervision is not measured by how often the leadership is present to inspect, but rather by how effective the supervisory information is in producing work improvements, strengthening competence, and more reliable traffic services.

Implementation of recommendations requires institutional support so that it does not depend entirely on the personal initiative of the Head of Division. Departments can establish supervision mechanisms as work procedures, integrate them with performance targets, and review their effectiveness periodically. Consistent documentation also allows changes in officials or changes in personnel not to break the follow-up history. At the same time, procedures must remain flexible in the face of dynamic traffic conditions. Operational discretion can be granted as long as the reasons for decisions are recorded and the results are evaluated. In this way, supervision functions as an organizational learning system: field experience is transformed into information, information into decisions, and decisions into improvements in work standards.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of supervision by the Head of the Traffic Division of the Majalengka Regency Transportation Agency reached an average of 69.55% and was included in the moderately good category. Direct supervision reached 66.67%, while indirect supervision reached 73.88%. This difference shows that reporting is more consistent than field inspections and observations. Oversight needs to be balanced through direct risk-based monitoring and report verification.

Employee performance reached an average of 72.57% and was included in the moderately good category. Work quality obtained 75.38%, quantity 70.90%, reliability 73.13%, and attitude 70.90%. Supervision and performance scores are in the same category, but the research does not prove a causal relationship because it does not use inferential analysis. Findings indicate the need for improvement in target accuracy, fieldwork consistency, communication, and work attitudes.

Obstacles to implementing supervision are limited leadership time and differences in employee abilities in understanding instructions and submitting reports. Efforts that have been made include delegation of authority, scheduling supervision, communication training, participation in seminars, and educational opportunities. These efforts need to be equipped with clear monitoring indicators, simple reporting formats, documented feedback, and follow-up monitoring.

The Transportation Agency is advised to build an integrated supervision cycle that links work standards, briefings, field observations, reporting, verification, feedback and competency development. Further research is recommended using objective performance data and statistical analysis to examine the relationship between supervision and performance and compare results between units or between periods.

REFERENCES

- Asif, A., & Rathore, K. (2021). Behavioral drivers of performance in public-sector organizations: A literature review. *SAGE Open*, 11(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244021989283>
- Awan, S. H., Habib, N., Akhtar, C. S., & Naveed, S. (2020). Effectiveness of performance management system for employee performance through engagement. *SAGE Open*, 10(4), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020969383>
- Blom, R., Borst, R. T., & Voorn, B. (2021). Pathology or inconvenience? A meta-analysis of the impact of red tape on people and organizations. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 41(4), 623–650. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X20924117>

- Brown, T. C., O’Kane, P., Mazumdar, B., & McCracken, M. (2019). Performance management: A scoping review of the literature and an agenda for future research. *Human Resource Development Review*, 18(1), 47–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484318798533>
- Franco-Santos, M., & Doherty, N. (2017). Performance management and well-being: A close look at the changing nature of the UK higher education workplace. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(16), 2319–2350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1334148>
- Khaltar, O., & Moon, M. J. (2020). Effects of ethics and performance management on organizational performance in the public sector. *Public Integrity*, 22(4), 372–394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2019.1615163>
- Kroll, A. (2015). Drivers of performance information use: Systematic literature review and directions for future research. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 38(3), 459–486. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2015.1006469>
- Sharma, N. P., Sharma, T., & Agarwal, M. N. (2016). Measuring employee perception of performance management system effectiveness: Conceptualization and scale development. *Employee Relations*, 38(2), 224–247. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-01-2015-0006>
- Siraj, N., & Hågen, I. (2023). Performance management system and its role for employee performance: Evidence from Ethiopian SMEs. *Heliyon*, 9(11), e21819. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e21819>
- Van Waeyenberg, T., Decramer, A., Desmidt, S., & Audenaert, M. (2017). The relationship between employee performance management and civil servants’ turnover intentions: A test of the mediating roles of system satisfaction and affective commitment. *Public Management Review*, 19(6), 747–764. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1209230>
- Van Waeyenberg, T., Peccei, R., & Decramer, A. (2022). Performance management and teacher performance: The role of affective organizational commitment and exhaustion. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(4), 623–646. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1754881>
- Vidè, F., Micacchi, L., Barbieri, M., & Valotti, G. (2023). The renaissance of performance appraisal: Engaging public employees through perceived developmental purpose and justice. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 43(4), 573–600. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X221116584>
- Hajnal, G., & Staroňová, K. (2021). Changing patterns of individual performance appraisal systems for civil service in European Union countries: Toward a developmental or an incentivizing model. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 34(7), 748–764. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-02-2021-0051>
- Harrington, J. R., & Lee, J. H. (2015). What drives perceived fairness of performance appraisal? Exploring the effects of psychological contract fulfillment on employees’ perceived fairness of performance appraisal in U.S. federal agencies. *Public Personnel Management*, 44(2), 214–238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026014564071>
- Iqbal, M. Z., Akbar, S., Budhwar, P., & Shah, S. Z. A. (2019). Effectiveness of performance appraisal: Evidence on the utilization criteria. *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 285–299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.035>
- Kim, T., & Holzer, M. (2016). Public employees and performance appraisal: A study of antecedents to employees’ perception of the process. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(1), 31–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X14549673>
- Stankevičiūtė, Ž., & Savanevičienė, A. (2021). Linkage between leaders’ behaviour in performance management, organisational justice and work engagement in public sector. *Economies*, 9(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies9010015>