

Result Analysis of Performance Management Framework for Public and Private Association

Kartik Rohit¹, Akash Tomar², Tarun Kumar Yadav³

¹MTech Scholar, Department of Mechanical Engineering, BTIRT Sagar, MP, India

^{2,3}Assistant Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering, BTIRT Sagar, MP, India

Abstract: *The execution of a performance management framework gives a space to mediation on horrible showing and for remunerating great performance. It is additionally impacted by the authoritative culture, the executive's style, conduct of workers, and different factors. There are additionally factors that fill in as limitations to the effective implementation of an performance management framework, and they incorporate a portion of the accompanying: the requirement for additional time than designated by associations, deficient assets and limit, temperamental stage in an association, absence of the management responsibility, absence of appropriate preparing to the managers and absence of clear objectives. The performance management procedure incorporates performance planning, performance review, Performance measurement and assessment, and performance feedback and results, and it utilizes the result of the performance management framework to intercede on terrible showing by actualizing appropriate formative projects and to reward great performance.*

Keywords: Performance management framework, socio-demographics, relationship network, descriptive statics

1. Introduction

This chapter presents a point by point examination of the essential data gathered utilizing study instrument extraordinarily intended for the current investigation. The data are aggregated in two significant areas; first segment presents the socio-demographic factors and descriptive statistic measurements. Socio-Demographic factors incorporate the sort of association, sexual orientation; education qualification, designation and experience of the respondents right now the Preliminary examination and Scale Descriptive measurements are introduced based on the reactions gathered from public and private sector associations and the elements recognized for directing the

current investigation. The second section presents the hypothesis testing process utilizing ANOVA. The investigation of data was done by utilizing IBM SPSS 20.0 programming package.

Preliminary Analysis- Primer investigation is canvassed in three sections.

- Socio-Demographics
- Descriptive Statistics
- Relationship Network

a) **Socio-Demographics-** In the study for the present investigation the socio-demographics data of the respondents were additionally gathered.

Table 1: Gender Wise Distribution

| Variables | Category | Frequency (N=400) | Percentage (100%) |
|-----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Gender | Male | 304 | 76 |
| | Female | 96 | 24 |

Table 2: Age Wise Distribution

| Variables | Category | Frequency (N=400) | Percentage (100%) |
|-----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Age | 21-30 | 97 | 24 |
| | 31-40 | 159 | 40 |
| | 41-50 | 98 | 24 |
| | 51-60 | 46 | 12 |
| | 61+ | 2 | 0 |

Table 3: Educational Qualification

| Variables | Category | Frequency (N=400) | Percentage (100%) |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Educational Qualification | Intermediate (10+2) | 7 | 2 |
| | Diploma | 15 | 3 |
| | Graduate | 179 | 45 |
| | Post Graduate | 191 | 48 |
| | Higher Degree | 8 | 2 |

Table 4: Position Held in the Organization

| Variables | Category | Frequency (N=400) | Percentage (100%) |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Position | Lower Management | 165 | 41 |
| | Middle Management | 82 | 20.5 |
| | Senior Management | 11 | 3 |
| | Operative Employee | 138 | 34.5 |
| | Others | 4 | 1 |

Table 5: Years of Service in the Present Organization

| Variables | Category | Frequency (N=400) | Percentage (100%) |
|--|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Years of Service in the present Organization | <5 Years | 146 | 36.5 |
| | 5-10 Years | 127 | 32 |
| | 10-15 Years | 76 | 19 |
| | 15-20 Years | 29 | 7 |
| | >20 Years | 22 | 5.5 |

Table 6: Type of Organization

| Variables | Category | Frequency (N=400) | Percentage (100%) |
|----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Type of Organization | Public | 200 | 50 |
| | Private | 200 | 50 |

b) Descriptive Statistics

Right now, nitty gritty illustrative measurements are given. Table 7 shows the Mean worth, Standard Deviation and Standard Error of the considerable number of reactions gathered from both open and private area undertakings on

various scales, i.e., Corporate Objectives, Performance Planning, Performance Review, Implementation, Feedback, Rewards and Recognition and Performance Improvement.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Public and Private Sector Enterprises

| | | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum |
|-------------------------|---------|-----|--------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|
| | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | |
| Corporate Objective | Public | 200 | 3.975 | 0.63687 | 0.04503 | 3.8862 | 4.0638 | 1.2 |
| | Private | 200 | 4.196 | 0.47318 | 0.03346 | 4.13 | 4.262 | 2.4 |
| | Total | 400 | 4.0855 | 0.57114 | 0.02856 | 4.0294 | 4.1416 | 1.2 |
| Performance Planning | Public | 200 | 3.6117 | 0.70176 | 0.04962 | 3.5138 | 3.7095 | 1 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.835 | 0.72412 | 0.0512 | 3.734 | 3.936 | 1.67 |
| | Total | 400 | 3.7233 | 0.72085 | 0.03604 | 3.6525 | 3.7942 | 1 |
| Performance Review | Public | 200 | 3.6142 | 0.601 | 0.0425 | 3.5304 | 3.698 | 1.92 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.8967 | 0.59246 | 0.04189 | 3.8141 | 3.9793 | 2.25 |
| | Total | 400 | 3.7554 | 0.61255 | 0.03063 | 3.6952 | 3.8156 | 1.92 |
| Implementation | Public | 200 | 3.793 | 0.51991 | 0.03676 | 3.7205 | 3.8655 | 1.6 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.95 | 0.52304 | 0.03698 | 3.8771 | 4.0229 | 2.3 |
| | Total | 400 | 3.8715 | 0.52672 | 0.02634 | 3.8197 | 3.9233 | 1.6 |
| Feedback | Public | 200 | 3.4375 | 0.83867 | 0.0593 | 3.3206 | 3.5544 | 1.5 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.7763 | 0.71786 | 0.05076 | 3.6762 | 3.8763 | 1.5 |
| | Total | 400 | 3.6069 | 0.79786 | 0.3989 | 3.5284 | 3.6853 | 1.5 |
| Rewards & Recognition | Public | 200 | 3.5593 | 0.75901 | 0.05367 | 3.4535 | 3.6651 | 1.29 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.9207 | 0.65359 | 0.04622 | 3.8296 | 4.0118 | 1.71 |
| | Total | 400 | 3.74 | 0.73015 | 0.03651 | 3.6682 | 3.8118 | 1.29 |
| Performance Improvement | Public | 200 | 3.7375 | 0.74675 | 0.0528 | 3.6334 | 3.8416 | 1.17 |
| | Private | 200 | 3.9367 | 0.6874 | 0.04861 | 3.8408 | 4.0325 | 1.83 |
| | Total | 400 | 3.8371 | 0.72369 | 0.3618 | 3.7659 | 3.9082 | 1.17 |

c) Correlation Analysis

Correlation is a proportion of relationship between two constant factors that measures the both, size and direction of relationship and signified by 'r' which has a worth consistently - 1 and +1. The squared correlation is a proportion of strength of the association (Tabachnick and

Fidell, 1989). Table 8 portrays a point by point connection examination with different factors, for example, Corporate Objectives, Performance Planning, execution audit, usage, criticism, prizes and acknowledgment and execution improvement.

Table 8: Correlation Matrix

| | | Corporate Objectives | Performance Planning | Performance Review | Implementation | Feedback | Rewards and Recognition | Performance Improvement |
|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Corporate Objectives | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 0.639 | 0.656 | 0.648 | 0.474 | 0.654 | 0.630 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | N | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |
| Performance Planning | Pearson Correlation | 0.639 | 1 | 0.836 | 0.709 | 0.658 | 0.730 | 0.769 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | N | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |
| Performance Review | Pearson Correlation | 0.656 | 0.836 | 1 | 0.753 | 0.702 | 0.757 | 0.795 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | N | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |
| Implementation | Pearson Correlation | 0.648 | 0.709 | 0.753 | 1 | 0.572 | 0.668 | 0.709 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | N | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |
| Feedback | Pearson Correlation | 0.474 | 0.658 | 0.702 | 0.572 | 1 | 0.645 | 0.678 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| | N | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |
| Rewards and Recognition | Pearson Correlation | 0.654 | 0.730 | 0.757 | 0.668 | 0.645 | 1 | 0.785 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| | N | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |
| Performance Improvement | Pearson Correlation | 0.630 | 0.769 | 0.795 | 0.709 | 0.678 | 0.785 | 1 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | N | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

From the above correlation matrix, it is obvious that corporate objectives are having a critical correlation with performance planning, review, improvement, implementation, and rewards and recognition with different elements. Consequently the above given table connotes that all the correlation variables of performance management framework are firmly associated with one another.

2. Scale Descriptive Statistics

Right now, scale's united legitimacy, dependability is checked and finally enlightening insights related with every one of the factors are determined. Concurrent legitimacy was checked utilizing principal component analysis. Scale

dependability was checked utilizing Cronbach's Alpha (α). The accompanying segments present the aftereffects of the primer examination for every one of the gatherings of components, i.e., corporate objective, performance planning, performance review, implementation, feedback, rewards and recognition and performance improvement.

Subsequent to coding the responses, they were investigated through "Rule Component Analysis" utilizing "Varimax" revolutions. This was done to consolidate these things in to builds so as to identify the hidden measurements and to guarantee that the scales utilized have united legitimacy for the example.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Corporate Objectives

| Factor & Items | Eigen Value | Cronbach's alpha | % of variance Explained | Overall mean score |
|-------------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Corporate Objectives | 6.566 | 0.753 | 12.159 | 4.09 |
| Performance Planning | 5.487 | 0.887 | 10.337 | 3.68 |
| Performance Review | 4.519 | 0.851 | 8.524 | 3.63 |
| Implementation | 4.547 | 0.794 | 8.425 | 3.78 |
| Feedback | 3.08 | 0.764 | 5.805 | 3.58 |
| Rewards And Recognition | 3.058 | 0.847 | 5.668 | 3.69 |
| Performance Improvement | 2.529 | 0.833 | 4.683 | 3.84 |

- a) Hypothesis testing for public and private sector enterprises
- b) Analysis for public and private sector enterprises using anova

H01: There is no significant difference between the Corporate Objectives of public and private sector associations

Table 10: Corporate Objectives

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| H01 | Between Groups | 121.103 | 1 | 121.103 | 15.395 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 3130.795 | 398 | 7.866 | | |
| | Total | 3251.897 | 399 | | | |

Table 10 shows the results of the investigation of variance between corporate objectives of public and private sector associations. The value of the sum of squares between the gatherings (SSM) for corporate objectives is 121.103 with 1

degree of freedom (dfm) and sum of squares within the group d (SST) is 3130.795 with 398 degrees of freedom (dfr). In this way, the value of mean squares (MSM) between the groups is $121.103/1 = 121.103$ and for within the groups the value of mean squares (MSR) is $3130.795/398 = 7.866$. The value of the resultant F proportion (MSM/MSR) for corporate objectives is $121.103/7.866 = 15.395$, which is exceptionally significant with $p = 0.000$ at 0.05 significant level. In this manner, it very well may be inferred that there is a noteworthy distinction between the corporate objectives of public and private sector associations. Subsequently invalid hypothesis one is dismissed.

H02: There is no huge distinction between the Performance Planning of public and private sector associations

Table 11: Performance Planning

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------|
| H02 | Between Groups | 344.96 | 1 | 344.96 | 10.526 | 0.001 |
| | Within Groups | 13043.23 | 398 | 32.771 | | |
| | Total | 13388.19 | 399 | | | |

The above table 11 shows that the F ratio for performance planning among public and private sector associations was determined which turned out to be $F(1, 398) = 10.526$, which is highly significant with $p = 0.001$. Since $p < 0.05$, there exists a significant difference between the performance planning of public and private sector associations. Therefore null hypothesis two is dismissed.

H03: There is no noteworthy contrast between the Performance Review of open and private segment ventures

Table 12: Performance Review

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| H03 | Between Groups | 1064.023 | 1 | 1064.023 | 23.687 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 17877.86 | 398 | 44.919 | | |
| | Total | 18941.88 | 399 | | | |

Table 12 shows the consequences of the analysis of variance between preference review of public and private sector association. The value of the sum of squares between the groups (SSM) for performance review is 1064.023 with 1degrees of freedom (dfm) and sum of squares within the groups (SST) is 17877.86 with 398 degrees of freedom (dfr). Consequently, the value of mean squares (MSM) between the groups is $1064.023/1 = 1064.023$ and for within the groups the value of mean squares (MSR) is $17877.86/398 = 44.919$. The value of the resultant F ratio (MSM/MSR) for performance review is $1064.023/44.919 = 23.687$, which is exceptionally critical with $p = 0.000$ at 5% centrality level. Since the value of $p < 0.05$ in this way, it very well may be reasoned that there is a significant distinction between the performance review of public and private sector associations. Subsequently null hypothesis three is dismissed.

H04: There is no significant difference between the Implementation of PMS among public and private sector associations

Table 13: Implementation

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| H04 | Between Groups | 185.323 | 1 | 185.323 | 8.88 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 8306.575 | 398 | 20.87 | | |
| | Total | 8491.898 | 399 | | | |

Table 13 shows the results of the analysis of variance for the comparison between implementation of performance management framework out in the public and private sector associations. For concern, the assessed F ratio is $F(1, 398) = 8.880$ with $p = 0.003$, which is highly significant as the value is under 0.05, hence it tends to be said that there exists a significant difference between the implementation of performance management framework at public and private sector associations or as such it is expressed that invalid hypothesis four is dismissed.

H05: There is no significant difference between the Feedback arrangement of public and private sector associations

Table 14: Feedback

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| H05 | Between Groups | 180.603 | 1 | 180.603 | 18.534 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 3878.295 | 398 | 9.744 | | |
| | Total | 4058.898 | 399 | | | |

Table 14 shows the aftereffects of the analysis of variance between feedback given to representatives at public and private sector associations. The value of the sum of squares between the groups (SSM) for feedback is 180.603 with degrees of freedom (dfm) 1 and sum of squares within the groups (SST) is 3878.295 where degrees of freedom (dfr) is 398. In this manner, the value of mean squares (MSM) between the groups is $180.603/1 = 180.603$ and for within the groups the value of mean squares (MSR) is $3878.295/398 = 9.744$. The value of the resultant F ratio (MSM/MSR) for feedback is $180.603/9.744 = 18.534$, which is profoundly noteworthy with $p = .000$ at 5% noteworthiness level. It is, in this way, presumed there is a significant difference between the feedback given to the representatives of public and private sector association. Consequently null hypothesis five is dismissed.

H06: There is no significant difference between the Rewards and Recognition of public and private sector associations

Table 15: Rewards and Recognition

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| H06 | Between Groups | 637.09 | 1 | 637.09 | 25.92 | 0 |
| | Within Groups | 9779.95 | 398 | 24.572 | | |
| | Total | 10417.04 | 399 | | | |

The above table 15 shows that the F for rewards and recognition among public and private sector associations was determined which turned out to be $F(1, 398) = 25.92$,

which is exceptionally significant with $p = .000$. Since $p < 0.05$, there exists a significant difference between the rewards and recognition gave to the workers of public and private sector endeavors. Accordingly null hypothesis six is dismissed.

H07: There is no significant difference between the Performance Improvement of public and private sector associations

Table 16: Performance Improvement

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| H07 | Between Groups | 139.803 | 1 | 139.803 | 7.542 | 0.006 |
| | Within Groups | 7376.995 | 398 | 18.535 | | |
| | Total | 7516.798 | 399 | | | |

Table 16 demonstrated the results of the ANOVA between performance improvement of public and private sector associations. The value of the sum of squares between the groups (SSM) for performance improvement is 139.803 with 1 level of degree of freedom (dfm) and sum of squares within the groups (SST) is 7376.995 with 398 degrees of freedom (dfr). Hence, the value of mean squares (MSM) between the groups is $139.803/1 = 139.803$ and for within the groups the value of mean squares (MSR) is $7376.995/398 = 18.535$. The value of the resultant F ratio (MSM/MSR) for performance improvement is $139.803/18.535 = 7.542$, with $p = 0.006$ at 0.05 essentialness level. Accordingly, it is reasoned that there is a significant difference between the performance improvement of public and private sector associations. Subsequently null hypothesis seven is dismissed.

3. Analysis and Results

Table 17: Summarized Results for Hypothesis Testing

| Hypothesis Testing | Sectors | Null Hypothesis Accepted/ Rejected |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| H01 | Public V/s Private Enterprises | Rejected |
| H02 | Public V/s Private Enterprises | Rejected |
| H03 | Public V/s Private Enterprises | Rejected |
| H04 | Public V/s Private Enterprises | Rejected |
| H05 | Public V/s Private Enterprises | Rejected |
| H06 | Public V/s Private Enterprises | Rejected |
| H07 | Public V/s Private Enterprises | Rejected |

4. Conclusion

Performance management can be accordingly better comprehended as surveying the person's performance in an planned and systematic manner. According to the current investigation larger part of representatives knows about the Performance Management framework of the organization whether public or private. Representatives hold a feeling that their assessment ought to be finished by seniors just as without anyone else. The gap among the management and representatives should be spanned, so workers can see their management from an alternate point of view than they presently do. Performance management is an all encompassing methodology and procedure that is utilized to guarantee proficient administration of representatives and group to accomplish authoritative objectives and targets.

Managers need to screen and revise their crucial well as explanation of objectives on standard premise to contrast their objectives and key objectives of the association.

References

- [1] Aguinis, H. (2009). Performance Management. (2nd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- [2] Bititci, U.S., Turner, T., & Begemann, C. (2000). Dynamics of performance measurement system. International Journal of Operations and Production Management, 20(6), 692-704.
- [3] Cascio, W.F. (1991). Applied psychology in personal management (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 301-317.
- [4] De Waal, AA., & Counet, H. (2009). Lessons learned from performance management systems implementations. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 58(4), 367-390.
- [5] Gopinath, M.N. (2009). Performance Management System. SIES Journal of Management, 6(1), 1-9.
- [6] Inyang, J. & Esu, B. (2009). A case of performance management in the public sector in Nigeria, International Journal of Business and Management, 4(4), 98-105
- [7] Kuhlmann, Sabine. (2010). Performance Measurement in European Local Governments: a comparative analysis of reform experiences in Great Britain, France, Sweden and Germany. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 76 (2).
- [8] Lauras, M., Marques, G., & Gourc, D. (2010). Towards a multi-dimensional project Performance Measurement System. Decision Support Systems. 48(2).
- [9] Mansor, Abu et al. (2011). Determinants of performance management system in South East Asia. Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 3(2), 43-56.
- [10] Mondy, R. & Wayne. (2010). Human Resource Management. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. 4.7
- [11] Nath, V. (2015). Antecedents of Indian Consumers' Green Purchase Intentions. PhD Thesis. Uttarakhand Technical University, Dehradun.
- [12] Pant, P., Kavidayal, P.C. and Pant, H. (2013). Job Satisfaction among employees in FMCG sector in Uttarakhand, IJTEMT, 2(4), 1-4.
- [13] Pradhan, S. & Chaudhary, S. (2012). A survey of employee performance management and its implication to their retention in OCL India Ltd. Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 2(4), 249-262.
- [14] Reddy, K.S. and Sharma, R. (2012). Designing case studies from secondary sources – A conceptual framework. International Management Review, 8(2), 63-70.
- [15] Singh, A. (2012). Performance management system design, implementation and outcomes in Indian software organizations: A perspective of HR managers. South Asian Journal of Management, 19 (2), 99-120.
- [16] Upadhyay, D. and Gupta, A. (2012). Efficacy of performance management system: An empirical study at ICICI bank. International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences, 1(3), 216-225