Artificial Intelligence formulated this projection for compatibility purposes from the original article published at Global Journals. However, this technology is currently in beta. *Therefore, kindly ignore odd layouts, missed formulae, text, tables, or figures.*

Performance Management and Employee Loyalty Manish¹ and Dr. Rishipal² ¹ Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Uttar Pradesh *Received: 16 December 2012 Accepted: 4 January 2013 Published: 15 January 2013*

6 Abstract

29

Present research is a comparison between the various dimensions of the performance 7 management among the loyal and disloyal employees. A sample of 162 bank employees was 8 selected randomly on availability basis for this research from a universe of bank employees of 9 private and nationalized banks situated at Punjab, Haryana and National Capital Region of 10 New Delhi. Selected employees were tested for their loyalty. On the basis of higher and lower 11 scores of loyalty, employees were divided into two groups, each having 57 subjects. First group 12 was consisting of the subjects who scored on the loyalty scale from 87-117 and nominated as 13 group of dislovals. Whereas, second group was consisting of employee who scored 120-150 and 14 this group was categorized as loyals. After formation of loyal and disloyal groups, subjects of 15 both the groups were tested for the role in performance management. Performance 16 Management was tested with its four major dimensions, such as ?Organizational Planning?, 17 ?Decision Making?, ?Effective Execution?, and ?Result Producing Capability?. The mean 18 scores for organizational planning among loyal and disloyal groups were (22.3) and (10.6)19 respectively. There was significant difference between the mean score values of organizational 20 planning between the loyal and disloyal employees. The mean score values for the capability of 21 decision making were (21.7) and (9.5) respectively. There was significant difference in the 22 mean scores of loyal and disloyal groups. When the mean scores of third dimension i.e. 23 effective execution of performance management for loyal and disloyal employees group were 24 compared, they were found (20.4) and (13.2). The mean scores of loyal and disloyal group for 25 effective execution also differ significantly. Similarly the mean scores of result producing 26 capability among loyal and disloyal groups were found (19.5) and (10.7). Mean score values of 27 result producing capability also differs considerably. Lastly the combined m 28

Index terms— various dimensions of the performance management among the loyal and disloyal employees. A sample of 162 30 31 bank employees was selected randomly on availability basis for this research from a universe of bank employees of 32 private and nationalized banks situated at Punjab, Haryana and National Capital Region of New Delhi. Selected 33 employees were tested for their loyalty. On the basis of higher and lower scores of loyalty, employees were divided 34 35 into two groups, each having 57 subjects. First group was consisting of the subjects who scored on the loyalty scale 36 from 87-117 and nominated as group of disloyals. Whereas, second group was consisting of employee who scored 37 120-150 and this group was categorized as loyals. After formation of loyal and disloyal groups, subjects of both the groups were tested for the role in performance management. Performance Management was tested with its four 38 major dimensions, such as "Organizational Planning", "Decision Making", "Effective Execution", and "Result 39 Producing Capability". The mean scores for organizational planning among loyal and disloyal groups were (22.3) 40 and (10.6) respectively. There was significant difference between the mean score values of organizational planning 41 between the loyal and disloyal employees. The mean score values for the capability of decision making were (21.7) 42 and (9.5) respectively. There was significant difference in the mean scores of loyal and disloyal groups. When 43

44

45

46

47

48

49

the mean scores of third dimension i.e. effective execution of performance management for loyal and disloyal employees group were compared, they were found (20.4) and (13.2). The mean scores of loyal and disloyal group for effective execution also differ significantly. Similarly the mean scores of result producing capability among loyal and disloyal groups were found ??19.5) and ??10.7). Mean score values of result producing capability also differs considerably. Lastly the combined mean scores for all the dimensions for performance management were compared, they were found (83.9) and (44.0) respectively. These mean scores of performance management among

loyal and disloyal differs significantly. 50 erformance Management (PM) is sum total of all such activities and efforts which can support organizational 51 management to achieve its goal by utilizing the available resources in the most effective and efficient manner. In 52 simple words performance management can be understood as the activities performed by its employees to achieve 53 their goals effectively and efficiently. Performance Management is a collective effort by individual employees, 54 departmental units and organizational management as a whole. The role of organizational management in the 55 present scenario has undergone a sea change and its focal point is on evolving such functional strategies which 56 enable the management for successful implementation of major corporate strategies for effective and efficient 57 performance of its activities. Today performance management works towards facilitating and improving the 58 59 performance of the employees by building a conducive work environment and providing maximum opportunities 60 and resources to the employees for participating in organizational planning, decision making, executing and 61 result producing process. Today all the major organizational activities are driven towards development of high 62 performance. So it can be interpreted that the role of performance management has evolved merely an appraiser 63 to a facilitator and an enabler. Loyalty is the sincerity, devotion, relatedness and faithfulness towards a belief, place, person or organization. 64 Organizational loyalty is the faithfulness, devotion and relatedness of its stakeholders such as customer, employees, 65 investors and society towards the organisation. Different stakeholders of organization, such as employee, customer,

66 investor and other have different type of loyalty. The employee loyalty is the characteristic by virtue of which 67 loyal employees has faith and devotion towards organization and this loyalty is shown by the employee by 68 contributing maximum of their time, energy, knowledge, skill and effort for the effective and efficient achievement 69 of organizational goals. The long-term success of any company depends upon the quality of its employees and 70 their loyalty. Loyal employees can be incredible assets to a growing company. Furthermore, there is a direct 71 relationship between employee loyalty and a company's growth and profitability (Aaron Green, 2007). Employee 72 73 loyalty is evident to the customers and it's nearly impossible to generate loyal customers without strong internal 74 employee loyalty.

As already said every organization has different stakeholders or interest groups, the direction and degree of loyalty of these stakeholders are different.

77 1 ()

A all the interest groups of organization, its existence and achievement of goals is not possible. Organizations 78 79 need loyal employees in order to attract loyal clients/customers. Employees who are loyal and enthusiastic will work dedicatedly and manufacture the goods and services of best quality. Best quality products and services will 80 generate the loyal customer, which is very significant and crucial factor of performance management. So there may 81 exist a relationship between the employee loyalty and their role in performance management. Most prominently 82 a loyal employee will stand with the organization, whatever the circumstances may be, in comparison to a 83 disloyal employee. Present study has discovered the factors responsible for the effective and efficient performance 84 85 management as well as the factors which were cause for loyalty and disloyalty among employees. Besides this, 86 study has also established the relationship between performance management and employees loyalty. 1. To enquire the relationship between employee loyalty and performance management. 2. To find out the relationship 87 between the dimensions of performance management i.e. organizational planning, decision making, effective 88 execution and result producing capability among the loyal and disloyal employees. 89

There will exist a relationship between employee loyalty and performance management.
 There will exist
 a relationship between the dimensions of performance management i.e. organizational planning, decision making,
 effective execution and result producing capability among the loyal and disloyal employees.

a) Research Design 162 bank employees were taken for this research from different nationalized and private 93 sector factors responsible for performance management such Region of Delhi. Selected subjects were tested for 94 their approach towards performance management and the tendency of loyalty towards their banks. Subjects 95 96 were tested for loyalty by using questionnaire method, whereas for the performance management, an inventory of 97 statements was developed and used to find out the role of employees in performance management. With the help 98 of these testing, subjects were categorized into the loyal and disloyal as well as the employees having approach 99 for effective and ineffective performance management. While testing the subject, not only the basic tendency and approach for loyalty and b) Sample 100

The population for sample of this study was the employees working on the position of bank office assistant to the level of branch managers from various nationalized & private sector banks situated in the National Capital Region of Delhi, Haryana and Punjab state. From this universe a sample of 162 employees was taken randomly on availability basis for this research.

¹⁰⁵ 2 c) Method of Data Collection

Questionnaire method was used to collect the data for testing the loyalty of the subjects. But for finding the approach towards performance management, selected subjects were tested with the help of an inventory consisting of a set of statements. Both the tests of loyalty and performance management were developed by the researcher.

¹⁰⁹ 3 d) Tools Used

Both the Employee Loyalty Test and Performance Management Inventory were developed by the researchers and
 used for scaling the tendency of loyalty and Performance Management.

Present research is a comparison between the various dimensions of the performance management among the 112 loyal and disloyal employees. Total 162 bank employees were taken for this research from a universe of bank 113 employees of private and nationalized banks situated at Punjab, Haryana and National Capital Region of New 114 Delhi. Selected employees were tested for their loyalty towards the banks with which they were working. The 115 details of their scoring such as minimum score (87), maximum score (152), range (65), mean (132.5), Standard 116 deviation (28.2) etc. has been shown at Table (1). as organizational planning, decision making, effective execution 117 and result producing capability etc. were tested and compared among the loyal and disloyal employees. After 118 collection of data for the above stated purpose, results and findings were analyzed to test the hypothesis. 119

factors responsible for performance management such performance management were tested but also the Higher 120 the score, greater the tendency and lower the score, lesser the tendency for loyalty. On the basis of higher and 121 lower scores, employees were divided into two groups, each having 57 subjects. First group was consisting of 122 the subjects having score from 87-117 and this group was nominated as the group of disloyals. Whereas, second 123 group was consisting of employee who scored 120-150 and this group was categorized as the loyal. Details of 124 their minimum score, maximum score, range, mean and standard deviation etc. have been shown in Table (2) 125 After formation of loyal and disloyal groups, subjects of both the groups were tested for their role in performance 126 management. Performance Management was tested by evaluating four major and important dimensions of 127 performance management like "Organizational Planning", "Decision Making", "Effective Execution", and "Result 128 Producing Capability". Subjects were tested for all these dimensions as well as the combined score for their role 129 in Performance Management. Details of the scores such as minimum, maximum score, range, mean, standard 130 deviation etc. for organizational planning, decision making, effective execution, result producing capability and 131 overall role in performance management for loyal category were found as under in Table (4). Details of the scores 132 such as minimum, maximum score, range, mean, standard deviation etc. for organizational planning, decision 133 making, execution capability, result producing and overall role in performance management for disloyal category 134 have been shown in Table (5). ??0.6) respectively. These results show that there was significant difference 135 between the mean score values of organizational planning between the loyal and disloyal employees. This means 136 137 that loyal employees were playing better role in Performance Management of the organization in comparison to the disloyals. The mean score values for the capability of decision making which is one of the dimensions 138 of performance management were (21.7) and (9.5) respectively. These values show that there was noteworthy 139 difference between the two mean scores. 140

This difference in the mean score values of Decision Making ability shows the effective decision making among 141 loyal employees whereas disloyal employees were not that much effective. When the mean scores of third dimension 142 i.e. effective execution of performance management for loyal and disloyal employees group were compared, they 143 were found (20.4) and (13.2). The mean scores for effective execution differ radically. The means difference 144 145 clearly exhibits that the loyals are better executor in comparison to disloyals. Similarly the mean scores of 146 result producing capability of performance management among loyal and disloyal groups were found (19.5) and 147 ??10.7). Mean score values of result producing capability differs considerably. Mean score values of result 148 producing capability for both the groups shows that loyals were better result producer in comparison to disloyals. Lastly the combined mean scores for all the dimensions for performance management were compared. They were 149 found (83.9) and (44.0) respectively. These mean scores of performance management among loyals and disloyals 150 differed significantly. So from the above findings it was clear that loyal employees were having an effective and 151 better role for performance management towards their organization. 152

A simultaneous and comparative analysis of results and findings shown at various tables and discussion given above shows that there was a positive and significant relationship between the loyalty of employees and their role in performance management which concludes the approval and acceptance of comparison of all the dimensions of performance management such as organizational planning, decision making, effective execution and result producing capability among loyal and disloyal groups shows that the loyal employees were better role player in the performance management in comparison to the disloyal, hypothesis 2 is also accepted and approved.

 $^{^{1}}$ © 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

| Group formation on the basis of higher tendency of loyalty and nominated as loyal | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---------------------------|-------------|------|--------------------|----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| No. | | Minimum Maximum RangeMean | | | | andard | | | | | | | |
| | | score | score score | | | eviation | | | | | | | |
| 57 | | | 122 | 152 | 30 1 | 140.3 10 |).3 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Figure 1: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Minimum score | Maximum score | Range | Mean | Standard Deviation | | iation | | | | | | |
| 57 | 87 | 117 | 30 | 96.6 | 9.5 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Figure 2: Table 3 : | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| performance management of loyal group | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dimension of Loyalty N | | | | | | Mean | Standard | | | | | | |
| | 0 0 | | Score score | | 0 | | Deviation | | | | | | |
| Organizational Planning 57 | | | 18 | 28 | 20 | 22.3 | 8.20 | | | | | | |
| 0 | on Making | 57 | 14 | 32 | 18 | 21.7 | 6.70 | | | | | | |
| | ve Execution | 57 | 15 | 34 | 19 | 20.4 | 8.04 | | | | | | |
| Result | Producing Capabi | lity 57 | 13 | 29 | 26 | 19.5 | 9.2 | | | | | | |
| Overa | | 57 | 60 | 123 | 63 | 83.9 | 28.14 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 3: Table 4 :

$\mathbf{5}$

| performance management of disloyal group Dimension of Loyalty | | MinimuMaximunRange Mean Standard Deviation | | | | | |
|--|----|--|-------|----|------|------|--|
| | | Score | score | | | | |
| Organizational planning | 57 | 8 | 18 | 10 | 10.6 | 4.30 | |
| Decision Making | 57 | 5 | 12 | 7 | 9.5 | 6.50 | |
| Effective Execution | 57 | 6 | 22 | 16 | 13.2 | 8.30 | |
| Result producing capability | 57 | 7 | 16 | 9 | 10.7 | 7.20 | |
| Overall | 57 | 26 | 68 | 42 | 44.0 | 6.67 | |

Figure 4: Table 5 :

12

Volume XIII Issue III Version I () A

Figure 5: Table 1 : Table 2 :

- 159 [Konvitz ()], Milton R Konvitz. 1973. (Loyalty)
- [Rout Ledge ()], Taylor Rout Ledge. Journal of Organizational Behavior Management 2009.
- 161 [Daniels ()] Bringing out the Best in People, Aubrey C Daniels . 1999. McGraw-Hill. (2nd edition)
- 162 [Connor ()] James Connor . The Sociology of Loyalty, 2007. Springer. (1st ed.)
- 163 [Wiener ()] Encyclopedia of the History of Ideas, Philip P Wiener . 1973. New York: Scribner's. p. 108.
- [Sydney Axinn ; 20 et al. ()] Encyclopedic Dictionary of Business Ethics, P H Sydney Axinn ; 20, R E Werhane
 Freeman . 1997. 2002. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. p. . (Loyalty)
- [Thomas et al. ()] Handbook of Organizational Performance, C Thomas , William K Mawhinney , Johnson
 Redmon & Carl Merle . 2001. (Rout ledge)
- [Alford ()] Implications of Whistleblower Ethics for Ethical Theory. Whistleblowers: broken lives and organiza tional power, C , Fred Alford . 2002. Cornell University Press.
- [Geary et al. ()] Improving Performance: How to Manage the White Space in the Organization Chart, A Geary
 P Rummler & Alan , Brache . 1995. (2nd edition)
- 172 [Mullin ()] Josiah Royce's Philosophy of Loyalty as the Basis for Ethics, Richard P Mullin . 2007. Suny Press.
- 173 [Kim Dae ()] Jung Kim Dae . Loyalty, Filial Piety in Changing Times, 1999.
- [Ewin ()] Loyalty and Virtues. The Philosophical Quarterly, R E Ewin . 1992. Blackwell Publishing. p. .
- 175 [Organizational Effectiveness] Organizational Effectiveness, Performance Management Publications. (4th ed.)
- [Cokins ()] Performance Management -Integrating Strategy Execution, Gary Cokins . 2009. Methodologies, Risk
 and Analytics: John Wiley & Sons.
- 178 [Dr and Daniels ()] Performance Management: Changing Behavior That Drives, Aubrey C Dr , Daniels . 2006.
- [Daniels ()] Performance Management: Changing Behavior that Drives Organizational Effectiveness, Aubrey
 Daniels . 2004. (4th edition)
- [Zaffron and Steve ()] Performance Management: The Three Laws of Performance: Rewriting the Future of Your
 Organization and Your Life, Logan Zaffron, David Steve. 2009. (1st edition)
- 183 [References Références Referencias] References Références Referencias,
- 184 [White ()] 'Royce's Philosophy of Loyalty'. Howard B White . The Journal of Philosophy 1956. 53 (3) p. .
- 185 [Nitobe ()] The Duty of Loyalty, Inaz? Nitobe . 1975.
- 186 [Royce ()] The Philosophy of Loyalty, Josiah Royce . 1908.