

# DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN YUNNAN UNIVERSITIES

Jingxiu XIONG<sup>1</sup> and Thada SITHTHADA<sup>1</sup>

1 Educational Administration, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand;  
kilinxjx@foxmail.com (J.X.) Thada.si@ssru.ac.th (T.S.)

## ARTICLE HISTORY

**Received:** 21 July 2026

**Revised:** 23 July 2026

**Published:** 24 July 2026

## ABSTRACT

Performance management has become an important part of university governance as higher education institutions face growing expectations for teaching quality, research productivity, and social contribution. In China, higher education reforms have encouraged universities to adopt performance-oriented management systems to improve accountability and institutional development. Although many studies have discussed performance management in Chinese universities, relatively few have focused on universities in Yunnan Province. This paper reviews the existing literature on performance management in higher education, with particular attention to research conducted in China and its implications for Yunnan universities. The review first explains the concept and development of performance management, followed by a discussion of its application in higher education institutions. It then summarizes major research themes, including faculty evaluation, research assessment, incentive mechanisms, and organizational performance. Finally, the paper examines the main challenges faced by universities in Yunnan, such as limited research resources, regional disparities, and the need to balance teaching, research, and social service. Based on the reviewed studies, several research gaps are identified, including the lack of comprehensive studies on performance management systems in Yunnan universities and the limited use of mixed research methods. This review provides a theoretical foundation for future empirical studies and offers practical insights for university administrators seeking to improve performance management practices in less-developed regions of China.

**Keywords:** Performance Management, Higher Education, Yunnan Universities

**CITATION INFORMATION:** Xiong, J., & Siththada, T. (2026). Development of Performance Management in Yunnan Universities. *Procedia of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(7), 87.

## INTRODUCTION

Universities around the world are operating in an environment of rapid change. Global competition, technological development, digital transformation, and growing public expectations have reshaped the way higher education institutions are managed. In addition to providing teaching and conducting research, universities are expected to support innovation, serve society, and contribute to regional development. These new responsibilities require universities to improve organizational efficiency while maintaining academic quality. As a result, performance management has become an important topic in higher education research and practice (Aguinis, 2019). Performance management is generally defined as a continuous process that aligns individual performance with organizational goals through planning, monitoring, feedback, evaluation, and professional development (Aguinis, 2019). Compared with traditional performance appraisal, which mainly measures employees' achievements at the end of a performance cycle, performance management places greater emphasis on continuous communication and long-term improvement. Armstrong and Taylor (2023) argued that an effective performance management system should support employee development, encourage regular feedback, and strengthen organizational performance instead of focusing only on performance ratings. The application of performance management has expanded rapidly in higher education over the past two decades. Universities have introduced various evaluation systems to improve teaching quality, increase research productivity, and strengthen institutional accountability. Faculty members are commonly evaluated based on teaching performance, research output, student supervision, academic service, and professional development. These evaluation results are often linked to promotion, salary adjustment, research funding, and contract renewal. Consequently, performance management has become an important component of university governance rather than a simple administrative procedure (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017).

China has experienced significant reforms in higher education since the beginning of the twenty-first century. National initiatives, including the Double First-Class Initiative, have encouraged universities to improve academic quality and international competitiveness. At the institutional level, many universities have established performance management systems that combine research evaluation, teaching assessment, and faculty development. These reforms have contributed to rapid growth in scientific publications and institutional performance. However, they have also generated new challenges, including increased work pressure, greater reliance on quantitative indicators, and concerns about academic autonomy (Huang & Xu, 2020). Although performance management has become a widely discussed topic in Chinese higher education, existing research mainly focuses on nationally recognized universities or institutions located in economically developed regions. Comparatively less attention has been paid to universities in western China, particularly those in Yunnan Province. Yunnan is an important border province with unique geographical, economic, and cultural characteristics. Universities in the province not only undertake teaching and research responsibilities but also support regional development, ethnic education, and international cooperation with neighboring countries. These characteristics create a distinctive context for the implementation of performance management. Existing studies related to Yunnan universities mainly discuss teacher evaluation, educational quality, organizational commitment, and faculty development. While these studies provide valuable insights, they rarely examine performance management as an integrated management system. In addition, little attention has been given to how regional characteristics influence the implementation and effectiveness of performance management policies. This gap suggests the need for a comprehensive review of existing studies to identify current knowledge, major findings, and future research directions. This paper therefore reviews the existing literature on performance management in higher education with a particular focus on Chinese universities and Yunnan universities. Specifically, the review has four objectives. First, it explains the concept and theoretical development of performance management in higher education. Second, it summarizes the major research findings on performance management in

Chinese universities. Third, it discusses the current situation and key challenges of performance management in Yunnan universities. Finally, it identifies research gaps and proposes future research directions. It is expected that this review will provide a useful theoretical reference for future empirical research and offer practical suggestions for improving performance management in universities located in less-developed regions of China.

### **Performance Management in Higher Education**

Performance management has developed from a traditional human resource practice into a strategic management approach that supports organizational development and continuous improvement. Earlier studies often regarded performance appraisal as the core of employee evaluation. However, more recent research argues that performance management is a broader and more dynamic process. It includes goal setting, performance planning, continuous feedback, performance evaluation, coaching, and professional development. The main purpose is not only to assess employee performance but also to improve individual capability and organizational effectiveness (Aguinis, 2019). Armstrong and Taylor (2023) further suggested that performance management should create a shared understanding between managers and employees, helping individuals understand how their work contributes to organizational objectives.

Although performance management was first developed in the business sector, it has gradually been adopted by public organizations, including universities. Higher education institutions operate in an increasingly competitive environment. Governments, funding agencies, students, and society expect universities to provide high-quality teaching, produce influential research, and contribute to economic and social development. These expectations have encouraged universities to introduce more systematic approaches to evaluating organizational and individual performance. Consequently, performance management has become an important element of university governance in many countries.

Previous studies indicate that performance management in universities differs from that in business organizations. Unlike companies, universities pursue multiple objectives rather than a single financial goal. Academic staff are responsible for teaching, research, student supervision, academic service, community engagement, and international cooperation. These diverse responsibilities make performance evaluation more complicated. A single indicator cannot accurately reflect academic performance. Therefore, researchers generally agree that university performance management should adopt multiple evaluation dimensions and recognize different forms of academic contribution (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017).

Several scholars have emphasized that performance management should be viewed as a continuous improvement process instead of a one-time administrative activity. Pulakos et al. (2015) argued that many traditional performance appraisal systems fail because they focus primarily on annual ratings while neglecting continuous communication and employee development. They proposed that organizations should replace inflexible evaluation procedures with regular performance conversations, timely feedback, and coaching. Similar ideas have also been supported by Aguinis (2019), who stated that continuous performance management helps employees adjust their work goals, improve job performance, and strengthen organizational commitment. Another important issue discussed in the literature concerns the relationship between performance management and employee motivation. According to goal-setting theory, clear performance objectives help employees understand organizational expectations and improve work performance. At the same time, regular feedback allows employees to identify weaknesses and make timely improvements. Researchers therefore consider performance management an important tool for enhancing both individual performance and organizational learning. Nevertheless, motivation may decline if evaluation standards are perceived as unfair or if performance indicators become excessively rigid (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). In higher education, performance management has gradually shifted from simple output evaluation to a more comprehensive assessment system. Early university evaluation mainly focused on teaching workload and publication numbers. Today, many

universities also evaluate research quality, graduate supervision, interdisciplinary collaboration, international engagement, knowledge transfer, and social service. This broader evaluation framework reflects the changing mission of higher education in modern society. Universities are no longer expected to produce only academic knowledge; they are also expected to respond to national development strategies and regional needs.

Despite these developments, previous research has identified several limitations in current performance management practices. One frequently discussed issue is the excessive reliance on quantitative indicators. Research publications, citation counts, research funding, and university rankings have become common measures of academic performance. While these indicators improve transparency and comparability, they may also encourage short-term academic behavior. Faculty members may concentrate on increasing publication numbers rather than pursuing innovative or socially meaningful research. DeNisi and Murphy (2017) argued that performance management should balance measurable outcomes with qualitative assessment to avoid reducing complex academic work to numerical indicators.

Another challenge relates to academic autonomy. Universities require accountability because they receive substantial public investment and are expected to demonstrate educational quality. However, academic work also depends on creativity, independent thinking, and long-term knowledge production. Several studies have suggested that highly standardized performance systems may unintentionally restrict innovation and increase occupational stress among faculty members. Therefore, many researchers recommend combining quantitative indicators with peer review, self-evaluation, and developmental feedback to create a more balanced evaluation system (Pulakos et al., 2015).

Overall, previous studies demonstrate that performance management has become an essential component of modern university governance. The literature has gradually shifted from discussing how to measure academic performance to exploring how performance management can support organizational learning, faculty development, and institutional sustainability. This theoretical development provides an important foundation for understanding how performance management has been implemented in Chinese universities.

### **Performance Management Practices in Chinese Universities**

Performance management has attracted increasing attention in Chinese higher education since the implementation of national higher education reforms. During the past two decades, Chinese universities have experienced rapid expansion, increasing international competition, and continuous policy reform. National strategies such as Project 211, Project 985, and the Double First-Class Initiative have encouraged universities to improve teaching quality, strengthen research capacity, and enhance global competitiveness. Within this context, performance management has gradually become one of the main approaches used to improve university governance and institutional performance.

Previous studies suggest that performance management in Chinese universities is strongly influenced by national education policies. Compared with universities in many Western countries, Chinese universities place greater emphasis on aligning institutional development with national strategic goals. Performance evaluation is therefore not only an internal management activity but also an important mechanism for implementing educational policies and improving public accountability. Faculty members are commonly evaluated through teaching quality, scientific research, graduate supervision, academic service, and contributions to university development (Wang & Wang, 2024).

Research productivity has become one of the most important dimensions of performance evaluation in Chinese universities. Shu et al. (2020) found that publications indexed by the Web of Science have become a key indicator in faculty promotion and tenure decisions. Universities increasingly encourage international publication, research funding acquisition, and interdisciplinary collaboration to improve institutional competitiveness. This evaluation system

has contributed to China's rapid growth in international scientific publications. However, some researchers have questioned whether excessive dependence on publication indicators may overlook teaching quality and other forms of academic contribution.

Teaching performance remains another important component of faculty evaluation. Most universities combine student evaluations, peer observation, classroom teaching quality, curriculum development, and graduate supervision into their teaching assessment systems. Although these indicators provide useful information, previous research has suggested that teaching quality is more difficult to measure than research productivity. Consequently, research performance often receives greater attention in promotion and reward systems. This imbalance has become one of the most widely discussed issues in Chinese higher education literature.

Another major topic concerns the influence of performance management on academic staff. Huang and Xu (2020) investigated the experiences of young academics in Chinese universities and found that many faculty members adjusted their research behavior in response to institutional performance requirements. Some participants concentrated on achieving measurable outputs within limited timeframes, while others reported increasing pressure resulting from publication targets and promotion requirements. The study suggested that performance management may improve organizational efficiency, but it may also influence research choices, career planning, and professional identity.

Performance-based employment systems have also become an important research topic. Wang and Wang (2024) examined the development of tenure-track systems in Chinese universities and argued that performance-based contracts have improved institutional flexibility and encouraged faculty productivity. At the same time, the authors pointed out that increasing performance expectations have created new challenges for early-career academics, particularly regarding job security, promotion opportunities, and work-life balance. These findings indicate that performance management should support faculty development rather than function solely as an accountability mechanism.

Recent studies have also discussed the relationship between performance management and university governance. Rather than serving only as an evaluation system, performance management has become closely connected with strategic planning, financial resource allocation, and organizational decision-making. University leaders increasingly use performance information to allocate research funding, evaluate academic departments, and formulate long-term development strategies. As a result, performance management now influences institutional governance at both the organizational and individual levels.

Although considerable progress has been made, the literature consistently identifies several limitations in current performance management practices. First, quantitative indicators continue to dominate many evaluation systems. Second, evaluation criteria often differ across universities because of variations in institutional missions and regional development. Third, limited attention has been given to teacher well-being, organizational commitment, and professional development. These findings suggest that future performance management systems should place greater emphasis on developmental evaluation, academic diversity, and institutional sustainability.

Overall, the existing literature indicates that performance management has become an integral part of higher education reform in China. Current studies have moved beyond simple discussions of evaluation indicators and increasingly focus on faculty development, organizational governance, and sustainable university management. These findings also provide the theoretical basis for examining the implementation of performance management in Yunnan universities, where regional characteristics create both opportunities and challenges for policy implementation.

### **Performance Management in Yunnan Universities: Current Evidence and Research Gaps**

Compared with the extensive literature on performance management in Chinese higher education, research focusing specifically on Yunnan universities remains limited. Existing studies are more likely to examine issues such as faculty evaluation, organizational governance, quality assurance,

occupational well-being, and educational leadership rather than performance management as a complete organizational system. This imbalance suggests that Yunnan universities have received relatively little attention in the broader discussion of higher education management despite their important role in supporting regional development, cross-border cooperation, and ethnic education in Southwest China. Consequently, reviewing the available evidence is necessary to understand the current situation and identify directions for future research.

One distinctive feature of Yunnan universities is their institutional and regional context. Unlike many research-intensive universities located in eastern China, universities in Yunnan often undertake multiple responsibilities simultaneously. In addition to teaching and scientific research, they are expected to contribute to local economic development, cultivate professionals for border regions, support ethnic minority education, and strengthen international cooperation with Southeast Asian countries. These diverse missions mean that performance management cannot rely solely on research output or publication indicators. Instead, evaluation systems need to reflect broader institutional objectives and regional development priorities. However, previous studies indicate that many existing evaluation frameworks continue to follow nationally standardized indicators that primarily emphasize research productivity. As a result, local institutional missions are not always adequately reflected in faculty assessment and organizational evaluation.

Faculty evaluation represents the most frequently discussed topic in studies related to Yunnan higher education. Current evidence suggests that universities generally evaluate academic staff through several dimensions, including teaching performance, scientific research, student supervision, administrative service, and professional contribution. Although these dimensions appear comprehensive, their actual implementation is often uneven. Research achievements, especially publications and externally funded projects, usually receive greater weight because they are easier to quantify and compare across institutions. Teaching quality, curriculum innovation, mentoring, and community engagement are more difficult to measure and therefore receive relatively less attention in promotion and reward systems. Similar patterns have also been reported in studies of Chinese universities more broadly, indicating that quantitative performance indicators continue to dominate faculty evaluation despite repeated calls for more balanced assessment approaches.

Another emerging research theme concerns faculty perceptions of performance evaluation. Rather than examining institutional outcomes alone, recent studies have begun to explore how teachers experience and respond to performance management policies. Evidence from private universities in Yunnan suggests that faculty members' perceptions of fairness play an important role in shaping professional identity, organizational identification, and overall job satisfaction. When performance evaluation is perceived as transparent, developmental, and supportive, teachers are more likely to report stronger organizational commitment and higher levels of professional well-being. Conversely, evaluation systems that rely heavily on numerical targets and rigid performance indicators may increase psychological pressure and reduce intrinsic motivation. These findings support the argument that effective performance management should not only measure performance but also encourage professional growth and organizational trust.

Occupational stress has also become an important issue in the discussion of university performance management. As universities continue to raise expectations regarding research productivity, teaching quality, and administrative responsibilities, academic staff are increasingly required to perform multiple roles simultaneously. A recent study conducted at Kunming Medical University found that occupational stress differs across academic ranks, with promotion requirements, research expectations, workload, and career development identified as major sources of pressure. The study further suggested that excessive stress may negatively affect teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and long-term faculty development if universities focus primarily on performance outcomes while overlooking staff well-being. These findings reinforce the view that

sustainable performance management requires balancing organizational expectations with realistic workload arrangements and supportive human resource practices.

Quality assurance has become another important perspective for understanding performance management in Yunnan universities. Although quality assurance and performance management are conceptually different, they share common objectives related to accountability, continuous improvement, and institutional effectiveness. Recent qualitative research examining third-party quality assurance agencies in Yunnan found that external evaluation mechanisms still face several challenges, including limited organizational independence, insufficient professional authority, and inadequate public trust. The study argued that quality assurance agencies often function more as administrative extensions than as independent evaluators, reducing their ability to provide objective feedback for institutional improvement. These findings suggest that performance management should incorporate more transparent and credible evaluation mechanisms while encouraging greater participation from academic communities and external stakeholders.

Another issue discussed in recent literature concerns leadership and organizational governance. University leaders play a central role in interpreting national policies, allocating institutional resources, and implementing performance evaluation systems. Research conducted in Yunnan during the COVID-19 period demonstrated that higher education leaders faced substantial challenges in maintaining teaching quality, staff management, organizational coordination, and financial sustainability under rapidly changing conditions. Although the study focused on crisis leadership rather than performance management directly, its findings highlight the importance of flexible governance structures and adaptive management practices. Performance management systems therefore need to provide sufficient flexibility to respond to changing institutional environments instead of relying exclusively on fixed performance targets.

When comparing studies conducted in Yunnan with the broader literature on Chinese universities, several common patterns become evident. First, performance management is increasingly recognized as an important component of university governance rather than a simple evaluation tool. Second, measurable indicators remain dominant despite growing recognition of the limitations of output-oriented assessment. Third, teacher development, organizational commitment, and academic well-being are receiving increasing attention alongside traditional performance measures. These developments indicate that the focus of research is gradually shifting from measuring performance to understanding how performance management influences academic behavior, organizational culture, and institutional sustainability.

Despite these developments, important research gaps remain. Existing studies tend to examine isolated topics, such as faculty stress, teacher evaluation, leadership, or quality assurance, rather than investigating performance management as an integrated organizational system. Furthermore, empirical evidence from comprehensive public universities in Yunnan remains relatively scarce, as available studies often focus on individual institutions or specific academic groups. Methodologically, cross-sectional questionnaire surveys continue to dominate the literature, while longitudinal research, mixed-methods designs, and comparative studies across different university types are still uncommon. These limitations make it difficult to understand how performance management policies influence faculty behavior and institutional development over time.

Future research should therefore move beyond describing existing evaluation practices and examine the mechanisms through which performance management affects university development. More attention should be given to the interaction among evaluation policy, organizational culture, leadership practices, faculty motivation, and institutional performance. In addition, evaluation frameworks should better reflect the distinctive missions of universities in less-developed regions. Instead of applying identical indicators across all institutions, performance management systems could incorporate measures related to regional service, talent cultivation, community engagement, interdisciplinary collaboration, and international cooperation with neighboring countries. Such an approach would better align institutional evaluation with the

strategic role that Yunnan universities play in China's regional development and higher education modernization.

Overall, the current body of literature indicates that performance management in Yunnan universities is gradually evolving from a narrow focus on performance measurement toward a broader emphasis on institutional quality, faculty development, and organizational sustainability. Nevertheless, the evidence remains fragmented, and comprehensive studies that integrate policy implementation, faculty behavior, organizational governance, and regional development are still lacking. Addressing these gaps will not only strengthen future research on Yunnan universities but also contribute to a more balanced understanding of performance management within the broader context of Chinese higher education reform.

## CONCLUSION

Performance management has become an important component of university governance as higher education institutions respond to increasing expectations for educational quality, research excellence, and social contribution. This literature review examined the concept and development of performance management, summarized the main research findings from Chinese universities, and discussed the current evidence related to Yunnan universities. The review also identified several limitations in the existing literature and proposed directions for future research.

The literature consistently indicates that performance management has evolved from a traditional performance appraisal system into a continuous management process. Rather than focusing only on annual evaluation, current performance management emphasizes goal alignment, regular feedback, professional development, and organizational learning (Aguinis, 2019; DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). This shift reflects a broader understanding that performance management should improve both individual capability and institutional effectiveness. In higher education, the process is particularly complex because universities pursue multiple objectives, including teaching, research, academic service, innovation, and regional engagement. Consequently, performance management systems need to balance different institutional missions instead of relying on a single performance indicator.

The review also demonstrates that performance management has become closely associated with higher education reform in China. National policies have encouraged universities to strengthen research performance, improve teaching quality, and increase international competitiveness. In response, most universities have established performance evaluation systems linking faculty assessment with promotion, salary, research funding, and career development. Existing studies suggest that these reforms have contributed to higher research productivity and improved organizational accountability. However, researchers have also expressed concern that excessive dependence on quantitative indicators may encourage short-term academic behavior, increase occupational pressure, and weaken academic autonomy (Huang & Xu, 2020).

The discussion of Yunnan universities reveals a different picture. Compared with nationally leading universities, institutions in Yunnan operate within a distinctive regional context characterized by relatively limited research resources, uneven institutional development, and broader responsibilities related to ethnic education, border development, and regional cooperation. Existing studies indicate that universities in Yunnan are gradually improving their performance management practices, particularly in faculty evaluation, quality assurance, and organizational governance. Nevertheless, empirical research remains fragmented, and comprehensive studies that examine performance management as an integrated organizational system are still scarce. Most available studies investigate only one aspect of university management, such as teacher well-being, educational quality, or leadership, without examining how these elements interact within a broader performance management framework.

Several research gaps emerge from the reviewed literature. First, future studies should pay greater attention to universities located in less-developed regions, where institutional missions and

development conditions differ from those of research-intensive universities in eastern China. Second, more longitudinal and mixed-methods research is needed to examine how performance management policies influence faculty behavior, organizational culture, and institutional performance over time. Third, future research should explore evaluation systems that combine quantitative indicators with qualitative assessment, peer review, and developmental feedback. Such an approach would provide a more balanced understanding of academic performance while supporting faculty development and organizational sustainability. Overall, performance management will remain a key element of higher education governance in China. The challenge for universities is no longer whether performance should be evaluated, but how evaluation systems can better support teaching quality, research innovation, faculty development, and regional service simultaneously. For Yunnan universities, designing context-sensitive and development-oriented performance management systems may improve institutional effectiveness while preserving the diversity of university missions. The findings of this review provide a theoretical foundation for future empirical research and offer practical implications for university administrators and policymakers seeking to strengthen performance management in higher education.

## References

- Aguinis, H. (2019). *Performance management* (4th ed.). Chicago Business Press.
- Aguinis, H., Joo, H., & Gottfredson, R. K. (2011). Why we hate performance management and why we should love it. *Business Horizons*, 54(6), 503-507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.06.001>
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2023). *Armstrong's handbook of performance management: An evidence-based guide to delivering high performance* (7th ed.). Kogan Page.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 421-433. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000085>
- DeNisi, A. S., & Smith, C. E. (2014). Performance appraisal, performance management, and firm-level performance: A review, a proposed model, and new directions for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 127-179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2014.873178>
- Huang, Y. T., & Xu, J. (2020). Surviving the performance management of academic work: Evidence from young Chinese academics. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(4), 704-718. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1685946>
- Murphy, K. R. (2020). Performance evaluation will not die, but it should. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(1), 13-31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12259>
- Pulakos, E. D., Hanson, R. M., Arad, S., & Moye, N. (2015). Performance management can be fixed: An evidence-based review. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 51-76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.4>
- Schleicher, D. J., Baumann, H. M., Sullivan, D. W., Levy, P. E., Hargrove, D. C., & Barros-Rivera, B. A. (2018). Putting the system into performance management systems: A review and agenda for performance management research. *Journal of Management*, 44(6), 2209-2245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318755303>
- Shu, F., Quan, W., Chen, B., Qiu, J., Sugimoto, C. R., & Larivière, V. (2021). The role of Web of Science publications in China's tenure system. *Scientometrics*, 126(2), 1233-1251.
- Wang, X., & Wang, W. L. (2024). The tenure track employment system in colleges and universities in China: A scoping review of the Chinese literature. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1271110. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1271110>

- Adler, S., Campion, M., Colquitt, A., Grubb, A., Murphy, K. R., Ollander-Krane, R., & Pulakos, E. D. (2016). Getting rid of performance ratings: Genius or folly? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 219-252. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.106>
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (Rev. ed.). Doubleday.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107-136. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- O'Boyle, E. H., Jr., & Aguinis, H. (2012). The best and the rest: Revisiting the norm of normality of individual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 65(1), 79-119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01239.x>

**Data Availability Statement:** The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

**Publisher's Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.



**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors. This is a fully open-access article distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).