

Call for papers

Special Issue: Innovation in Performance Management and Feedback Interventions

TO BE PUBLISHED IN:

.E PRACTICE
THE EAWOP PRACTITIONERS E-JOURNAL

DUE DATE FOR PROPOSALS (1,000-1,500 WORDS):

1 October 2018

DUE DATE FOR PAPER SUBMISSIONS (MAX. 7,000 WORDS):

1 March 2019

EXPECTED PUBLICATION:

October 2019

EDITORS

Colin Roth

BlackBox Open, Germany

Angela Carter

University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

Diana Rus

Creative Peas, The Netherlands

Background

Researchers and practitioners in Work and Organizational Psychology have devoted decades to understanding and developing performance management systems in organizations. The term performance management (PM) refers to organizational interventions or activities aimed at improving individual, group, or organizational performance, for example, via goal setting, feedback, and reward systems. According to a recent extensive review of the field by DeNisi and Murphy (2017), future research should broaden its perspective on the context in which performance management is done. Furthermore, research should take a closer look into how individual or team outcomes of PM interventions can be linked to organizational level performance.

Many organizations, including global players like Deloitte, Accenture, or Adobe are turning away from formal performance management systems towards more informal processes such as instant performance feedback (Roberts, 2017). According to O'Leary and Pulakos (2011) performance management has failed, because in many ways it has been reduced to prescribed steps within formal administrative systems. Scaduto, Hunt, and Schmerling (2015) take a more constructive view on the issue. They argue that PM systems can be effective if they rely on the participation of the different stakeholders in defining performance criteria as well as on regular feedback based on those criteria.

Some of the main reasons, why performance management is, in practice, quite often a difficult task and, instead of supporting employee performance, undermines it, are:

- Performance is multifaceted and interdependent. It does not consist of one single key indicator and every industry, unit, manager, employee will understand something slightly different when talking about performance. In order to measure these various facets, organizations have created complex and elaborate rating processes which often require fine-tuned judgements which are very time consuming.
- With fast changing markets, it is difficult to define individual goals that are not only aligned with the organization's (shifting) strategy, but also meaningful to an individual employee and not outdated or obsolete within weeks.
- Judgements and ratings are always subject to errors and social judgement. Even if defined procedures and rating standards are in place, managers' ratings of their employees will invariably be coloured by their point of view and subjective impression, which, in turn, results in inconsistent and unequal judgment.

- Most modern work forms require group work. This means that it is often difficult or even impossible to tease out an individual's specific output or performance within a group. Hence, measuring individuals' performance in a context where they are interdependent with others and, therefore, don't have full control over their own performance a) will be perceived as unfair and b) will not lead to performance improvements given that feedback at the individual level will not automatically lead to improvements at the group level.

Aims of the Special Issue and Possible Topics

The aim of this In Practice Special Issue is to provide a platform for practitioners and researchers to showcase the latest practice, research and trends in the areas of innovation in performance management and feedback interventions.

We invite both empirical and theoretical submissions and especially welcome contributions from practitioners who have developed and/or implemented innovations in performance management and feedback interventions. In particular, we encourage submissions that address issues related (but not limited) to providing a "missing link" in this area as DeNisi and Murphy called it:

- Is there (some) empirical evidence regarding the relationship between individual performance outcomes and firm level performance?
- What are the latest trends in performance management and feedback interventions?
- If "instant" or "continuous" feedback is the right thing to do, is there evidence regarding its effectiveness or is it just "old wine in new bottles?"
- Evidence-based techniques, tools and methods in the area of performance management and feedback interventions
- Empirical research in the organizational context on innovations in performance management and feedback interventions
- Also, very much appreciated are studies conducted outside the field of organizational psychology, such as for instance in sports. The learnings from performance management in sports can be very fruitful to the organizational domain (Roth, Young, Koenig, Schmerling, & Pritchard, 2017).

Submissions

In order to be considered for publication in the Special Issue, a proposal of 1,000–1,500 words (can include a figure/table) should be submitted by 1st October, 2018. The editors will review the proposals and contact authors with an invitation to submit full manuscripts up to a maximum of 7,000 words by 1st March, 2019.

Proposals and full papers must be written in English and in the style of *In Practice* (see <http://www.eawop.org/style-guide>).

Submitted papers must be unpublished and not be in the process of being submitted to other journals. Publication of this Special Issue is planned for October, 2019.

Send proposals to: InPractice@eawop.org

The editors are happy to discuss ideas for proposals and provide further information about the content of the special issue. For further information, contact Colin Roth (colin.roth@blackboxopen.com).

References

- DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(3), 421–433. doi:10.1037/apl000085
- O'Leary, R. S., & Pulakos, E. D. (2011). Why Is Performance Management Broken? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 4*(2), 146–164. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01315.x
- Roberts, D. R. (2017). Reimagining Performance Management and Rewards: Lessons From Change Leaders. *Paper presented at the SIOP 2017, Orlando, FL.*
- Roth, C., Young, B. L., Koenig, N., Schmerling, D., & Pritchard, R. D. (2017). Organizational insights from performance management intervention applied to sports. In D. J. Svyantek (Ed.), *Sports and Understanding Organizations* (pp. 250–282). Charlotte: Age Publishing Inc.
- Scaduto, A., Hunt, B., & Schmerling, D. (2015). A Performance Management Solution: Productivity Measurement and Enhancement System (ProMES). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 8*(1), 93 – 99. doi:doi:10.1017/iop.2015.18