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ABSTRACT

In establishing the performance parameters, performance management has been measured as a significant phenomenon in dealing with the policies, strategies and practices that mainly deals with how the employees behave in an organization and how the organization monitor and evaluate their performance. In this connection, the performance measures that how the employees fulfill their responsibilities in attaining the desired tasks. Different models have been recommended however, the most comprehensive set/attributes for the employees’ performance consists of efficiency, effectiveness, innovativeness, and responsiveness. This study aimed at examining employees’ performance through the mentioned attributes by collecting data from faculty hailing from HEIs of KP, Pakistan. The results offer significant information about the role of these attributes in determining the employees’ performance. For policymakers, in higher education context, some recommendations have been emerged along with the implications of the study.
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Introduction

The success of higher institutions is the outcomes of various dynamic factors along with the critical measurement parameters which are responsible for the smooth functioning of these institutions. Among many factors, the phenomenon of performance is the most influential and dynamic factor that alone is enough to cover all other parameters (Armstrong & Baron, 2005). The success of the educational institutions is contingent upon the effective role of the main functionaries like leaders and employees wherein role of a leader is about inspiration and motivation of employees while the role of employees is all about to fulfill the assigned responsibilities with commitment (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008). The best performance results in innovation and strong culture leading to institutional success while pathetic performance results in institutional failure and thus creates challenges for institutional
survival (Osman, Munever, Dogan & Nermin, 2010). The researcher recommended various dynamic attributes for performance wherein efficiency, effectiveness, innovativeness and responsiveness are the foremost that cover almost all the other dimensions/parameters.

The effective performance management system is an effective parameter in determining the success of organizations including higher institutions. Along with this, effective performance evaluation system is also vital in gauging the performance as per institutional standards. The performance is the mixture of different dynamic matters which when combined build the phenomenon of the performance in comprehensive manners (Audrey & Patrice, 2012). The most critical and key parameters in this drive are efficiency, effectiveness, creativity and responsiveness that are widely used as measurement tools for performance and measured as effective attributes in determining employees performance (Alavi, Abdi, Mazuchi, Bighami & Heidari, 2013). The performance is the ability of individuals to utilize their knowledge effectively and to respond efficiently by ensuring their skills in the innovative manners to achieve the desired objectives (Amjad, Sabri, Ilyas & Hameed, 2015). The management and leadership are solely responsible for effective performance management by inspiring the employees to attain the institutional objectives successfully.

The individuals are knowledgeable and caring over continuous determinations that help them to develop their knowledge and abilities in viable environments. Consequently, the individuals adapt, learn, change and exchange on the way to understanding and develop their professional abilities in diverse cultures (Coman & Catalina, 2016). The performance is the outcome concerning intellectual and physical dimensions that covers individuals’ ability to respond to institutional long-term objectives in desirable manners. In this link, traditional technique for measuring the performance aligned with predefined aims directly leads to the efficiency parameters (Kumar & Kesari, 2017). The effectiveness leads the employees to use the resources skillfully, ensure the minimum wastage of resources, have proper planning for resource utilization and helps in improving skills to meet changing demands (Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019). Similarly, employees are required to adapt contributing parameters towards performance like responsiveness and innovativeness by ensuring the innovative techniques to chase the institutional objectives effectively.

**Literature Review**

The employees’ performance is the outcome of various dynamic determinations likewise the inspiration on the part of institution and the wholehearted efforts on the part of employees (Pulakos, Schmitt, Dorsey, Hedge & Borman, 2002). Thus, performance is a comprehensive concept that includes the flexibility of inputs about employees’ skills and behavior and value of the outputs on the part of both, institutions and employees (Bhattacharya, Gibson & Doty, 2005). The employees’ performance is the multi-dimensional and multifaceted phenomenon that helps in evaluating institutional performance. Thus, various models are available in existing research studies that examined employees’ performance from different dimensions.
An Investigating on Influential Attributes in determining the Employees’ Performance

with diverse dynamic pro activity and outcomes (Grant & Ashford, 2008). The most leading models are the effectiveness, innovation and efficiency, efficiency, economy, quality and effectiveness, efficiency, economy, equity and effectiveness, innovativeness, responsiveness effectiveness and efficiency and effectiveness, efficiency and adaptability.

The employees’ performances along with certain dynamic factors (attributed & accredited) are responsible for success and failure of every organization including higher institutions. The employees’ readiness for optimistic change over decent performances shows ultimate adaptability, consistency and involvement and intrinsic motivation towards the institutional affairs (Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2011). The performance on the part of employees is the outcome of various efforts that are dependent upon structure, policies and practices of the institution. The employees’ professional behavior matters a lot while counting the performance of employees and institutions (Asif & Searcy, 2014). The higher institutions desire higher mark of professionalism that defines attitude, professional ethics, commitment and performance of concerned employees. Thus, performance, work ethics, professionalism, and dedication are active and go hand in hand towards attainment of institutional objectives (Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019). Employees’ performance is coupled with certain attributes which when combines form the overall performance of the employees.

Employees Performance

The performance of institutions is outcomes of employees’ performance which is supported by the concerned institution. Some researchers categorized components of performance concerning task and contextual performances (Chen & Francesco, 2003). Task performance describes the potential efficacy of the concerned employees to perform the institutional tasks at par to institutional desires keeping in view technological and cultural changes (Armstrong & Baron, 2005). The contextual performance is related to citizenship behavior of concerned employees which have a significant impact on the social and psychological parameters within the institution (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Both these performances are vital in determining institutional performance. However, main theme again pivots around the efficiency and effectiveness parameters further supported by the responsiveness and innovativeness (Mihaiu, Opreana & Cristescu, 2010). For this purpose, this study focuses the suggested attributes like efficiency, effectiveness, innovativeness and responsiveness which are phenomenal while judging the performance level in the institutions.

The employees’ performance is a vital tool for higher institutions in chasing their long-term objectives in a competitive environment. It helps evaluate financial and academic position of the institutions supported by the application of modern technologies (Khattak, Khan, Khan & Tariq, 2012). Similarly, the performance denotes individuals’ behavior at the workplaces that to what extent employees are responsible for attaining the tasks leading to institutional objectives (Sidorenko, & Gorbatova, 2015). Employees’ performance is influenced by other factors like relationships with colleagues, job security, environment, promotions, wages, personality profiles, procedures and processes, supervision, and fairness in the institution (Diamantidis &
Chatzoglou, 2019). However, strong mechanism is direly needed to realize the situation where numerous elements are active in attaining institutional among which work ethics, professionalism, communication, commitment and behavioral development are foremost while efficiency, effectiveness, innovativeness, responsiveness are under considerations in this study.

Attributes of Employees Performance

The employees’ performance is pivoted around some attributes which are vital in defining the performance comprehensively. As revealed previously, different researchers suggest different model however, the most comprehensive model is four attributed model presented by Uphoff and Moharir (1994). The efficiency denotes the best use of requisite dynamism, potential and time interval to attain the anticipated consequences. Similarly, the ability to understand and manage the desired results within available resources is called effectiveness (Chen & Francesco, 2003). The use of innovative ideas and creative skills are also the main theme of performance which is done through innovativeness (Alirezaei & Tavalaei, 2008). The responsiveness is the involvement, awareness and sensitivity of work forces concerning institutional tasks that to how much extent the employees are responsive and serious about the assigned tasks (Sidorenko & Gorbatova, 2015). These traits and factors are playing a substantial role in improving performance, nurturing commitment, augmenting work ethics and developing communication that has been verified empirically in the various studies (Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019).

Efficiency

The employees’ efficient behavior is vital in determining performance as it leads to decent performance that strongly contributes to the success of the institutions. On the part of employees, efficiency is the substance based on the diligence and hard work (Uphoff & Moharir, 1994). The efficiency has a significant connection with employees’ potential, efforts, commitment and performance that leads to an undaunted relationship between employees and institution (Coelli, Rao & Battese, 2001). The higher institutions are emphasized in improving efficiency as it helps in augmenting the employees’ attitude to behave ethically and professionally over intellectual capital and performance (Peng, Pike & Roos, 2007). In building ethical culture in the institutions, different approaches are available that make the institutions responsible for catering to the situation as per the needs and demands of the employees and institutions as well (Mihaiu, Opreana & Cristescu, 2010). The efficiency is the merger of various basics like rules and regulations, self-interest, work ethics, personal ethics, communication, devotion, social responsibility, codes of conduct time utilization and hard work at the workplace (Kumar & Kesari, 2017).

Effectiveness

The employees’ abilities to perform their responsibilities wholeheartedly by achieving the assigned tasks within the required standards denoted by effectiveness (Griffin, Neal & Neale, 2000). The effectiveness also denotes the phenomenal
development towards teamwork that is spirited in attaining certain assigned shared tasks by performing enthusiastically for the best interests of the institutions (Armstrong & Baron, 2005). The employees’ effectiveness is contingent upon the best use of the institutional interactions and communications where tasks are shared and desired consequences are communicated (Krishnan & Krishnan, 2012). In the higher educational context, determination for higher efficiency and effectiveness, the leadership and management prominently contribute to acquaint with the performance parameters to measure and manage the performance phenomenon (Sidorenko & Gorbataova, 2015). The effectiveness is all about when somewhat is considered as active for the specific purpose (input) and when there is something that is aimed to attain (output) that yields the vivid impressions on institution credibility and ultimate success (Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019).

Innovativeness

The employees’ performance is also measured through innovativeness that to what extent the employees are using innovative and creative ideas in attaining the institutional goals (Uphoff & Moharir, 1994). The researchers presented different meanings for innovativeness as to some it is an attribute while to others; it is a process to gain the competitive lead in the competitive environments (Obenchain, Johnson & Dion, 2004). In this link, when employees perform creatively then it means they are suggesting the novel, useful and creative ideas and procedures to attain the desired objectives within the prerequisite constraints (Alirezaei & Tavalaei, 2008). The innovativeness helps in developing the institutional abilities to respond available opportunities through adaptability to survive and develop in modern competitive situations (Malikeh & Zare, 2013). Literature offered ample evidence that innovativeness is vital for institutions in attaining desired standing and ranking. Similarly, an understanding of culture, attraction complexity, personal uniqueness, self-confidence, broad interests, and uncertainty consideration are related positively to innovative performances (Elina & Elita, 2017).

Responsiveness

The responsiveness has been considered as the most significant attribute of the employees’ performance as, without the proper response from employees towards the assigned tasks, the institution might not be able to attain their desired standards (Uphoff & Moharir, 1994). The responsiveness is also considered a vital aspect for employees due to the technological changes and variations in the cultural demands (Jayachandran & Varadarajan, 2006). In this connection, active responses on the part of employees are vital to continue the institutional activities in desired processes and procedures. It not only helps in creating suitable situation for ideas sharing, motivation and trust but also helps the institutions in nurturing the abilities and competencies of the employees (Liang, Chang & Wang, 2011). However, the lack of proper responses may create the situation of misunderstanding which results in affecting the working format undesirably (Elina & Elita, 2017). Consequently, the standing and roles of responsiveness in higher institutions in phenomenal as it directly related with the
social and emotional aspects of employees and credibility and success of concerned institutions (Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019).
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**Figure 1** Theoretical Framework

**Material and Methods**

The selection and application of suitable methods, tools and techniques is an important part of the research studies to provide the guidelines necessary for conducting the studies and reaching the conclusion. This section offered the details about the procedures of methods for selecting the sample, data collecting and data analysis in finding out the answers to research questions. Therefore, the descriptive statistics (that describe what is going on in the data) and inferential statistics (relationships among research variables), wherein the researchers try to infer results from the sample data by generalizing towards the population.

**Philosophy and Approach**

This study is based on exploring the existing realities (employees’ performance through attributes) in a native environment by applying statistical procedures to validate again these realities wherein information derived from sensory experience is interpreted over reason and logic (Cooper & Schindler, 2008). These are the main characteristics of the positivist approach therefore; positivism is the research philosophy adopted in this study. Similarly, as an essential parameter of the positivism, survey approach has been used to access the population of the study.

**Population and Sample**

The teaching faculty is considered one of the most influential units in higher institutions due to their important role in imparting education. The data was collected from the faculty hailing from higher institutions of the southern region, KP, Pakistan. This data has already been used in PhD dissertation. Total population comprises 1740
faculty members wherein a sample of 356 was drawn by using statistical formula (Yamani, 1967). The sample responses about 322 were used for analysis.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

The primary data was collected through questionnaire while secondary data was collected through different online databases. As per the construct (theoretical framework), the data was analyzed by using the descriptive as well as inferential analysis to describe the data and to examine relationships among variables to find out reactions towards research questions and to reach the decisions about the existence of certain relationships.

**Research Context and Measurement**

The study was conducted in higher education context due to its significant role in promoting an excellent environment for teaching and learning thereby imparting quality education to the students. The variables were measured through diverse questions related to employees’ performance which was further measured through different attributes. The questionnaire was extracted from the existing research studies (Uphoff&Moharir, 1994).

**Results and Discussions**

The analysis of data is merely the process wherein the research questions are answered and the results are presented. Therefore, results about the reliability, descriptive statics and inferential statics have been presented in the data analysis section. Similarly, the results have been discussed in light of existing research studies results to examine the commonalities and differences in the current and existing research studies.

**Table 1 Reliability Statistics**

| SN | Variables               | Cronbach Alpha | Items |
|----|------------------------|----------------|-------|
| 1  | Efficiency             | .788           | 06    |
| 2  | Effectiveness          | .830           | 06    |
| 3  | Innovativeness         | .759           | 06    |
| 4  | Responsiveness         | .789           | 06    |
| 5  | Employees Performance  | .929           | 10    |

Through Cronbach Alpha, reliability of examine was analyzed which shows that the variables in construct have acceptable reliability in terms of internal consistency wherein Cronbach Alpha values for efficiency (.788) measured over 06 items, effectiveness (.830) as measured through 06 items, innovativeness (.759) measured through 06 items, responsiveness (.789) measured over 06 items and employees’ performance (.929) measured over 10 items. Thus, the variables have good reliability in terms of internal consistency.
Table 2
Descriptive Statistics

|                   | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
|-------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Efficiency        | 322 | 2.65    | 6.98    | 4.9408 | 1.06019        |
| Effectiveness     | 322 | 1.68    | 6.13    | 3.7806 | 0.89980        |
| Innovativeness    | 322 | 2.03    | 6.89    | 4.0142 | 0.98547        |
| Responsiveness    | 322 | 1.76    | 6.69    | 4.4119 | 1.00900        |
| Employees Performance | 322 | 1.80    | 7.00    | 4.3707 | 1.22782        |

The descriptive statistics provide the details for describing the data used for measuring the research variables. It offered the data about the research variables concerning the sample-size, minimum and maximum responses, mean and standard deviation. Likewise, the sample size (322) while for efficiency, minimum and maximum responses were (2.65 & 6.98) and mean and standard deviation (4.9408 &1.06019), for effectiveness (1.68 & 6.13) with mean and standard deviation (3.7806 & .89980), for innovativeness (2.03 & 6.89) with mean and standard deviation(4.0142 & .98547), for thereresponsiveness (1.76 & 6.69) with mean and standard deviation and minimum and maximum responses for employee performance (1.80 & 7.00) while mean and standard deviation (4.3707 & 1.22782).

H1: Association between performance attributes (efficiency, effectiveness, innovativeness & responsiveness) and employees’ performance.

Table 3
Correlation Analysis

|                   | Efficiency | Effectiveness | Innovativeness | Responsiveness |
|-------------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Employees Performance | .777**     | .782**        | .663**         | .835**        |
| Sig. (2-tailed)    | .000       | .000          | .000           | .000          |
| N                  | 322        | 322           | 322            | 322           |

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

The first assumption was about association between performance attributes and employees’ performance which was examined over correlation procedure. The results from correlation provide significant information in deciding the existence of association between the variable. The results show that employees’ performance is significantly and positively correlated with the performance attributes likewise, efficiency and employees’ performance (R= .777 & P-value =.000), effectiveness and employees’ performance (R= .782 & P-value =.000), the innovativeness and employees’ performance (R=.663 & P-value =.000) and responsiveness and employees’ performance (R=.835 & P-value =.000). The highest association was found between responsiveness and employees’ performance preceded by effectiveness, efficiency and innovativeness. Consequently, from results, hypothesis # 1 is accepted as true and thus substantiated.
The existing studies offered various results about the performance attribute and employees’ performance in different contexts. Likewise, efficiency has been explored concerning transformation tension in higher education about equity, efficiency, performance and development (Mihaiu, Opreana & Cristescu, 2010; Krishnan & Krishnan, 2012). Effectiveness has been explored in the extent of utilizing institutional resources towards efficient and effective performances in institutions (Alavi et al., 2013; Elena & Marina, 2015). Likewise, the innovativeness denotes to novel ideas overview and application of innovation in contributing to employees’ performance (Alirezaei & Tavalaei, 2008; Osman, Shariff & Lajin, 2016). The responsiveness has a significant impact on employee performance which has also been explored previous with significant association towards the employees’ performance in organizations (Liang, Chang & Wang, 2011; Linda, Jennifer, Claire, Boot & Allard, 2014). So, the results have been validated through the results of existing research studies to verify the attributes of performance towards employees’ performance in different context including higher institutions.

**H₂**: Impact/Influence of performance attributes (efficiency, effectiveness, innovativeness & responsiveness) on employees’ performance.

### Table 4
**Regression Analysis (Summary Table)**

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of Estimate |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 1     | .8825 | .778     | .775              | .62060                 |

### Table 5
**Regression Analysis (ANOVA)**

| Model     | Sum Squares | df  | Mean Square | F        | Sig.  |
|-----------|-------------|-----|-------------|----------|-------|
| Regression| 427.340     | 4   | 106.835     | 277.392  | .000b |
| Residual  | 122.090     | 317 | .385        |          |       |
| Total     | 549.430     | 321 |             |          |       |

### Table 6
**Regression Analysis (Coefficient)**

| Model            | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig.  |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------|
|                  | B                           | Std. Error                | Beta   |       |
| 1 (Constant)     | -1.069                      | .179                      | -5.957 | .000  |
| Efficiency       | .245                        | .056                      | .201   | 4.355 | .006  |
| Effectiveness    | .329                        | .051                      | .276   | 6.413 | .024  |
| Innovativeness   | .149                        | .046                      | .122   | 3.274 | .031  |
| Responsiveness   | .446                        | .059                      | .389   | 7.508 | .000  |
a. Predictors: (Constant), Responsiveness, Innovativeness, Effectiveness, Efficiency
b. Dependent Variable: Employees Performance

The second assumption was about the predictability of employees’ performance through the performance attributes. The results offered significant information in deciding the impact of performance attributes (effectiveness, efficiency, responsiveness & innovativeness) on the employees’ performance. The attributes are responsible in bringing 77.8% variation in the employees’ performance by showing a significant impact. Likewise, the efficiency has a significant impact on performance (coefficient = .245 & P-value = .006), effectiveness on the performance (coefficient = .329 & P-value = .024), the innovativeness on the employees’ performance (coefficient = .149 & P-value = .031) and responsiveness on the performance (coefficient = .446 & P-value = .000). Again the responsiveness shows a significant impact on employees’ performance preceded by efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness. These results also support the results from correlation. Consequently, from results, hypothesis # 2 is accepted.

The previous studies offered significant information about the role of performance attributes towards employees’ performance in different contexts. Likewise, efficiency is the capability of the individuals to act and produce effectually with minimum efforts and least of waste of resources (Mihaiu et al., 2010; Sidorenko & Gorbatova, 2015). The effectiveness is widely recognized as an effective attribute toward performance thereby having a significant impact on employees’ performances at workplaces in institutions (Krishnan & Krishnan, 2012; Kumar & Kesari, 2017). The innovation has also significant influence upon the performance wherein the employees try to attain the assigned tasks by applying creative ideas and new techniques to achieve the desired tasks (Osman et al., 2016; Parmar, Mackenzie, Cohn & Gann, 2014). Likewise, the responsiveness helps in producing the situations of the motivation and trust wherein the individuals share their ideas and where their ideas are responded in response to various determinants of organizational performance (Linda et al., 2014; Kumar & Farouk, 2016). Consequently, performance attributes have been explored in diverse contexts with diverse theoretical and empirical links between the performance attributes and employees’ performance.

Conclusion

The organizations may be able to achieve their desired status only when they have an active performance management system where the performance is prioritized with no concession to get the anticipated outcomes. The performance management on the part of all the organizations including the higher institutions needs additional focus on certain attributes related to the performance. This study examined the most effective attributes about the employees’ performance among which the efficiency, effectiveness, innovativeness and responsiveness which have been formerly examined by various researchers in different contexts. The study offered significant information about the association and influence of the role of performance attributes in determining employees’ performance wherein efficiency and responsiveness are most important followed by the effectiveness and innovativeness. Thus, this study validated the
existence of relationships between the performance attributes and employees’ performance in the higher educational context. Some recommendations are hereby offered to policy-makers and future researchers to further explore these variables in different contexts.

**Recommendations**

- ✓ The efficiency is more critical for the institutions as it helps in reshaping the employee attitude and behavior to become efficient to produce desired outcomes. Therefore, institutions are required to focus on employees’ efficiency to develop respectable performance from them leading to institutional success.

- ✓ The effectiveness helps in motivating employees to be successful in producing the required standards. So, being effective is all about doing accurate things while being efficient is all about doing things right. Thus, institutions are required to promote the effectiveness to produce more outputs with the least inputs.

- ✓ The employees’ responsiveness is also vital for institutions where employees are responded to institutional tasks more effectively. Thus, the institutions are required to arrange certain courses to shape the behavior of employees to respond effectively to the institutional tasks in more efficient manners.

- ✓ The innovativeness is vital for promoting innovative ideas wherein the employees are encouraged and their ideas are respected. Thus, the institutions are required to offer the required facilities to their employees to implement the new ideas based upon the facts so as to achieve better institutional outcomes.

**Implications of study**

- ✓ The present study involves an understanding about different attributes of employees’ performance by testing the suggested framework which shows that all the attributes are significant in determining the employees’ performance however, some are least while others are most significant based upon the context.

- ✓ The application of the suggested framework in other contexts might be interesting to produce significant results by analyzing and comparing the outcomes from other contexts with the higher educational contexts to examine the possible common and changing aspects of employees’ performance.

- ✓ It would be interesting how other organizations are dealing with a performance by focusing on similar or diverse attributes about the performance in organizations. It will help in accepting employees’ performance about different attributes that are vital in determining the employees’ performance.
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