EVALUATING ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN PUBLIC
SPORT ORGANIZATIONS¹KAMUSAL SPOR TEŞKİLATLARINDA ÖRGÜTSEL
PERFORMANSIN ÖLÇÜLMESİ

Kubilay ÖCAL

Muğla Sıktı Koçman Üniversitesi Physical Education Sports High School Muğla / Turkey

Öz: Bu çalışma kamu kurumlarındaki örgütsel performansı oluşturan öğeleri ölçen dört farklı ölçüm aracının geliştirilme sürecini anlatmaktadır. Bu çalışmada geliştirilen ölçüm araçları sırasıyla İnsan Kaynakları Yönetim Performansı, Yönetim performansı, Finansal performans ve Çalışan performansı olarak tanımlanmaktadır. İnsan Kaynakları Yönetim Performansı: Kurumda çalışan personelin kapasitelerinin verimli kullanılmasını açıklayan Yönetim Performansı: Kurum içerisindeki olumlu iklim ve kültürel gelişimi ifade etmektedir. Diğer yandan Finansal Performans kurumsal bütçenin miktarını, bu bütçenin kullanımındaki otonomi ve bütçenin artırılması amacıyla yapılan tüm çalışmaları anlatmak için Çalışan Performansı ise personelin iş tanımlarında yer alan görevleri yapma ve diğer sosyal psikolojik değişkenleri ortaya koymaktadır. Bu amaçla çalışma iki farklı aşamada ele alınmıştır. Birincisi aşamada geliştirilen anketler tek bir kurumdan 160 personel üzerinde uygulanmış ve bunun ardından faktör analizi ile anketlerin güvenilirlik katsayıları ve faktör dağılımları belirlenmiştir. Çalışmanın birinci aşamasının sonuçlarına göre İnsan Kaynakları Yönetim Performansı Ölçeği ve Yönetim Performansı Ölçeği tek boyutlu olup güvenilirlik katsayıları iki ölçek için de 0.93 olarak hesaplanmıştır. Finansal Performans Ölçeği; Finansal Güç ($\alpha=.85$), Finansal Çaba ($\alpha=.81$) Finansal Otonomi ($\alpha=.87$) olarak üç faktörden oluşmaktadır. Çalışan Performansı Ölçeği ise; Temel Performans ($\alpha=.87$), İleri Performans ($\alpha=.84$) ve Bütünleşme ($\alpha=.79$), olarak üç faktörden oluşmaktadır. Çalışmanın ikinci kısmında ölçüm araçlarına 15 farklı kurumda 221 kişiden oluşan örneklemden toplanan veriler üzerinde AMOS 18 ile Onaylayıcı Faktör Analizi yapılmış ve anketlerin kullanılabilirliği onaylanmıştır [RMSA<.090, CFI, NNFI<.90 and (x2 / df) <3]

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel Performans, Yönetim Performansı, İnsan Kaynakları Yönetim Performansı, Finansal Performans, Çalışan Performansı, Kamusal Spor Örgütleri

Abstract: This paper describes the process of developing and validating four different scales to assess organizational performance in public sports organizations. The scales are Human Resources Management Performance Scale, Administrative Performance Scale, Financial Performance Scale and Employee Performance Scale. Human Resources Performance refers to the effective use of human capitals and Administrative Performance includes the capacity to improve positive climate and cultural aspects in an organization. Financial Performance on the other hand involves the amount of budget, autonomy in use of this budget and various attempts to increase this budget. Finally, Employee Performance refers to activities performed in job scope (task performance) and activities which contribute to social and psychological context of the organization (contextual performance) by all members. For this purpose a two-phase study was conducted. In the first phase of the study, exploratory factor analyses were conducted with 160 managers and employees in a single organization. Results of the Exploratory Factor Analyses showed that both Human Resources Management Performance and Administrative Performance were explained by one-factor structure with satisfactory reliability scores (Cronbach's $\alpha=.93$ for both scales). Moreover financial performance is explained by a three-factor structure as Financial Power ($\alpha=.85$), Financial Effort ($\alpha=.81$), and Financial Autonomy ($\alpha=.87$). Additionally, Employee Performance was also explained by a three-factor structure named as Fundamental Performance ($\alpha=.87$), Advance Performance ($\alpha=.84$) and Internalization ($\alpha=.79$). In the second phase of the study, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted by Analysis Moments of Structures (AMOS) 18 with 221 managers and employees selected from 15 governmental sports organizations in order to validate the usability of the scales. Results of the confirmatory factor analysis showed that fit indices meet acceptance level [RMSA<.090, CFI, NNFI<.90 and (x2 / df) <3]

Key Words: Organizational Performance, Administrative Performance, Human Resources Management Performance, Financial Performance, Employee Performance, Public Sport Organizations

Doi: 10.17363/SSTB.20151610874

- (1) **Sorumlu Yazar:** Kubilay ÖCAL, Muğla Sıktı Koçman Üniversitesi Physical Education Sports High School Muğla / Turkey ocalkubilay@gmail.com **Geliş Tarihi / Received:** 13.11.2014 **Düzeltilme Tarihi / Revision Date** 11.03.2014 **Kabul Tarihi / Accepted:** 29.03.2015 **Makalenin Türü:** Type of article (Araştırma – Uygulama / Research -Application) **Çıkar Çatışması / Conflict of Interest:** Yok / None “Etik Kurul Raporu Yok - None of Ethics Committee” (Araştırmada Kurum İzni Var / Yok) “YOK” “The Research Council Permit Yes / No” “NO”

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

INTRODUCTION

There is communal sense in recent decades that public sector organizations (PSOs) are characterized as bureaucratic and mechanistic norms which result in inefficient in terms of low productivity and low capacity (Holzer & Rabbin, 1987; Wright & Pandey, 2010) But PSOs are valuable governmental structures which maintain employment to millions of people and providing significance amounts of financial sources to global economy (Jordan et al., 2012). For that reason, a considerable interest in PSOs keeps its importance in every period of administrations and politics. On account of governmental shrinkage triggered by global economic crises, many PSOs today, are trying to deal with their increasing social responsibilities and overcome multifaceted restrictions on their strategic and financial activities (Hull & Lio, 2006). In contrast to private sector, public organizations mostly depend on governmental support in terms of labor force and finance. For that reason, limited resources and additional requirements increase pressure on these organizations to improve their performance and develop measurable outcomes (Decramer, Smolders, & Vanderstraeten, 2013; Veld, Paauwe & Boselie, 2010).

With the upsurge interest in performance management reform at the beginning of twenty first century (Moynihan, 2008) public sector organizations imported some key concepts, ideas and tools from private sector in order to increase their efficiency and organizational performance. It is called New

Public Management (NPM) that brought a radical change in public services which have relatively stable and bureaucratic management system. NPM provide a shift to business sector perspective by using performance indicators (Boden et al., 1998; Dunleavy and Hood, 1994; Kessler et al., 2000). These performance indicators used for understanding strong and weak aspects of organizations. By the way it would be possible to implement required interventions to make a shift in organizational performance.

In public sector, organizational performance can be examined in two main dimensions as internal and external performance. Internal performance refers to the degree of success in realizing administrative and operational functions in relation to institutional mission (Kim (2004). Administrative function refers to the management capacity in organizational design and the way of using human resource (Jime'nez & Valle, 2005; Sanchez, Jimenez, Carnicer, & Perez, 2007). Effective use of human resources helps managers to improved performance outcomes through the workforce (Knies, Boselie, Gould-Williams, & Vandenabeele, 2015). Findings suggest that human resource management (HRM) has positive effects on employee motivation and organizational performance in the public sector (Messersmith, Patel, Lepak, & Gould-Williams, 2011).

Operational function of the organization on the other hand, deals with quality service provided by employees of organizations defined as job

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

performance. According to Motowidlo and Schmit (1999), job related performance can be examined in two dimensions of task performance and contextual performance. Task performance deals with fluency of implementing the scope of job as an employee or as a manager. For example, while employee task performance requires providing staff functions effectively and efficiently, managerial task performance requires success in planning, coordinating or supervising. Contextual performance deals with the structure of social and psychological environment of the organization. It includes activities that promote the viability of the social and organizational network and enhance the psychological climate of an organization by members of organization. Contextual performance are composed of activities such as helping and cooperating with others; following organizational rules and procedures; endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives; persisting with extra enthusiasm when necessary to complete own tasks successfully; and volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job. Contextual performance is mostly related to organizational culture and climate which provides sufficient environment to perform duties and responsibilities required in one's job.

External performance refers to the public satisfaction provided by fulfilling the mission of organization which in turn to increase governmental support (e.g. increase in funds, surge in investments). According to the NPM perspective; external

performance is also the indicator of organizational efficiency as an important dimension of overall organizational performance (Giague, Biget, & Varone, 2013).

Financial performance is another indicator for organizational performance which needs to be considered. The perspective of NPM on financial performance is also different from traditional PM. Although traditional financial performance focuses on discrepancies between budgets and the actual expenses, NPM focuses on efficiency and resource savings (Jansen, 2008). Studies and reforms in public sector organizations originate from the need for efficiency and effectiveness in these organizations

The literature on organizational performance provide various theoretical perspectives that each attempts for the most efficient way to conceptualize or measure organizational performance (Nowy, Wicker, Feiler, & Breuer, 2015). But performance has different meanings for different organizations depending on the ways of success. Among the different approaches to organizational performance, the Systems Resources Model, the Process Model, and the Goal Model are mostly accepted models according to Winand et al. (2014).

It is also agreed that the concept of organizational performance requires an approach that combines financial and non-financial measures.

In recent decades, several studies aimed at the implementation of organizational change in the

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

public sector (e.g., Fernandez & Pitts, 2007; Van der Voet, Kuipers, & Groeneveld, 2015). Leadership is often highlighted as a central factor in processes of change in public organizations (Stewart & Kringas, 2003) as in private sector organizations (Higgs & Rowland, 2011). However success in organizational change is a subjective and multi-interpretable term and change without the support of employees cannot be achieved. Therefore many studies focus on employee attitudes toward change (e.g., Van der Voet, 2014; Wright & Pandey, 2013).

For this reason, research studies that take employees' perspectives and attitudes into account have a great importance. Organizational performance in public sector is a multifaceted concept which needs to have examinations in detail to provide better understandings. Researchers from management field agree on the notion that we cannot manage what we cannot evaluate. For that reason we need new and valuable tools to evaluate organizational information. Therefore, this study aims to develop and validate four different scales for evaluating the administrative performance, human resources management performance, financial performance and employee performance in public sector organizations.

Theoretical Perspective

Institutional theory provides a basic background for this study addressing the impact of dynamic

interplay between managers, employees and organizations.

Guy Peters (2000) defines an institution as “a formal or informal, structural, societal or political phenomenon that transcends the individual level, that is based on more or less common values, has a certain degree of stability and influences behavior” (cited in Casimir, Izueke, & Nzekwe, 2014, p.219).

Institutions directly and indirectly determine the motives guiding individual behavior (Vandenabeele, 2015). Ryan and Deci (2005) stated that individuals acquire their identities through interactions with other individuals or institutions. These interactions make employee satisfied with their psychological needs. Institutions construct institutional socialization and internalization by exposing their members with public service values: such as interest in politics and policy making, public interest, compassion, self-sacrifice, customer orientation, democratic values, and good governance (Vandenabeele, Leisink, & Knies, 2013).

According to the Meyer and Zucker (1989) performance is (a) the norm of participative democratic governance operates, sometimes in the formal structure or rules of an organization; (b) the interests of multiple constituencies are given recognition; and (c) the organization's function is non-technical and outputs elude measurement. This definitions clearly point to institutional theory

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

that provide a significant frame work in perceptive performance evaluation concepts for this study.

METHOD

Five stages were followed in developing performance evaluation scales of (Human Resources Management Performance Scale (HRMPS), Administrative Performance Scale (ADMPS), Financial Performance Scale (FINPS) and Employee Performance Scale (EMPPS). In the first stage, conceptual frameworks for each instrument were developed. For the purpose of this stage, a detailed review of literatures on various types of performance measures for organizations was carried out. The result of the literature review revealed that developing these scales has great importance for organizational studies in measuring performance. In the second stage of the instrument development process, item pool was developed for each measure by considering previous research studies. After that, demographic items such as gender, age and status were added. The third stage, expert opinions were obtained for content validity of the scales. Before Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), expert opinion from managers, academicians and management professionals about the items in scales were taken with both written and face to face exchange of views. Contacting those people from different areas provided rich amount of feedbacks for finalizing the measures. The fourth stage was EFA which reveals factor structure of the scales and provides evidence for construct validity. Six point scales were used for

rating responses in order to capture small differences among participants. In the final stage confirmatory factor analysis was conducted with a selected sample from governmental organizations.

EFA with Maximum Likelihood extraction method (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, and Strahan (1999) and oblique rotation (direct oblimin) (Preacher & MacCallum, 2003) was carried out by using the data obtained from 160 managers and employees working in a single organization. After obtaining the final version of the scales, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted with another sample composed of 221 participants selected from 15 governmental organizations in order to confirm the usability and validity of the measures and provide further evidence for reliability. Before administration of the scale, permission was obtained from Human Subjects Ethic Committee and Management of related organization

RESULTS

According to the Norman and Streiner's (1994) formula which was utilized by Garson, (2006), minimum value of factor loadings for data set was calculated. Then, the matrix of correlation coefficients and their respective significance levels were used to check the correlations among scale items which have been used to define the factors. Examination of the bivariate relationships revealed that the majority of values are greater than .5 and there were not any value greater than

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

.9 (Field, 2005). In addition, significant Barlett test of sphericity result confirmed the factorability of correlation coefficients and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy, which provide a minimum standard that should be passed before

a factor analysis, is found to be greater than the suggested minimum value of .60 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Hence, it was considered that the data were adequate for the factor analysis

Table 1. Summary of Factor Analysis Result of Human Resources Management Performance Scale (HRMPS), Administrative Performance Scale (ADMPS), Financial Performance Scale (FINPS) and Employee Performance Scale (EMPPS)

Scales	N of Items	Factors	Factor model explaining	Reliability for EFA	Reliability for CFA
HRMPS	13	Single factor	49.44	.93	.95
ADVPS	13	Single factor	50.81	.93	.95
FINPS	12		56.35	.88	.94
	5	Financial Power	40.76	.85	.91
	4	Financial Effort	9.08	.81	.88
	3	Financial Autonomy	6.49	.77	.83
EMPPS	14		64.35	.92	.94
	6	Fundamental Performance	51.56	.87	.87
	5	Internalization	7.09	.84	.88
	3	Advance Performance	5.71	.79	.87

EFA results were summarized in Table 1. Number of items, name of factors, percentage of explained variances, and Cronbach's Alpha scores for both exploratory factor analyses, and confirmatory factor

analysis were presented. The following Tables 2, 3, 4, 5 provide factor loadings of oblimin rotation for the HRMPS, ADMPS, FINPS, and EMPPS.

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

Table 2. Summary of Factor Loadings of Oblimin Rotation for the HRMPS and Item-Total Correlations

	Factor Loadings	Item Total Correlation	Alpha If Item Deleted
Item 5	.80	.73	.92
Item 6	.78	.72	.92
Item 7	.77	.72	.92
Item 2	.77	.67	.92
Item 11	.76	.75	.92
Item 8	.71	.52	.93
Item 1	.71	.68	.92
Item 3	.68	.65	.93
Item 10	.68	.70	.92
Item 4	.68	.66	.93
Item 9	.64	.72	.92
Item 13	.59	.69	.92
Item 12	.52	.69	.92

As shown in Table 2, all 13 items loaded on a single factor and was labeled as HRMPS, which is related to the management success in effective use of human capitals in an organization. For the

reliability evidence of HRMPS, Cronbach alpha was calculated. The results generated satisfactory evidence for the reliability of HRMPS. Cronbach alpha for the scale was .93.

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

Table 3. Summary of Factor Loadings of Oblimin Rotation for the ADMPS and Item-Total Correlations

	Factor Loadings	Item Total Correlation	Alpha If Item Deleted
Item 11	.78	.75	.92
Item 6	.76	.72	.92
Item 9	.76	.72	.92
Item 5	.76	.73	.92
Item 7	.75	.72	.92
Item 10	.73	.70	.92
Item 12	.72	.69	.92
Item 13	.71	.69	.92
Item 1	.69	.68	.92
Item 2	.69	.68	.92
Item 4	.67	.66	.93
Item 3	.67	.65	.93
Item 8	.54	.52	.93

EFA with oblimin rotation revealed one factor model, explaining the 50.81 % of the variance. The scree plot revealed only one dominant factor. As indicated in Table 3, all 13 items loaded on a single factor and was labeled as ADMPS, which is related to behaviors that contribute to

the culture and climate of the organization. For the reliability evidence of ADMPS, Cronbach's alpha was calculated. Alpha for the scale was .93 that generated satisfactory evidence for the reliability.

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: 10-100-121-128 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

Table 4. Summary of Factor Loadings of Oblimin Rotation for the FINPS and Item- Total Correlation

	Factor Loadings			Item-Total Correlation	Alpha If Item Deleted
Financial Power	1	2	3		
Item 7	,89	-,13	-,07	,74	,80
Item 8	,79	-,05	-,10	,72	,81
Item 6	,55	,29	,12	,57	,84
Item 12	,49	,08	-,30	,64	,83
Item 5	,41	,34	-,22	,65	,82
Financial Effort					
Item 3	,18	,79	,04	,68	,73
Item 4	,07	,69	-,12	,63	,76
Item 2	-,11	,68	,00	,62	,76
Item 1	-,01	,54	-,10	,58	,78
Financial Autonomy					
Item 11	-,12	,13	-,90	,65	,63
Item 9	,06	,00	-,59	,57	,72
Item 10	,14	,00	-,57	,58	,71

The first, second, and third factors accounted for the 40.76%, 9.08%, 6.49% of the variance, respectively. According to the Table 4, it can be observed that 5 items (5, 6, 7, 8, and 12) loaded on the first factor which was labeled in this study as Financial Power (FIP), explaining total amount of investment in use. Sample items from the scale are; “there is linear increase in financial incomes of the organization” and “organization has sufficient financial sources to realize its own objectives”. Items, 1, 2, 3, 4 loaded on the

second factor which was identified as Financial Effort (FIE), as all of these items were about the economical strives and activities to increase organizational investment. Sample items from the scale are; “organization use its financial resources effectively” and “organization cooperate with governmental organizations to increase its financial investment”. Items 9, 10, and 11 loaded on the third factor which was labeled as Financial Autonomy (FIA), which is related to having a sense of autonomy while taking economic decisions.

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

Sample items from the scale are; “organization has independent prudential financial strategies” and “organization creates great part of its own financial resources”. For the reliability evidence of FINPS and its subscales, Cronbach alpha was

calculated separately for total scale and for subscales. The results generated satisfactory evidence for reliability of FINPS. Cronbach alpha for the total scale was .88, and for the subscales were .85, .81, and .77 respectively.

Table 5. Summary of Factor Loadings of Oblimin Rotation for the EMPPS and Item- Total Correlation

	Factor Loadings			Item Total Correlation	Alpha If Item Deleted
Fundamental Performance	1	2	3		
Item 4	,90	,10	,21	,71	,83
Item 3	,80	-,05	-,11	,71	,84
Item 9	,78	-,09	,01	,57	,86
Item 1	,64	,03	-,20	,63	,85
Item 5	,62	,27	,03	,72	,83
Item 2	,55	,12	-,32	,64	,85
Internalization					
Item 13	-,12	,98	,12	,64	,82
Item 10	-,03	,76	-,09	,56	,83
Item 12	,24	,65	-,07	,70	,80
Item 11	,30	,54	-,12	,68	,80
Item 14	,30	,51	-,14	,69	,80
Advance Performance					
Item 7	-,06	-,09	-,98	,71	,65
Item 6	-,10	,30	-,67	,60	,77
Item 8	,37	,02	-,55	,61	,73

By examining the Table 5, it can be observed that 6 items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9) loaded on the first factor and was labeled in this study as Fun-

damental Performance (FEP) which is related to having a sense of basic employee behaviors desired by an organization in general. Items; 6,

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: 10-100-121-128 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

7, and 8 loaded on the second factor which was identified as Advance Employee Performance (AEP) explaining the more developed employee skills. Items; 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 loaded on the third factor identified as Internalization (INT), explaining the high level of interaction between employee behaviors and organizational goals. Cronbach's alpha for the total scale was .92, and for subscales were .87, .84, and .79 respectively

Adaptation of the Measures

In order to provide evidence for validity of developed measures for governmental organiza-

tions, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted employing the maximum likelihood method by using the AMOS 18 program (Arbuckle & Wothke, 1999) on HRMPS, ADMPS, FINPS, and EMPPS. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted by AMOS 18. Comparative fit index (CFI), non-normed fit index (NNFI) and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) were used to check if the model fit the data. After re-specification of models Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was computed to check for the internal consistency of adapted and developed scales (Table 1).

Table 6. Summary of Goodness of Fit Statistics for the Scales

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2 / df	CFI	NNFI	RMSEA
HRMPS	115	60	1.9	.97	.97	.076
ADMPS	145	58	2.5	.96	.94	.086
FINPS	125	51	2.5	.96	.95	.081
EMPPS	145	58	2.5	.95	.94	.073

The following Tables provide Goodness of Fit Statistics for HRMPS, ADMPS, FINPS, and EMPPS. Results of the confirmatory factor analysis study show that all scales and subscales are in predefined thresholds for acceptable model fit [RMSA<.090, CFI, NNFI<.90 and (χ^2 / df) <3]

DISCUSSION

This study provides four different scales for evaluating performance in public sector organizations. HRMPS is a single factor explaining the

administrative qualification in successful use of human capitals in organization. ADMPS is a single factor explaining implications for contributing to the positive culture and climate in organization and systematic adaptations to New Management System. FINPS has three dimensions. These are FIP explaining amount of investment in use, FIE dealing with economical strives and activities to increase organizational investment, and FIA which is related to having a sense of autonomy while taking economic decisions. Employee

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

Performance is measured by three factors. FEP is related to having a sense of basic employee behaviors expected by an organization in general. AEP, on the other hand, explains moderate level of employee skills which an employee is supposed to use his or her individual potential effectively. INT is the third level explaining the highest level of employee performance that an interaction occurs between employee behaviors and organizational goals.

Scales was developed with a process of extensive literature review, interview with managers, employees and scholars for content validation. A pilot study with sample of 160 managers and employees selected from a single organization, in order to test the factorial structure of the scales, and a cross-validation study with a sample of 221 managers and employees to confirm the factor structures to provide reliability and further validity evidence.

Factor analytic evidence indicates that all patterns coefficients were high, indicating a significant contribution of each items to the corresponding subscales. In addition, the result of the confirmatory factor analysis also indicated that the good fit proved with high fit indices.

These findings provide evidences for construct validity for scales. Criterion related validity was tested by using correlational inquiry. Each dimension of scales (i.e. FINPS and EMPPS) had high and significant correlations. All dimensions

showed high internal consistency. Overall, it can be concluded that the scales are reliable and valid tools for evaluating various performances in organization.

This study has various implications for the management of public organizations. First of all it is strongly emphasize the human as main resources for public organizations. Combination of all single performances in an organization generates total performance which we call organizational performance. For that reason this study primarily focuses on performance of managers as administrative performance; performance of individuals as employee performance, and human resource performance which mediates the relationship between two and includes organizational culture and climate. Additionally, financial performance is handled as external sources which provide clues about politics and public interests.

With the emphasis on public management reform in many countries, performance measurement in the public sector becomes more popular (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011). In this reform, governments force public organizations to chance, be modernized and be more effective. In fact, leadership and employee attitudes were highlighted as a central factor in processes of change in public organizations (Stewart & Kringas, 2003; Van der Voet, 2014; Wright et al., 2013). Therefore it is thought that evaluating HRMP, ADMP, EMPP, and FINP provides strong evidence on organizational performance in public organizations.

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: 10-100-121-128 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

Acknowledgement

I would like to give my thanks to Dr.Yeşim Çapa Aydın, Dr. Yaşar Kondakçı for their valuable guidance and information's during the process of this study.

APPENDIX: MEASURES

A- İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Performansı Ölçeği.

- 1.Kurumda çalışanların terfileri performanslarına göre belirlenir.
- 2.Çalışanlar kurumla ilgili konularda söz sahibidir.
- 3.Kurumda demokratik liderlik tipi benimsenmiştir.
- 4.Çalışanlara performansları ile ilgili sürekli geribildirim verilmektedir
- 5.Kurum kendi çalışanlarını seçebilme yetkisine sahiptir
- 6.Kurumsal gelişim çok yönlü bir şekilde ölçülmektedir.
- 7.Kurumda adil bir yükselme ve ödüllendirme sistemi vardır.
- 8.Kurumda çalışanların pozisyonları yeteneklerine göre belirlenir.
- 9.Kurumda çalışanların motivasyonu sürekli yüksek tutulmaktadır.
- 10.Kurumda gerçekleştirilen faaliyetler çalışanlarına göre anlamlı ve önemlidir.

11.Kurum çalışanlarını özenle seçer.

12.Kurumda etkili bir yönetim sistemi vardır.

13.Kurum sahip olduğu bilgi ve deneyimleri çalışanlarına başarı ile aktarır.

B- Yönetim Performansı Ölçeği.

- 1.Kurumun değerleri açık ve anlaşılabilir.
- 2.Kurumun hedefleri açık ve anlaşılabilir.
- 3.Kurumda etkili bir planlama sistemi vardır.
- 4.Kurum içi disiplin amacına uygundur.
- 5.Kurumda çok yönlü bir iletişim ağı vardır.
- 6.Kurumda iş ahlakı gelişmiştir.
- 7.Kurum paydaş/müşteri memnuniyeti odaklıdır.
- 8.Kurum yenilikçiliği ve teknolojik gelişmeleri desteklemektedir.
- 9.Kurumun çevresel değişimlere duyarlı bir stratejisi vardır.
- 10.Kurumsal iletişim sürekli.
- 11.Kurumda çalışanlar arasında karşılıklı anlayış ve saygı vardır.
- 12.Kurumun hedefleri ulaşılabilir.
- 13.Kurumda çalışmak mutluluk vericidir.

C-Finansal Performans Ölçeği.

- 1.Kurum sahip olduğu finansal kaynakları en iyi şekilde değerlendirir.

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi
Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015
International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences
July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

2.Kurumda finansal girdilerin ve çıktıların kontrolü özenle yapılır.

3.Kurum finansal kaynaklarını artırmak için resmi kurumlarla işbirliği yapar.

4.Kurum paydaşlarının / müşterilerinin taleplerini karşılayacak yatırımları yapabilecek finansal yeterliliğe sahiptir.

5.Kurum kendisine benzer kurumlarla karşılaştırıldığında finansal olarak daha iyi konumdadır.

6.Kurum “kurumsal hedeflerini” gerçekleştirecek finansal kaynaklara sahiptir.

7.Kurumun finansal gücü düzenli olarak artmaktadır.

8.Kurum finans kaynaklarını artırmak için özel kurum ve kişilerle işbirliği yapar.

9.Kurum finans kaynaklarının büyük kısmını kendisi yaratır.

10. Kurum kendi finans kaynaklarını özgürce kullanabilme yetkisine sahiptir.

11.Kurumun geleceğe yönelik bağımsız finansal stratejileri vardır.

12.Kurum teknolojik gelişmeleri takip edecek finansal güce sahiptir.

D-Çalışan Performansı Ölçeği.

1.Mesleğimle ilgili güncel bilgi ve gelişmeleri takip ederim.

2.Görevlerimi doğru ve standartlara uygun yaparım.

3.İş ortamındaki ilişkilerimde dengeli ve tutarlıyım.

4.İş arkadaşlarıma karşı saygılı ve anlayışlıyım.

5.Ortaya koyduğum iş ve performansım ile ilgili eleştiri ve değerlendirmelere açıyım.

6.Gerektiğinde grup çalışmalarına kolayca adapte olabilirim.

7.Sorunlara hızlı ve başarılı bir şekilde çözüm üretirim.

8.Kişisel yeteneklerimi iş hayatımda başarıyla kullanırım.

9.İşimin gerektirdiği teknolojik gelişmeleri takip ederim.

10.Kurumun amaç ve hedeflerini desteklemekteyim.

11.Kurumu her ortamda özenle temsil ederim.

12.Kuruma karşı sorumluluk duygum gelişmiştir.

13.Kuruma karşı bağlılık duygum gelişmiştir.

14.Öz değerlendirme yaparak kendimi sürekli geliştiririm.

REFERENCES

BODEN, R., GUMMETT, P., COX, D., & BARKER, K., (1998). Men in white coats . . . Men in Grey Suits: New Public Management and the Funding of Science and Technology Services to the UK Government”, Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 11(3), 267-91

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: 10-100-121-128 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

CASIMIR, K.A., IZUEKE, M.C., & NZEKWE, I.F., (2014). Public Sector and Corruption in Nigeria: An Ethical and Institutional Framework of Analysis. *Open Journal of Philosophy*, 4, 216-224

DECRAMER, A., SMOLDERS, C., & VANDER-STRATEN, A., (2013). Employee Performance Management Culture and System Features In Higher Education: Relationship with employee performance management satisfaction. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24, 352-371

DUNLEAVY, P.J., & HOOD, C., (1994). From Old Public Administration to New Public Management”, *Public Money and Management*, 14(3), pp. 9-16

FABRIGAR, L.R., WEGENER, D.T., MACCALLUM, R.C., & STRAHAN, E.J., (1999). Evaluating the Use of Exploratory Factor Analysis in Psychological Research. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272-299

FIELD, A., (2005). *Discovering Statistics using SPSS (2nd Ed.)*. London: Sage.

GARSON, G.D., (2006). Factor Analysis, Retrieved; May 13, 2006, from <http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/factor.htm#should>

GIAUQUE, D., ANDERFUHREN-BIGET, S., & VARONE, F. (2013). HRM Practices, Intrinsic Motivators, and Organizational

Performance in the Public Sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 42(2), 123-150

HIGGS, M., & ROWLAND, D. (2011). What Does It Take to Implement Change Successfully? A Study of the Behaviors of Successful Change Leaders. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 0021886311404556

HOLZER, M., & RABIN, J., (1987). Public Service: Problems, Professionalism, and Policy Recommendations. *Public Productivity Review*, 11(1), 3-13

HULL, C.E., & LIO, B.H., (2006). Innovation in Non-Profit and For-Profit Organizations: Visionary, Strategic, and Financial Considerations. *Journal of Change Management*, 6(1), 53-65

JANSEN, E., (2008). New Public Management: Perspectives on Performance and the Use of Performance Information. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 24(2), 169. doi:10.1111/j.1468 0408.2008.00447.x

JIMÉNEZ-JIMÉNEZ, D., & SANZ-VALLE, R., (2005). Innovation and Human Resource Management Fit: an Empirical Study. *International Journal of Manpower*, 26(4), 364-381

JORDAN, M.H., LINDSAY, D.R., & SCHRAEDER, M., (2012). An Examination of Salient, Non-Monetary, Factors Influencing Performance in Public Sector Organizations: A Concep-

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi
Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015
International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences
July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

tual Model. Public Personnel Management,
41(4), 661-684

KESSLER, I., PURCELL, J., & SHAPIRO, J.C., (2000). Employment Relations In Local Government: Strategic Choice and the Case of Brent”, Personnel Review, 29 (2), 162-87

KIM, S., (2004). Individual-level Factors and Organizational Performance in Government Organizations. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 15(2), 245-261

KNIES, E., BOSELIE, P., GOULD-WILLIAMS, J., & VANDENABEELE, W., (2015). Special issue of International Journal of Human Resource Management: Strategic Human Resource Management and Public Sector Performance. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 26(3), 421-424

MESSERSMITH, J.G., PATEL, P.C., LPAK, D.P., & GOULD-WILLIAMS, J.S., (2011). Unlocking the Black Box: Exploring the Link Between High-Performance Work Systems And Performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 96, 1105

MEYER, M.W., & ZUCKER, L.G., 1989. Permanently Failing Organizations, Newbury Park, Sage

MOTOWIDLO, S.J., & SCHMIT, M.J., (1999). Performance Assessment in Unique Jobs. In D.R. Ilgen and E.D. Pulakes (Eds.). The

Changing Nature of Performance (pp.56-86).
San Francisco: Jassey Bass

MOYNIHAN, D.P., (2008). The Dynamics of Performance Management: Constructing Information and Reform. Washington: Georgetown University Press

NORMAN, G.R., & D.L., STREINER (1994). Biostatistics: The Bare Essentials. St. Louis, MO: Mosby

NOWY, T., WICKER, P., FEILER, S., & BREUER, C., (2015). Organizational Performance of Nonprofit and For-Profit Sport Organizations. European Sport Management Quarterly, (ahead-of-print), 1-21

POLLITT, C., & BOUCKAERT, G., (2011). Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis-New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo-Weberian State. Oxford University Press

PREACHER, K. J., & MACCALLUM, R., C. (2003). Repairing Tom Swift’s Electric Factor Analysis Machine. Understanding Statistics, 2, 13-32

RYAN, R.M., & DECI, E.L., (2000). Intrinsic And Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25, 54-67

SANCHEZ, A.M., JIMENEZ, J.V., CARNICER, P.D. L., & PEREZ, M.P., (2007). Manage-

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Temmuz / Ağustos / Eylül – Yaz Sonbahar Dönemi Cilt: 5 Sayı: 16 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

July / August / September - Summer Autumn Period Volume: 5 Issue: 16 Year: 2015

JEL CODE: I0-I00-I21-I28 ID:236 K:300

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Belge No / Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Belge No / Document No: 12880)

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

rial Perceptions of Workplace Flexibility and Firm Performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 27(7), 714-734

STEWART, J., & KRINGAS, P., (2003). Change Management—Strategy and Values in Six Agencies from the Australian Public Service. *Public Administration Review*, 63(6), 675-688

TABACHNICK, B.G., & FIDELL, L.S., (2007). Using Multivariate Statistics (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon

VANDENABEELE, W.V., LEISINK, P.L.M., & KNIES, E., (2013). Public Value Creation and Strategic Human Resource Management: Public Service Motivation as a Linking Mechanism. *Managing Social Issues: A Public Values Perspective*, 37-54

VAN DER VOET, J., (2014). The Effectiveness and Specificity of Change Management in a Public Organization: Transformational Leadership and a Bureaucratic Organizational Structure. *European Management Journal*, 32, 373-382

VAN DER VOET, J., KUIPERS, B.S., & GROENEVELD, S.M., (2015). Held Back and Pushed Forward: Leading Change in a Complex Public Environment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 28(2)

VELD, M., PAAUWE, J., & BOSELIE, P., (2010). HRM and strategic climates in hospitals: Does the Message Come Across at the Ward Level? *Human Resources Management Journal*, 20, 339-356

WINAND, M., VOS, S., CLAESSENS, M., THIBAUT, E., & SCHEERDER, J., (2014). A Unified Model of Nonprofit Sport Organizations Performance: Perspectives from the Literature. *Managing Leisure*, 19(2), 121-150
doi:10.1080/13606719.2013.859460

WRIGHT, B.E., & PANDEY, S.K., (2010). Transformational Leadership in The Public Sector: Does Structure Matter? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20, 75-89