

## Lecturers' Outcomes Measurement: A Study of Higher Education of Iran

Mahmoud Manafi<sup>1</sup>, Kamyar Golmohammadi<sup>2</sup>, Mahmood Zohoori<sup>3</sup>, Masoumeh Khanmohammadi<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Doctor of Business Administration, Multimedia University, Malaysia,

<sup>2</sup>PhD student of Management, Perdana School, UTM, Malaysia

<sup>3</sup>Master of environmental technology management, Faculty of engineering, UPM

<sup>4</sup>Master of business administration in human resource management, Limkokwing University of Creative

### Abstract

This research as a qualitative study will tries to recognize factors and important dimensions for measuring performance of university lecturers. On the other hand, this research through utilizing important concepts of talent management, tries to identify these dimensions. In this regard, 32 branches of Islamic Azad Universities, State Universities and Payam-e-Noor Universities have been studied. In final part, job satisfaction, knowledge sharing and also organizational commitment have been highlighted as the most important factors.

**Key words:** Talent Management, Employee Outcomes, Universities' Lecturers

### 1. Introduction

Evaluating employee performance is one of the most crucial issues in management and business. The reason behind this fact is that human resource management is existed with many different people who have different education levels, positions or business types. On the other hand, employee's outcomes can be dependent on so many different factors. In this regard, talent management (Berger and Berger, 2014; Gelens, Dries, Hofmans, and Pepermans, 2013; Collings and Mellahi, 2009; Lewis and Heckman, 2006) can focus separately on talents performance. Reviewing the performance of university lecturers can be considered as a common criteria between talent management and performance evaluation which requires separated studies and in previous researches also it was highlighted very well. Hence, this study tries to explore different dimensions of performance evaluation of university lecturers.

### 2. Literature Review

#### 2.1. Talent management and talent

Implementation of practices for talent management inside firms is at some point ubiquitous and also talent management as a result is an undeniable fact (Dries, 2013). McKinsey began to point out to War of Talent in 1990s in order to mention the talent's importance in developing organizations with high performance (Michaels, Handfield-Jones, & Beth, 2001). However, talent management has never been according to a proper theory (Lewis & Heckman, 2006; Collings & Mellahi, 2009; Dries, 2013). Because of limitations in theory there exist so many big differences in the way that how management of talent will be explained and employed (van Woerkom, & Dries, 2013; e.g., Collings & Mellahi, 2009; Lewis & Heckman, 2006).

For example, consideration exists among the exclusive and inclusive methods for talent management. At the time talent management could be assumed as an inclusive method for

defining how all of the staffs have the capability to show talent and are deserved for similar investments so we can assume it as inclusive as well that demonstrates individuals are different based on their added value into the firm and their position's strategic performance so they as a result should have investments which are differential (Dries, 2013; Gallardo-Gallardo, Dries, & González-Cruz, 2013; Iles, Chuai, & Preece, 2010). Gelelins et al. (2013) concentrated on exclusive method for talent management as the widely most implemented insight within organizations due to its efficiency and cost effective nature (Collings & Mellahi, 2009). It is related to the common trend in human resource management literature which demonstrates a shift from inclusive, standardized HRM practices into differential, exclusive HR practices finally (Becker & Huselid, 2006).

## 2.2. Workforce differentiation

The talent management field by the way still requires theoretical framework; with having no theoretical foundation the experts are not able to understand the data related to talent management and also human resource management practitioners have shortage of guidelines based on evidence. The differentiation of workforce is the disproportionate resources investments which mean a person might expect some returns disproportionately, for example investment for certain jobs and also those certain individuals related to jobs that can help developing success in a strategic manner (Ledford & Kochanski, 2004; Becker, Huselid, & Beatty, 2009).

Ledford and Kochanski (2004) mentioned that differentiation or segmentation is crucial for talent management concept (p.217). Additionally, it was noted that differentiation of workforce is the most important rule that makes difference between HRM and talent management (Collings & Mellahi, 2009; Preece, & Iles, 2008; Boudreau & Ramstad, 2005). For example, human resource management includes attempt to manage all of the members in organization, talent management concentrates just on those staffs that have uniqueness and high value for example having high potential (Chuai et al., 2008).

The workforce differentiation practice is based on the notion that firms generate high costs which are not necessary while they equally invest for all of the staffs (Williamson, 1981; Becker & Huselid, 1998; Lepak & Snell, 1999). A view which is resource based notes that in particular, the unique, valuable and also hard to imitate resources are necessary for high performance in long term and also competitive advantage of the organization (Wright, Smart, & McMahan, 1995; Barney, 1991). Hence, based on the developed model of cost economics by Lepak and Snell (1999), Williamson (1981), explained that an organization's limited sources can be invested in selecting, attracting, retaining and also developing members with unique and valuable skills such as high potentials, and they will create better productivity and as a result there will be better returns compared to those employees that do not have these types of skills (Morton, 2005; Collings and Mellahi, 2009).

Additionally, the mentioned high potentials are necessary for filling up the best valued strategic positions inside the firm (Becker & Huselid, 1998, 2006). Moreover, besides this trend of differentiation in organizational level, also another trend was noticed between employees about asking for higher personal recognition and treatment according to their certain needs and competencies (Lawler & Finegold, 2000). It will bring more proof for supporting workforce differentiation because both of the organizations and employees are asking for it (Gelens et al., 2013).

### 2.3. Employees' Outcome

There have been a lot of studies developed related to influence of employees outcome such as human resource performance on organizational performance (Huselid & Becker, 2011; Becker & Huselid, 1998, 2006). In this regard, organizational performance is relevant to turnover intention (Valentine, Godkin, Fleischman, and Kidwell, 2011; Tett and Meyer, 1993), financial performance (Minichilli, Corbetta, and MacMillan, 2010; Surroca, Tribó, and Waddock, 2010), growth and learning (Vanneste and Puranam, 2010; Rosenzweig, 2010)

Related to employee outcome there are a lot of different researches that according to different industries and well known researches have been highlighted. For example, trust (Thomas, Zolin, and Hartman, 2009; Kingshot and Pecotich, 2007; Garbarino and Johnson, 1999), organizational commitment (DeConinck and Bachmann, 2011; Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker, Gail, and Baker, 2010), knowledge sharing, job satisfaction (Holste and Fields, 2010; Wang and Noe, 2010; Jian and Hanling, 2009), organizational citizenship behavior or OCB (Bachrach, Sundstrom, and Halfhill, 2012; Zeinabadi, 2010; Organ, 1998), job satisfaction (Chen, Ployhart, Thomas, Anderson, and Bliese, 2011; Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller, and Johnson, 2009; Al-Hussami, 2008).

By the way, the fact that which dimensions are proper for measuring lecturer's performance requires a separated research to be developed. On the other hand, this research tries to recognize proper factors for measuring lecturers' performance.

### 3. Method and Results

This research which is a qualitative study after reviewing literature, have been highlighted many different factors as lecturers outcome including trust, OCB, creativity, job satisfaction, knowledge sharing, organizational commitment and etc. through studying 32 branches of Islamic Azad Universities, State Universities and Payam-e-Noor Universities and interviewing 96 lecturers who were mainly dean of these faculties and top managers, many different factors have been recognized that at last emphasized on three important outcomes for the lecturers. First, knowledge sharing can create more knowledge and improve the quality of training. Second, job satisfaction can emphasize on having a proper workplace, good colleagues and etc and finally, organizational commitment that as its definition demonstrates can be considered as a proper outcome. In addition, organizational commitment is a crucial factor which includes trust.

Another important concept which during interview was achieved and might not be as the core topic of this discussion is perceived justice issue. Understanding lecturers as the intellectual capitals of universities can improve their performance. Definitions of various concepts including participation, reward, financial support for creating study opportunities, etc. are some specific examples related to justice and their recognition regularly and as being categorized requires many separated researches in this field.

### 4. Conclusion

According to the findings of this study, 32 branches of Islamic Azad Universities, State Universities and Payam-e-Noor Universities should increase lecturers performance in three different organizational dimensions which are job satisfaction, commitment and knowledge sharing. It means that the best measurement tool of performance of lecturers regarding talents management is based on these three factors.

One of the findings of this research is the role of perceived justice for increasing lecturer's outcome which requires a separated research in order to exactly define a definition for

organizational justice in higher education in Iran for lecturers. According to this fact that importance of organizational justice in higher education still has so many ambiguities, reviewing it in previous studies is considered as a gap which requires a qualitative research.

Moreover, three identified factors in this research as the important dimensions of higher education might have rational relationships which are supported by previous studies as well. Therefore, future studies after identifying these relationships between three dimensions, can as a qualitative research study the impacts of influential factors including HRM practices or leadership style on employees outcomes. According to new findings of this study, clearly the mentioned topic will be considered as a gap of previous studies.

## References

- Al-Hussami, M. (2008). A study of nurses' job satisfaction: the relationship to organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, and level of education. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 22(2), 286-295.
- Becker, B. E., & Huselid, M. A. (1998). High performance work systems and firm performance: A synthesis of research and managerial implications. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 16, 53–101.
- Becker, B. E., & Huselid, M. A. (2006). Strategic human resources management: Where do we go from here? *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 898–925.
- Becker, B. E., Huselid, M. A., & Beatty, R. W. (2009). *The differentiated workforce: Transforming talent into strategic impact*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Berger, L. A., & Berger, D. R. (2004). *The talent management handbook*. New York.
- Boudreau, J. W., & Ramstad, P. (2005). *Talentship and the evolution of human resource management: From professional practices to strategic talent decision science*. *Human Resource Planning Journal*, 28(2), 17–26.
- Collings, D. G., & Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(4), 304–313.
- Chen, G., Ployhart, R. E., Thomas, H. C., Anderson, N., & Bliese, P. D. (2011). The power of momentum: A new model of dynamic relationships between job satisfaction change and turnover intentions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(1), 159-181.
- Chuai, X., Preece, D., & Iles, P. (2008). Is talent management just “old wine in new bottles”? The case of multinational companies in Beijing. *Management Research News*, 31(12), 901–911.
- DeConinck, J. B., & Bachmann, D. P. (2011). Organizational commitment and turnover intentions of marketing managers. *Journal of applied business research (JABR)*, 10(3), 87-95.
- Dries, N. (2013). The psychology of talent management: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23, 272–285.
- Gallardo-Gallardo, E., Dries, N., & González-Cruz, T. (2013). What is the meaning of ‘talent’ in the world of work? *Human Resource Management Review*, 23, 290–300 (in this issue).
- Garbarino, E., & Johnson, M. S. (1999). The different roles of satisfaction, trust, and commitment in customer relationships. *The Journal of Marketing*, 70-87.
- Gelens, J., Dries, N., Hofmans, J., & Pepermans, R. (2013). The role of perceived organizational justice in shaping the outcomes of talent management: A research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(4), 341-353.
- Griffin, M. L., Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Tucker-Gail, K. A., & Baker, D. N. (2010). Job involvement, job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and the burnout of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(2), 239-255.
- Holste, J. S., & Fields, D. (2010). Trust and tacit knowledge sharing and use. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 14(1), 128-140.
- Iles, P., Chuai, X., & Preece, D. (2010). Talent management and HRM in multinational companies in Beijing: Definitions, differences and drivers. *Journal of World Business*, 45(2), 179–189.
- Jian, Y., & Hanling, L. (2009, September). Psychological Capital as Mediator in Relationship among Organizational Socialization, Knowledge Integration and Sharing. In *Management and Service Science, 2009.MASS'09. International Conference on* (pp. 1-4). IEEE.

- Kingshott, R. P., & Pecotich, A. (2007). The impact of psychological contracts on trust and commitment in supplier-distributor relationships. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(9/10), 1053-1072.
- Ledford, G., & Kochanski, J. (2004). Allocating training and development resources based on contribution. In L. Berger, & D. Berger (Eds.), *The talent management handbook* (pp. 218–229). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (1999). The human resource architecture: Toward a theory of human capital allocation and development. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 31.
- Lewis, R., & Heckman, R. (2006). Talent management: A critical review. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2), 139–154.
- Ilies, R., Fulmer, I. S., Spitzmuller, M., & Johnson, M. D. (2009). Personality and citizenship behavior: the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 945.
- Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, H., & Beth, A. (2001). *The war for talent*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Minichilli, A., Corbetta, G., & MacMillan, I. C. (2010). Top Management Teams in Family-Controlled Companies: ‘Familianness’, ‘Faultlines’, and Their Impact on Financial Performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(2), 205-222.
- Nielsen, T. M., Bachrach, D. G., Sundstrom, E., & Halfhill, T. R. (2012). Utility of OCB Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Group Performance in a Resource Allocation Framework. *Journal of Management*, 38(2), 668-694.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.
- Rosenzweig, M. R. (2010). Microeconomic approaches to development: Schooling, learning, and growth. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 81-96.
- Surroca, J., Tribó, J. A., & Waddock, S. (2010). Corporate responsibility and financial performance: The role of intangible resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(5), 463-490.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel psychology*, 46(2), 259-293.
- Thomas, G. F., Zolin, R., & Hartman, J. L. (2009). The central role of communication in developing trust and its effect on employee involvement. *Journal of Business Communication*, 46(3), 287-310.
- Valentine, S., Godkin, L., Fleischman, G. M., & Kidwell, R. (2011). Corporate ethical values, group creativity, job satisfaction and turnover intention: The impact of work context on work response. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(3), 353-372.
- Vanneste, B. S., & Puranam, P. (2010). Repeated interactions and contractual detail: Identifying the learning effect. *Organization Science*, 21(1), 186-201.
- Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(2), 115-131.
- Williamson, O. E. (1981). The economics of organization: The transaction cost approach. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 87(3), 548–577.
- Zeinabadi, H. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 998-1003.