Performance Management Practices in Self-Managing Teams:

An explorative study at the Dutch healthcare organization

Ufuk Karakus
University of Twente
P.O. Box 217, 7500AE Enschede
The Netherlands

ABSTRACT,

The changing environment in the healthcare sector requires healthcare providers to adapt to the ongoing changes that include more flexible care with higher quality. Teamwork is an important aspect of working in healthcare as nowadays teamwork, and especially the Self-Managing Team (SMT), is seen as a fitting response to the changes in the environment. Therefore, the use of Self-Managing Teams has become an increasingly popular option for organizations. Among all aspects of self-organization, Performance Management is viewed as a crucial mechanism to get SMTs moving. At the same time, it is a new and mostly unexplored field even though studies have shown that Performance Management results in greater organizational success in reaching their goals. Inspired by this observation, this study aimed to identify Performance Management practices in Self-Managing Teams in the healthcare sector. To answer the research question, six interviews were conducted at the healthcare organization Livio who recently switched to utilizing SMTs. The results have shown that the involvement of SMTs in setting organizational goals and objectives is an important factor in maintaining high performance within the teams. Furthermore, introducing certain financial incentives based on team performance can keep team-members motivated and their performance high.

1. Introduction

This study focuses on analyzing and exploring performance management practices in self-managed teams in the healthcare sector. Self-managing teams (SMTs) are groups of interdependent individuals that have the authority to determine how team members are organized, monitored and managed to accomplish the teams' work (Cohen et al. 1996; Smets, 2014). A study from the Curtin University of Technology in Australia revealed that the use of performance management systems in organizations has increased over the past decade (Nankervis & Compton, 2006). The majority of the respondents in the study have reported to be satisfied with the effectiveness of their current performance management systems, which include aligning business strategies with their employees, development & coaching of employees, and performance appraisal.

The purpose of performance management is to improve employee performance as well as organizational performance (Smither & London, 2009). For organizations, employee performance usually means the extent to which employees contribute to achieving organizational goals. According to Singh (2012), job satisfaction has a direct effect on employee performance. Smith (1969) defines job satisfaction as the extent to which employees express a positive view towards their job. Smith's claim is supported by a recent study by Bakotic (2016), in which he researched 5806 employees from 40 different large- and medium-sized companies and found a strong connection between job satisfaction and job performance. A study conducted by Gazioglu & Tansel (2006) reported that training and development, which are part of performance management practices, has a positive influence on job satisfaction among British employees. The study was conducted with managers in over 3000 establishments in various industries.

An important component of performance management is giving feedback to employees and evaluating employee performance. To evaluate employee performance, organizations make use of performance appraisal (Lawler & Mcdermott, 2012). Mackey & Johnson (2000) have found that performance appraisal improves employee performance and satisfaction. Research by Sanyal & Biswas (2014) revealed that software companies seek to excel in the IT industry with the implementation of continuous monitoring and integration of individual and team performance. The research has further shown that the use of appraisal systems has led to the alignment of goals and expectations between employees and organizations.

The findings shown above strongly suggest that performance management practices are important tools in improving employee and organizational performance. However, there is limited research available that focuses on performance management in the healthcare sector. This can be attributed to performance management being a relatively new study in the healthcare sector (Martinez, 2000). This is likely the result of a changing environment of the healthcare sector due to an increasing demand for high quality care that is tailored to the wishes of the clients (Smets, 2014). This presents the challenge for healthcare providers to be more efficient and flexible while maintaining high quality of work (Almekinders, 2006). In order to meet the client's demands of high quality and flexible care, organizations can decentralize and move towards self-managing teams (Yeatts et al. 2004; Smets, 2014). A case study at the Uddevalla Volvo plant in Sweden has reported that the use of self-managing teams resulted in a significant improvement in quality and performance (Kapstein & Hoerr, 1989). The increase in performance from using self-managing teams is further supported by a study in a telecommunications company (Cohen & Ledford, 1994). The study indicated that self-managing teams provided better service and support than traditionally managed groups while doing the same tasks. Zuckerman and Coile (2003) stated that human labor is the most important production factor in healthcare organizations. Therefore, the performance of employees are directly related to the performance of the organization and the achievement of its goals.

Important criteria for high performing self-managing teams are the alignment of organizational and team goals, supportive organizational environment and feedback on tasks (Cohen et al. 1996; Smets, 2014). These criteria suggest that there should be a strong connection between the performance of self-managing teams and performance management practices. Combined with the evidence shown earlier, the importance of performance management for organizations that rely self-managing teams becomes apparent. By using the right performance management practices, self-managing teams can have a positive impact in organizations in the healthcare sector in order to reach their goals. The purpose of this research is to identify performance management practices in self-managing teams in the healthcare sector. This leads to the research question:

"What are performance management practices in self-managing teams in the healthcare sector?"

2. Literature review

2.1 Performance management
In this thesis I borrow the definition of Aguinis (2009) and view performance management as a continuous process of identifying, measuring, and developing the performance of individual and teams and aligning performance with the strategic goals of the organization. This definition can be broken down into several key components. Firstly, there is the continuous process of setting objectives which are aligned with business goals. Good performance management requires the alignment of objectives with organizational goals (Kandula, 2006; Smith, 2002). Secondly, the training and development of employees and teams. Thirdly, providing feedback and evaluating performance. Finally, recognizing and rewarding performance. In what follows, I briefly describe these steps in Performance Management

Figure 1: Activities of performance management

Setting objectives

Armstrong and Baron (2005) stated that the performance of a team must be in line with the objectives that are set out for the team. This requires the team members to understand and agree these objectives in order to develop plans, monitor progress and review performance (Armstrong & Baron, 2005). Locke and Latham (2002) concluded that setting specific goals does reduce ambiguity of performance, it does not necessarily improve performance by itself. However, it was found that motivated employees do perform better because they set higher goals for themselves. Therefore, it is important to involve team members in setting goals.

Training and development

We define training as giving employees the skills required to perform or improve their job (Dessler, 2008). Armstrong (2004) described organizational success can be achieved by improving the performance of employees through development of their skills. The need for training can be identified through observation by other, performance appraisal, and organizational plans (Sinha, 1974).

According to Schneier et al. (1987), employees are responsible for managing their own performance and development. This means maintaining a positive approach to work, keeping track of objectives, suggesting development opportunities and good teamwork. This can also be applied for teams that work in an autonomous setting.

Review

In order for goals to be achieved, feedback is required for employees that shows their progression towards reaching their goals (Locke et. al, 2002).

Performance management has to deal with individuals as well as teams which is further elaborated in section 2.3. This is also goes for the performance appraisal process. Performance appraisal is a formal feedback process where employees relate their work to organizational objectives (Khan, 2013).

The 360 degree feedback model differs from the traditional manager feedback approach to assess performance (Khan 2013). It is a technique that gathers data from different sources which the employee interacts with in his job measures inter-personal skills, team building skills and performance objectives which are described in the next section (Khan, 2013). There are five different main sources for information:

1. Manager/supervisor appraisals: Providing constructive feedback and identify areas for improvement
2. Self-appraisals: Increasing own performance by evaluating oneself by using clear performance criteria.
3. Coworker appraisals: They are often more aware than managers/supervisors on the performance of an employee. Coworker appraisal should be used for professional development.
4. Subordinate appraisal – subordinates can provide feedback to increase a manager's performance like communication and team building. This is more suitable for larger organizations with sufficient subordinates.
5. Client appraisals – Highly valuable source of appraisal for employees that have high degrees of interaction with people and are with organizational that have client oriented goals. and individual performance standards.

Cannon-Bowers et al. (1997) describes that a process-oriented approach, where behavioral measures are as relevant as results measures, would show how well an individual works with other team-members.

Recognizing and rewarding performance

After evaluation of employee performance and accomplishments, employees can be rewarded. According to Cohen et al. (1997), Rewards are one the features that improve teams and increases employee involvement. Having a rewards system lets employee know their value and appreciation of their efforts (Abduljawad, 2011). Pay-for-Performance is a monetary incentive that rewards employees based on their evaluation (Abduljawad, 2011).

The abovementioned framework encompasses four central issues within performance management and is an integration of theories that can structure the empirical findings and the analysis so that the relevant data for the purpose of this study is examined.

2.2 Performance criteria in healthcare

Healthcare in the Netherlands is separated into the private and public sector that can either be for-profit or not-for-profit purposes (Andre & Hermann, 2014). Li & Benton (1995) describe that performance measurement criteria for healthcare organizations can be distinguished by internal and external measures. Internal measures relate to the cost and financial performance, which are measured through efficiency and utilization, and quality performance through the processes and services. The external quality performance is measured through customer perceived quality and satisfaction. Nerenz et. al. (2001) describes several performance objectives in healthcare. The first objective is the quality of care provided to patients. Satisfaction of the care received by patients also falls under quality. Organizational efficiency, cost and utilization can be viewed as similar objectives as these are measures that look at the specific activities without considering if these activities are the correct ones. An example of an efficiency measure is the length of time a healthcare provider spends with his or her patients.

2.3 Performance management and self-managing teams

As described earlier, Self-managing teams (SMTs) are groups of interdependent individuals that have the authority to determine how team members are organized, monitored and managed to accomplish the teams' work (Cohen et al. 1996; Smets, 2014). These groups have the autonomy to make decisions which are traditionally the responsibility of managers and supervisors (Alper et al,. 1998). By allowing employees to self-manage, they are encouraged to show more initiative (Banner et al., 1992). According to Fredendall and Emery (2003), self-managed teams are not only used as a substitute for leadership but also as a tool for continuous improvement. Roles in self-managing teams are more dynamic where individuals can take on multiple roles and change current roles (Saunders et al., 2006). The role of teams are a special case in performance management (Smither et al. 2009). Performance management has to look at teams at both the team level and the individual level (Smither et al., 2009). Salas et al. (2006) describes several principles that that are important for managing team performance: The organization has to invest time and effort into measuring individual performance, the goals of measuring performance has to be clearly defined and finally there also needs to be long-term measures of performance as certain measures can only be sampled over time.

3. Methodology

This research is a case study carried out at the organization Livio. Livio is a healthcare provider that mainly provides care at the client's home. Livio employs over 2600 people and utilizes more than 40 self-managing teams with each team having around 15 members which are guided by coach-managers.

3.1 Research Methodology

This study is based on a qualitative exploratory research approach and makes use of both primary data with semi-structured interviews and secondary data. For the collection of primary data, 6 interviews were planned with members of various self-managed teams in close collaboration with Livio Thuiszorg in Enschede in the Netherlands. Interviews were scheduled from May 2017 till mid-June 2017 with each interview taking around 1 hour. Interviewing the team-members in a semi-structured format creates a more open atmosphere and lets the interviewees expand on their answers and give further and new insights into performance management related topics. Furthermore, data were gathered by observing the locations and employees before and after the interviews. In addition, discussions were held with peer junior researchers who conducted interviews in similar topics. In appendix A, the interview protocol used during the interviews can be found. The interviews, are with permission of the interviewee, audio-recorded.

	Gender	Position	Location	Education
1	Female	Specialized homecare	Enschede	Niveau 4
2	Female	Retirement facility	Haaksbergen	

3	Female	Retirement facility	Haaksbergen	
4	Female	Homecare	Enschede	Niveau 4
5	Female	Homecare	Enschede	Niveau 5
6	Female	Homecare	Haaksbergen	Niveau 5

3.2 Coding and analysis of data

The approach for a semi-structured interview usually results in a large amount of data subjected to further analysis. With the use of audio recordings, a strict protocol for transcribing the interviews is required. The first step in transcribing is to carefully listen to the recordings and write down everything that has been said for all six interviews. Then the transcripts are carefully read and notes have been made highlighting all relevant words and phrases. Subsequently, a coding scheme has been set up in 3 steps. The main categories of the coding are the composed of steps in the earlier described framework and self-managing Themes. These are further separated into variables that have been revealed from the transcripts and described with the specific parts from the transcripts. An example of the coding can be seen in the following table:

Categories	Variables	Specific codes
Organizational objectives	Goals Organizational support	
Training	Education	
Review	Feedback Monitoring Evaluation	
Rewards	Incentives Recognition Benefits	
Self-Managing Teams	Roles Motivation	

After the coding has been finalized for all interviews. the results are analyzed and discussed in order to draw conclusions and give recommendations.

4. Findings

4.1 Self-Managing Teams

Team-members were asked on what they view as self-managing. One team-member stated: "*We work with 11 people in a team and we arrange everything ourselves*" (Interviewee 5). The teams are self-steering and make all arrangements themselves. They independently talk and make agreements with their clients depending on their problems and needs. In the case where the team has questions or faces a problem that they can't solve directly, they have the ability to turn towards their coach-manager. "*I think it's important that a coach-manager listens to team-members and facilitates us in difficult situations*" (Interviewee 1). Amongst most teams the

coach-manager is considered to be the link between the teams and higher-management and should personally be available in case of problems or difficult client situations. The actual support of coach-managers across teams is perceived differently. In one team the team-member stated that their coach-manager is very approachable and open for discussion (Interviewee 2). However, in a different team the coach-manager has so many teams that they do not always have time to support each team sufficiently. "*We have one coach-manager and she has 17 teams, that is too much*" (interviewee 5).

The transition towards self-managing teams was perceived better in teams that were already highly autonomous than teams that were newly introduced to the concept of SMT. A member from a highly specialized team mentioned: "*We were always a team that did our thing, planning and management*" (Interviewee 1). So they perceived little change from the transition. In other teams, there was a lot of trying out to see what works and are still in the process. One team-member stated that there was a very short adjustment period and that they were then thrown into the field (Interviewee 5). From a different team, one stated that they underwent multiple changes of coach-managers in the beginning and this led to insufficient guidance (Interviewee 4). When asked on what Livio could have done better, a team-member mentioned that communicating in advance rather than implementing things at the last moment would have been better (Interviewee 6).

Regarding the success of self-managing teams. One team-member said that it makes everyone more involved in what must be done and makes them feel more responsible (Interviewee 4).

In their expectations for the future of self-managing teams, One person stated that, in any case, they will not return to the previous organizational structure of Livio because they have already given so much by building on their teams (Interviewee 5).

4.2 Division of roles and information sharing
For most teams, team-roles are divided depending on interest and competences of the individual team-members. When asked about the importance of having different roles, a team-member said: "*I think it's very important that you see what the ambitions of all the members are and to avoid feeling undervalued or not accepted*" (Interviewee 1). There is no formal procedure to divide roles and a team-member in the nursing home department stated that if they didn't like their role, they can pursue a different role (Interviewee 3). However, in some teams the division of roles depends on their level of education: "*I am the highest level nurse here and keep tabs of everything, give indications and make sure everything runs smoothly*" (interviewee 6). All teams can make use of Livio's smartphone application in order to arrange their weekly schedules. (Interviewee 2). Usually there is a person within the team that holds the end responsibility for the schedules (Interviewee 6). In case of illness, the first response by the team is to cancel the appointment with the client. However, if the client requires urgent care then the team-members will seek a substitute. One of the team-members did state that this usually does not happen as clients get used to a certain

care giver and find it difficult if someone else shows up (Interviewee 4).

Communication and information sharing between teams and team-members generally happens through e-mail and WhatsApp (Interviewee 1 & 2). According to several team-members, one of the problems with communication through email is that the computers are outdated and the recently changed information system does not function as expected (Interviewee 1 & 5). Livio has made the top-down decision of excluding the use laptops for teams, despite them being recommended by team-members (Interviewee 1).

4.3 Performance management
When asked about the performance management practices used within Livio, the response from one team-member was: "*This is something that can definitely improve*" (Interviewee 1). Another team-member mentioned that they currently do very little with performance management (Interviewee 6).

4.3.1 Goals and objectives

All teams are given the same main goal from Livio to have a certain division of productive and non-productive work. From one team was quoted: "*From the management-side, we have to do 85% productive work and 15% non-productive work*" (Interviewee 1). A different team-member mentioned that the minimum requirement was 80% productive and 20% non-productive (Interviewee 5). The productive work are the hours directly related to client-care, while education and team-meetings are accounted to non-productive work. For the teams, this means that having more meetings will result in getting called out by the organization (Interviewee 5).

When asked about the reasons for Livio to utilize SMTs, the responses were divided. Although most team-members agreed that increasing responsibility creates more involvement from employees, one also considered it a move in order to no fall behind its competitors: "*They began skipping the manager, because they thought the nurse is capable of organizing all the support around a client*" (Interviewee 5). Another one added: "*In order for Livio to keep their brand name strong they need to keep up with a society that thrives on self-managing*" (Interviewee 4). Furthermore, Several team-members believe that by reducing the middle management Livio is trying to reduce cost and consider saving costs as an important driver for implementing SMTs (Interviewee 3 & 4). One person had a different view on the reason: "*They want small teams so that there are no people in between and that ensure that the team-members are aware of each other. This is also for the clients so they see more of the same people*" (Interviewee 6).

While there are organizational goals set by Livio, goal setting within the teams is not that common. One team-member stated that they do have goals with clients but not with teams and only since recently they have annual talks with management where they discuss what the employee is interested in and wants to reach towards. Another team-member stated that, although they feel it's important, their team has not yet progressed enough to consider team goals (Interviewee 5).

4.3.2 Training

For education, Livio offers employees the possibility to sign up for courses online that are directly related to their field of work. The courses are offered at the Livio academy. Because professional care givers are required to be BIG-certified, they need to follow certain courses to be able to keep performing basic tasks at an adequate level. A team-member from the retirement facility added: "*We are authorized for a lot of things, but if we don't do certain things for extended periods of time we lose our competence to carry out the task*" (Interviewee 5) . For highly specialized workers, there appears to be much less support for education. "*Because we are highly specialized, it costs more time and money to get information*" (Interviewee 1). Although, the courses offered by Livio are also paid by the organization, special courses are often not directly covered and can take up to 2 years before Livio accepts a budget for it (Interviewee 1). Multiple teams also stated that they are able to go to their coach-manager if they recognize a need for education. Furthermore, If a person shows interest in a different branch of the sector, they have to pay for it themselves: "*Job related training is reimbursed by Livio, but if I wanted to go to a symposium of something I like such as stoma then it's not reimbursed*" (Interviewee 6).

Besides courses, employees can also follow a training on the job (Interviewee 5). When one client required cleaning of a voice controller in their throat, the caregiver had training from the medical-technical team at Livio.

A different team-member stressed the importance of education and keeping their knowledge and competences updated and expressed the lack of support from Livio in previous years (Interviewee 4). Previously, for this particular team, education was left out of the budget multiple times and only recently was education put in motion with the coach-manager.

4.3.3 Review

Clients from homecare are given anonymous forms after treatment in which they can give feedback about the care they received from a specific worker. By reviewing these forms, team-members can gain a better understanding of what they are doing well and what they are lacking. (Interviewee 1). One team-member stated that they also hold an conversation with clients twice a year asking about the quality of care and the involvement of the caregiver in question (Interviewee 5). These forms are also accessible for the management. Other team-members have also stated that the opinions of clients are the main channel from which they receive feedback on the quality of care they give. There is not a single aspect that they really focus on as care is a total process (Interviewee 2). Besides client forms, Employees are required to fill in a form with hours spent at clients or at the office. Livio uses these form to check if employees are fulfilling their hours while being within the restrictions or indirect hours (Interviewee 4).

All interviewees have stated that they have (semi) regular team-meetings and organizational meetings. The team-meetings can range from every week to once every 6 weeks. for advanced SMTs these meetings are mostly about client problems and emotional difficulties are discussed (Interviewee 1). Furthermore, every team-member can bring up anything they consider important

in the meetings (Interviewee 4). The team-members described the meetings as InterVision (Interviewee 1 & 4). SMTs that are not as advanced also discuss on how to become a better team (Interviewee 2). Most teams also discuss client feedback and take the opportunity to give each other feedback. They can also discuss in what aspects more education is required for whom. In certain teams, the coach-managers also joins the meetings, which is also supposed serves as a method for Livio to manage performance, They also mentioned that not much is done with that: "*When possible, the coach-manager sits with us, but there is no further checking on us and not much is done by them*" (Interviewee 6). Another team-member stated that they do receive feedback from the coach-manager (Interviewee 4). Furthermore, team-members have stated that they have annual appraisals with higher management to assess their work. One team-member from the retirement facility added that although they discuss what went well and what can be improved, if something went wrong they receive words from management much sooner than the annual meeting. One team that has meetings every 6 weeks described that being limited in how many times and hours they can gather together is not characteristic of self-managing teams (Interviewee 5).

When asked about opportunities to give feedback back to Livio, there was a distinction in the answers between those that work at a facility and those that give homecare. A team-members from homecare feels that although believe that Livio acts on the feedback, they usually do not link back to the teams and therefore improvements can go unnoticed (Interviewee 6). A team-member from a different team mentioned that the new computer system does not work properly and they get very little support when communicating this to Livio (Interviewee 5).

4.3.4 Rewards

While most teams perceive that they now have more responsibilities and are highly autonomous, the salaries of team-members are still decided by Livio based on standardized salary brackets (interviewee 5). When asked about performance-based rewards, the opinions across teams were divided. One team-member believed that performance-based rewards is difficult, but "*we could learn from how normal companies work*" (Interviewee 1). However, this team-member also noted that such an implementation could become threatening within a team and also comparing between tasks is believed to difficult. This sentiment is shared by other teams saying: "*It's possible but you can't know for sure what that will cause between team-members*" (Interviewee 5). One member of a different team also found it difficult but did state: "*I can't deny that the quality would improve in such a case*" (Interviewee 3).

Livio does offer certain benefits for its employees. These benefits include a discount for health insurance, discounts for items in its own store. Several team-members have stated that, although these benefits are appreciated, they do not contribute to an increase in their motivation or performance. These team-members have also stated that motivation is a big contributor to their performance: "*I believe so because sometimes we have to encourage each other as we are one team*" (Interviewee 6). When asked about how they keep their motivation high, one team-member responded that giving each other compliments

and doing activities with the team helps (Interviewee 5). Another team-member mentioned that they make an effort to have a positive attitude towards each other as they believe that a good atmosphere is important within the team (Interviewee 4). Recently, several teams in Livio were awarded for scoring the highest at a client satisfaction research. They were given a box of candies from Livio and one of the team-members did state that a better reward would make them feel more appreciated. This was similar for a different team: "*We scored high on the client satisfaction research and I expected a little bit better rewards*"(Interviewee 6). This person also stated that a performance-based reward would have a positive effect on their motivation.

5. Discussion

5.1 Self-Managing Teams

According to Alper et al., (2014), self-managing teams have the autonomy to make decisions which are traditionally the responsibilities of the managers. By self-managing, employees are encouraged to show more initiative (Banner et al., (1992). The overall feeling is that team-members have an increased sense of responsibilities. This is mainly because the teams have higher autonomy than before and have to ensure by themselves that the work processes run smoothly. Only when they can't solve the issue at hand the coach-manager becomes involved.

Saunders et al., (2006) argue that roles in self-managing teams are more dynamic compared other teams. The team-members in both homecare and at facility can have multiple roles within the team and the roles can change when desired during a period of time. The roles are usually divided depending on interest and competence of the individuals within the teams.

5.2 Performance Management Practices

The goal of performance management is to improve employee performance as well as organizational performance (Smither & London, 2009). The findings in the previous section does show that Livio has implemented certain practices to manage employee performance within the new SMT structure, however it was generally found that there is much to be improved. In this analysis, the previously established framework will be used analyze the practices that are performed well and those that need improvement.

5.2.1 Goals and objectives

Livio has determined that everyone within a team must spend at least 80% of their time doing productive work and only 20% of their time can be used for non-productive work. This objective is pre-determined and does not allow teams to deviate from it. In addition, time spent on team-meetings and discussions are also classified as non-productive. According to Armstrong and Baron (2005), the performance of a team must be in line with the objectives that are set out for them and requires team-members to understand and agree with these objectives. Locke and Latham (2002) stated that involving team-members in goal setting will result in better performance as they are more motivated to accomplish goals set by themselves. The results also show ambiguity on why SMTs were introduced as some individuals think it's a positive move while others see it as catching up to competitors.

5.2.2 Training

Training is giving the employees the skills required to perform and improve their job (Dessler, 2008). Livio offers courses for employees in order to remain competent for tasks and for employees to keep their BIG-certificate. Sinha (1974) mentions that the need for training can be identified through observations, appraisals and organizational plans. The SMTs have meetings together where they can discuss the need for training, which does happen in some teams but not as much in other teams. Although the employees are responsible for their own performance and training (Schneier et al. 1987), Livio puts constraints on teams by not allowing them a certain amount of their time to be spent discussing training with their teams and following courses. This is perceived negatively by certain teams.

5.2.3 Review

Feedback is required for employees in order to see their progression (Locke et. al, 2002). The SMTs have opportunities to give each other feedback during team-meetings, which for some teams are every 2 weeks and other teams every 6 weeks. Khan (2013) discusses that performance appraisal is a formal feedback process where employees relate their work to organizational objectives. Most interviewed team-members stated that they have an annual evaluation meeting with higher-management. Furthermore Khan (2013) describes a 360 feedback model that allows for employees to receive feedback from multiple sources. At Livio, it is intended that employees receive feedback from their team-members. However, time restrictions does not allow all teams to gather as often as they want. Furthermore, employees receive feedback from clients through forms and conversations. The forms are also available to the management at Livio, but it is indicated by team-members that not much is done with them. Another form of feedback is self-appraisal, where employees can reflect on their own performance critically. This is something that team-members have indicated that they do, especially with the client forms. However, this is not a requirement from Livio but rather the choice of employees themselves.

5.2.4 Rewards

According to Cohen et al. (1997), Rewards are one the features that improve teams and increases employee involvement. Salaries within Livio are determined from standardized salary-brackets and does not offer additional financial bonuses to employees. Abduljawad (2011) argued that having a rewards system shows employees their value and the organization's appreciation of their efforts. Teams have recently received a box of candies as a reward for reaching first at client satisfaction and they felt that they were underappreciated and would feel more valued if there was a better reward. Abduljawad (2011) also stated that a Pay-for-Performance can be an incentive for employees based on their performance. Although, higher rewards would be appreciated. Several of the teams have expressed their concerns on it creating a threating environment within the teams.

6. Conclusion

This study has aimed to identify what performance management practices can be utilized in SMTs in the healthcare sector.

6.1 Performance Management Practices
Aligning organizational objectives with team goals

Organizations need to take the SMTs into consideration when developing organizational goals and objectives. This is vital in order for teams to feel engaged and motivated to perform their job. The restricted independence of teams has brought dissatisfaction within several teams. This leads to the assumption that the teams were at best only limitedly involved when Livio decided on certain goals. Furthermore, the teams are restricted in the time they can meet together to discuss client-related business which this leaves little incentive for teams to take some time to give each other proper feedback and support. Livio could take an approach where team-meetings have a separate time and place which can lead to an improvement in team-meetings. If there a large difference between teams that communicate often and those that don't, they may develop as teams at very different rates.

The coach-managers play a big part in communication as they are supposed to be the link between organization and the SMTs. The organization should make more use of the coach-managers to communicate their organizational goals and expectations more clearly and provide the necessary information and feedback. Coach-managers should also be more included in team-meetings as they can give guidance and feedback on a team-level and also report back to the organization.

More independence for education

Although Livio provides courses for employees for which they can sign up for online, there is a lack of support on specialized training required by the more highly specialized teams. Even though the use of SMTs is supposed to increase flexibility, it can still take years for the organization to accept new courses recommended by teams. A specialized budget aimed towards education established by teams with the guidance and approval of their respective coach-manager can provide teams to receive training much quicker and improve quality of care given by team-members.

Using client information for individual performance feedback

Although Livio has access to all evaluation forms filled in by clients, there is little indication that these forms are actually used. Involving outside information in evaluating employees, higher management can make a more reliable and less biased assessment of the performance of employees and not solely relying on inside information they receive from other employees or coach-managers.

Introducing financial rewards

Currently, Livio offers no financial benefits for teams that perform well. The recent accomplishment of the teams in achieving the highest score in client satisfaction was awarded with a box of candy and left certain team-members wishing for more. Introducing financial rewards for independent awards that the team-members can't directly influence or keep track of can be an incentive to boost motivation and performance of teams without creating a threating environment between team-members of the same team.

6.2 Reflection of Conceptual Models
There are several things to be mentioned in the use of the model of framework for this study. After the empirical work, some factors emerged that were not included within the framework. The use of information systems appeared to be an important aspect for the self-managing teams from the interviews and the inclusion of it might have yielded more reliable results.

Overall, this study attempts to give an insight into the integration of a theoretical framework for performance management with self-managing teams in the context of healthcare. The model can be used to identify performance management practices for organizations that are utilizing or wish to make use of self-managing teams.

6.3 Limitations
This study involves a limited number of interviews due to a short time frame. In order to gain reliable data and reduce bias discussions were held with peer junior researchers to compare our findings. To secure the output quality of interviews, there were several meetings where the conducting of interviews were practiced. Furthermore, due to the nature of the study the findings here may differ than if it included research into multiple organizations on performance management practices in the healthcare. The interviews were conducted partly in Dutch and partly in English. Translation errors during interviews show certain limitations. To reduce and prevent the occurrence of such errors, English questions were frequently translated back to Dutch to confirm that both parties have a common understanding of the questions. Given that this study is specific to the Dutch healthcare system with results based on Dutch participants and may therefore be only partly applicable in a different context.

6.4 Further research
This research focuses on a single case study in the Netherlands regarding Performance Management practices in the healthcare and the results were collected during a specific period of time. Further research is recommended for organizations that have a different healthcare system than the Netherlands and possibly a different organizational structure.

7. Acknowledgement

References

Abduljawad, A. & Al-Assaf, A.F. (2011). Incentives for Better Performance in Health Care. Sultan Qaboos Univ Med J

Aguinis, H. (2009). Performance management. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Practise Hall

Almekinders, M. (2006). Teams beter thuis in de thuiszorg? Resultaatverbetering in thuiszorg met behulp van socio-technische organisatievernieuwing. Varsseveld: Stichting Sensire

Alper, S., Law, K., & Tjosvold, D. (1998). Interdependence and Controversy in Group Decision Making: Antecedents to Effective Self-Managing Teams

Armstrong, M. & Baron, A. (2005). Managing Performance: Performance Management in Action

Bakotic, D. (2016). Relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance

Banner, D. K., Kulisch, W. A., & Peery, N. S. (1992). Self-managing Work Teams (SMWT) and the Human Resource function

Cannon-Bowers, J.A. & Sales, E. (1998) Team Performance and Training in Complex Environments

Cohen, S.G., & Bailey, D.E. (1997) What Makes Teams Work: Group Effectiveness Research From the Shop Floor to the Executive Suite

Cohen, S.G., Ledford, G.E., & Spreitzer, G.M. (1996). A predictive Model of Self-Managing Work Team Effectiveness

Dale E. Yeatts et al. (2004). Self-Managed Work Teams in Nursing Homes: Implementing and Empowering Nurse Aide Teams

Dessler, G. (2008). Fundamentals of Human Resource Management

Fredendall, L. D., & Emery, C. R. (2003). Productivity increases due to the use of teams in service garages

Gazioglu, S. & Tansel, A. (2006). Job satisfaction in Britain: Individual and job related factors

Kandula, S. R. (2006) Performance management

Kapstein, J. & Hoerr, J. (1989). Volvo's radical new plant: The death of the assembly line?

Khan, M. (2013). Role of Performance Appraisal System on Employees Motivation

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2008). Learning the craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing

Lawler, E.E. & McDermott, M. (2003). Current performance management practices

Li, L.X. & Bento, W.C. (1995). Performance measurement criteria in health care organizations: Review and future research directions

Locke. E.A. & Latham, G.P. (2002). New Directions in Goal-Setting Theory

Mackey, K. & Johnson, G. (2000). The Strategic Management of Human Resources in New Zealand

McCracken, G. (1988). The long interview

Nankervis, A.R. & Compton, R. (2006). Performance Management – Theory in practice

Nerenz, D.R. & Neil, N. (2001). Performance measures for Health Care Systems

Sanyal., M.K. & Biswas, S.B. (2014). Employee motivation from Performance Appraisal Implications: Test of a Theory in the Software Industry in West Bengal (India)

Schneier, C.E., Beatty, R.W. & Baird, L.S. (1987). Performance Appraisal Sourcebook. Human Resources Development

Singh, A. (2012). Job satisfaction among the expatriates in the UAE

Smets, P.H.M. (2014). The transition towards self-managing teams in the health-care sector

Smith, P.C. 2002. Performance management in British health care: will it deliver?

Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement

Smither, J.W. & London, M. (2009). Performance Management: Putting research into action

Saunders, C.S. & Ahuja, M. (2006). Are All Distributed Teams the Same? Differentiating Between Temporary and Ongoing Distributed Teams

Zigon, J. (1998). Forced ranking performance appraisal/compensation plan

Zuckerman, A. M. & Coile, R. C. (2003). Competing on Excellence: healthcare strategies for a consumer-driven market

Appendix

Appendix A – Interview questions

Introduction
- Welcome and thank you for giving us some of your time
- The interview is anonymous (No names)
- Do you agree to a recording of this interview?
- No right or wrong question, the opinion of the interviewee is the most important

General questions
- What is "professioneel organiseren"(SMTs) in your view?
    - Own view, Livio's view
- Why were SMTs introduced?
    - In your view? In official communication? Reasons, vision/mission
- Experience in working in self-managing teams?
- How did you experience the introduction of SMTs
    - Positive, negative? Why? Examples
- Expectations about the role of the coach-manager
    - Division of tasks
- What is your own role within the team (responsibility)? Examples
    - Role of others, what do you think about it (importance, Responsibilities)?
    - How do you divide tasks among members of the team, why? Examples
- Advice or facilitation of teams
    - How does the support of HR department/coach-manager look like?
    - Expectations and experiences
    - Areas of support needed
- What would you change if you were the manager for one day?
- Expectations for the future
    - What is needed? Conditions to succeed in SMTs?

Questions Recruitment & Selection

Overall question:

Can you walk me through the process of recruitment and selection of a new employee in your team (professioneel organiseren)?

Follow up questions:

Recruitment Step 1
- How many team members left till you started? Please name an approx. number.
    - Why do you think this number is so high or low?
- How many job applications are you receiving per open position? approximate number.
    - Why do you think this number is so high or low?

- How long is your time-frame until your team needs to find a suitable new employee?
    - How do you deal with substitutions? Do you have an example?

Recruitment Step 2
- Does your company has formal procedures to recruit new employees?
    - If yes, what do those procedures look like?
- Where you as a team involved in the creation of those procedures?
- Who is responsible for recruitment and selection within your team? Why?
    -
    - If no, what is your individual procedure as a self-managing team?
- What recruitment channels do you use? Formal (Advertisements, employment agencies, Internet listings, etc.) or Informal (social networks, employee referrals, etc.)?
    - Why those channels?

Recruitment Step 3
- How successful is your team's recruitment practice in your opinion and why?
    - Can you name an example?
- What information of suitable candidates do you request for their application?
    - Why especially those information?

Selection Step 4
- How do you evaluate the qualifications of the applicant? For example background check, reference check, personality tests etc.
    - Do you evaluate them individually or as a group? Examples?
    - Who conducts the recruitment interviews? Why?

Selection Step 5
- Do you have the final say in the hiring process or Livio?
- Otherwise who makes the final decision?

Questions Performance Management
Overall question:
What are performance management practices within Livio? What do you think about it?

Objectives
- What are specific goals the teams work towards (quality of care, efficiency, saving time)?
    - Is it clear what the company expects from you?
- Who makes main decisions within the company?
    - To what extent do you feel involved in decisions within the company?
- How are team members being motivated to support the organizational goals?

Training & Development
- How does training correspond with performance? Examples?

Feedback & Evaluation

- Who gives you feedback on your work and how often?
    - How is the individual contribution assessed compared to team-performance? (Registration of working hours)
    - What are important indicators in determining the performance of individuals and teams?
    - What can be improved?
    - How do they show appreciation for the work you do?
- What kind of opportunities exist for team-members to give feedback and recommendations to higher-management?
    - And do you feel that the company will act on your feedback and recommendations?

Recognizing & Rewarding performance
- What do you think about performance based rewards?
- How does the company reward good performance?
- What kind of benefits are offered by the firm to team-members and coach-managers? (Insurance, Transportation, Lunch)

Closing remarks

- Thanking respondents
- Questions towards the interviewer