WSB Journal of Business and Finance
Year 0000, Vol. 56, No.1
eISSN 2657-4950

# Measuring Behavioural Aspects of Quality in an Enterprise A Study of Indicators Using the Slovak SMEs to Track Behavioural Aspects of Quality

Denisa Malá[a1], Martina Minárová[a] Dana Benčiková[a] Jaroslaw Ďaďo[a]

[a] *Department of Corporate Economics and Management, Faculty of Economics Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Tajovského 10, 975 90 Banská Bystrica, Slovakia*

*© Denisa Malá, Martina Minárová, Dana Benčiková, Jaroslaw Ďaďo 2022. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/bync-nd/3.0/*

DOI 10.2478/WSBJBF-2022-0004

**Abstract**

Problems that occur in enterprises are not always caused by risks from the external environment. Behaviour of employees, as well as their response to risks, has a great impact on problem occurrence, while among the risk factors that can be influenced are those on the inside of the enterprise, one of the crucial ones being the management of behavioural aspects of quality. The core of the article is its empirical research, i.e. the analysis of findings from a questionnaire, the objective of which was to identify the indicators that enterprises use to measure behavioural aspects of quality, and thus prevent potential risks in quality management. When evaluating the research results, we used methods of testing statistical hypotheses, and methods of descriptive statistics and data visualisation. The statistical program SPSS, version 25, was used to evaluate the collected data, while in testing the formulated hypotheses, the level of significance was determined at 0.05. Based on the research findings, we may claim that Slovak small and medium enterprises (SMEs) tend to track financial rather than behavioural indicators. It was also revealed that the more developed the behavioural component of an employee profile, the more frequently the behavioural indicators are tracked in the given enterprise. Among the most tracked indicators are service profitability, the enterprise's profit rate of growth, the behaviour of employees in the workplace and the productivity of labour from a timeframe point of view.

Keywords: behavioural approach; indicators, quality; enterprise

## 1 Introduction

Enterprises primarily use key performance indicators (KPIs) to measure the performance of their processes, which are defined as measurable and strategic unity that reflect the critical factors of success of the given enterprise. KPIs are essential not only for understanding and improving production efficiency but also for achieving strategic objectives (Kovrigo, Nekrashevych, 2019).

At present, it is an important trend, and also an inevitable necessity, to utilise a strategic approach to managing how the processes of an enterprise function. The purpose is to create a plan for tackling the important issues of the

[1] Denisa Malá; E-mail address: denisa.mala@umb.sk

contemporary competitive world, which are gradually intensifying under the influence of various phenomena, such as globalisation or the ubiquitous scientific and technological developments. The key element of strategies and values that customers are provided with is a certain specific exceptionality of an enterprise or product, i.e. its quality. It is mainly for the purpose of maintaining and continuously improving quality, enhancing the productivity of processes and optimising their costs that enterprises more frequently implement new principles of quality management. Among these modern approaches to evaluating quality is the measurement of behavioural quality, i.e. what employees and managers do 'behind closed doors' or, simply said, 'how they act when nobody is watching'. In the process of continuous improvement, the central focus is on the development of human resources and their potential, and on creating a participatory working atmosphere that enables – or even enhances – honest and proper behaviour.

## 2 Literature review

F An important characteristic of KPIs is their measurability, which leads to effective setting of objectives. KPIs also appear relevant in identifying, monitoring and predicting trends and are able to determine the right corrective and preventive measures, along with measures leading to the improvement of an enterprise and its processes. KPIs should express the character and size of the measured enterprise and its products, processes and activities. With regard to this function, KPIs should be gradually and appropriately elaborated as performance indicators for specific functions and layers in the enterprise, depending on its process structure, in order to support the monitoring of how the objectives are being met at the top level. It is necessary for the KPIs to be in line with the enterprise's objectives, its strategy and policy and to provide feedback as to how the policy, vision and strategy of the enterprise are determined (Namešanská, Pačaiová, 2013). The enterprise should also implement indicators that identify potential risks and opportunities.

When choosing the appropriate KPIs, an enterprise must ensure that they provide information that is measurable, precise, reliable and easy to be utilised in implementing corrective measures in case performance does not correspond with determined objectives. Last but not least, the KPIs should provide information that will serve as a way to improve activities and increase the efficiency of processes.

According to an internationally renowned professional in the field of business, Bernard Marr (2012), for an enterprise, KPIs represent vital navigation tools. Managers normally use them to find out if their enterprise is taking the right path to success or, on the other hand, if it is getting off the track to prosperity. The right structure and phrasing of the measurable indicators of performance help the enterprise to determine the areas and processes that require improvement. Without KPIs, managers are only 'blindly navigating their ship' into the unknown. In business practice, we often encounter a problem where it is the managers who stand in the way of successful quality management, as it is difficult for them to recognise which of the targeted indicators are most relevant. Instead, they collect and evaluate a large amount of different data that are easily measured but has no relevance for decision-making.

Small and medium enterprises (SMEs) mostly divide the standard measuring of employees into three basic areas (The Hartford, 2021): measuring productivity, measuring efficiency and measuring training quality.

Measuring productivity expresses the amount of labour that an employee is able to produce (complete) in a given time, e.g. a day or a week. Productivity grows with more experience and the increasing professionalism of the employee. Specific examples of measuring productivity are the number of produced or sold products or the number of successful sales phone calls.

Measuring efficiency is very closely related to measuring productivity, determining how much effort or cost is necessary to make an employee maximise their productivity. Based on this measuring, creative solutions are made to, e.g., reduce costs or the number of production non-conformities, as well as increase the reliability of data.

Measuring training quality, i.e. the correctly organised and regulated training of employees, increases their productivity and efficiency. In the short run, the efficiency of training can be measured or tracked by means of tests and questionnaires; however, in the long term, it should be observed in increasing productivity and efficiency.

The father of management, Peter Drucker, has been known for the quote, 'it is not possible to manage what you cannot measure'. Intangible elements, such as culture, values or behaviour, have long been overlooked due to their difficulty in quantifying and thus have been considered financially irrelevant with regard to evaluating an enterprise. Despite the fact that KPIs represent the key tool in measuring the performance of enterprises, in recent years, the strategic approach to performance in enterprises has managed to move to a new level – level of behavioural aspects of performance. If we believe that culture, values and behaviour are the main factors that affect performance, we must start searching for new ways to measure and evaluate these factors (www.profilesasiapacific.com, 2018). Based on this shift in the theoretical approach to measuring performance, what seems to be gaining more importance is the key behavioural indicators (KBIs). KBIs can be defined as such behaviours that can be identified, which enables determining specific characteristics. The most desired ones among

employees, from the view of management, appear to be motivation, satisfaction, engagement and loyalty (Cox, R. F. et al., 2005). KBIs serve as valuable tools for measuring employees' personal traits and characteristics, skills and knowledge. Using KBIs, we are able to determine if employees have completed the given tasks and fulfilled the objectives, but we can also tell which of the employees are willing to make more effort in achieving 'something extra' that is above the objective as it has been determined. KBIs can thus help managers find the strongest link in the team, reward this link/employee for the benefit and further support the manifested motivation to achieve better than average results. As a result, the relationship between the employee and the management is improving and strengthening, which in turn positively influences the employee's behaviour, as well as his/her further contribution to the development and growth of the given enterprise (Fridman, 2018).

KBIs can be formulated at different levels of an enterprise. At the organisational level, general patterns of behaviour should be determined, representing the inevitable pre-requisites to successful work by employees in the given enterprise. These standards ensure that all employees will act in an honest way, i.e. in line with the work ethic. Besides, KBIs reveal if individual employees only fulfil the minimum requirements regarding their tasks or if they do their job effectively. Similar to this, KBIs indicate if the given employee communicates and cooperates with others, or, by enabling obstructive communication, slows down the workflow. In this way, it is possible for an enterprise to identify ineffective employees despite them fulfilling the determined objectives and assigned projects (Profiles, 2018). The creation of a strong quality culture at the organisational level, however, does not mean that the work of quality managers is done. It is still necessary to find an effective way to measure the success of people holding individual positions. A targeted frame of competences helps the management identify what success at a given position should look like, how to behave and act in order to achieve this success and what natural abilities (being a team player, ability to make fast decisions and ability to adapt) are necessary (Profiles, 2018). Although more and more enterprises realise the importance of corporate culture, work ethic and good mutual relationships among employees, the majority rely on behavioural indicators only rarely or do not use them at all. The reasons may be the existence of various barriers that discourage them from doing so (Stentoft et al., 2019), the most common of which are administrative and time demands, demanding or difficult ways of measuring and evaluating the findings, conservative culture unwilling to change, subjectivity, lack of data or belief in the idea and so on.

Quality management and its implementation in business practice depend on physical and technological components, while human and behavioural ones also play an extremely important role. This fact has, however, long been neglected not only by academics and scholars who deal with quality and quality management in their work but also by those in business practice themselves. This can be proved by the fact that most initiatives and innovations in quality management focus on technological, structural or procedural questions, while the human factor receives less attention, this being even though a great deal of problems related to quality management occur mainly due to the existence of the human factor and are less frequently caused by technical or technological failure. According to Stentoft et al. (2019), in as many as 90% of cases, it is the human factor that has caused a problem, while technology is only responsible for the remaining 10%.

Implementation of innovations in quality, restructurating an enterprise, controlling processes, or any other 'hard-wiring' factors may all be expressed mathematically by expressions of formulas and supported by data. It is therefore possible to analyse them in detail and interpret the findings. These analyses, however, become irrelevant at the moment knowledge and understanding of the real environment of an enterprise are lacking. Sweeney (2013) refers to this approach as positivism. Choosing a merely positivist approach, however, only brings limited results as quality and quality management concern mainly people. Therefore, the initiatives that focus mainly on 'hard-wiring' of quality will most probably only have a partial effect. For this reason, it is appropriate if positivism helps to obtain an objective overview of a situation with regard to broader consideration of the whole context when making decisions; however, it is not the only approach that should be applied. Sweeney (2013) suggests complementing positivism with interpretivism, which is based on a qualitative and subjective approach.

KBIs focus on the desired behaviour of people in the internal and external environments of a department or enterprise. They cannot substitute for the traditional KPIs and should therefore be understood as their complement. KBIs provide us with a picture of specific behavioural indicators that further enable improvement in the performance of individuals and teams, and thus contribute to better results achieved and measured by KPIs.

Stentoft (2019) suggests a list of observable KBIs, which, besides sorting them out into levels, the author divides into internal KBIs of an enterprise and external, i.e. those perceived by business partners. Among the internally oriented ones are safe behaviour, mutual respect, providing constructive feedback, appropriate communication, keeping promises, using appropriate tone of voice, being responsible, proactive, disciplined and prepared for meetings, being physically and mentally present in meetings, being capable of cancelling irrelevant meetings, sharing information and engaging people in positions into processes at the right time. From the externally oriented, the author names: proactive communication of delays and tardiness, information flow, communication, appropriate

and constructive tone of voice, reliability, willingness to cooperate, working according to agreed processes, respect, being present at agreed meetings, being prepared for meetings, cooperation, being able to reply within 24 hours and being honest.

Research conducted by Stentoft (2019) revealed that employees rank the following among the top five relevant KBIs: appropriate tone of communication, being prepared for meetings, being present at planned meetings, being present both physically and mentally at the meetings and working according to the agreed processes.

At the same time, the results of the author's research pointed out that the perceived relevancy of the individual KBIs achieved higher mean values than the perceived reality, which means that there is room for improvement in this area. The situation is, however, complicated by the fact that KBIs cannot be measured as simply as KPIs and are also much more subjective. In Stentoft's research, employees expressed their opinions about what they view as the biggest barrier to implementing KBIs and, in their view, it was mainly administrative and time demands of work, complexity of measuring, weak culture, unwillingness to implement new things, subjectivity of measuring, lack of information and capacity (as to time, administration or employees). The responses suggested that evaluating KPIs consumes the majority of time, leaving no time for measuring by KBIs as well as other priorities.

Examining employee behaviour is substantiated by its importance not only for research relevant to quality and quality management but also for business practice. A better understanding of employee thought processes and decision-making is essential because these people often make decisions that are not consistent with the prescribed standard or with the agreed rules and norms. The attempt to understand and guide employee behaviour through KBIs may, however, be very complex, especially in SMEs that often experience multiple barriers, and in the worst-case scenario, all of the above mentioned.

KBIs may be understood and defined from three different perspectives (Stentoft et al., 2019). The first is the individual point of view (concerning solely the individual employee, e.g. changes in their behaviour that directly affect their decision-making). The second is the two-part point of view, which should be understood as behaviour between two sides or parties, e.g. respect for others, their priorities and personal characteristics. The third point of view relates to teams and describes behaviour that affects the whole team, e.g. arriving on time to participate in meetings, respecting the assigned task in the process and so on.

Measures that are implemented along with KBIs should motivate the employee and improve teamwork (Stentoft, 2019). In this regard, what plays an important role are employee traits, their motivation, satisfaction, engagement and loyalty, which managers in enterprises often neglect to support or pay attention to (Cox et al., 2005). KBIs should not only serve as a way to monitor behaviour in the workplace but also give the management the opportunity to reward employees in cases where these indicators are fulfilled. This may be used in making decisions about promotion, relocation of employees to different working positions or rewarding them for their work. If an enterprise correctly and ahead of time determines which factors affect its operations and functioning positively and, at the same time, have a positive effect on the employee as an individual, it can develop a set of factors that will measure the success of the enterprise other than the basic requirements expected from an employee at work. KBIs are important in evaluating the traits, skills and knowledge of specific people, and it is therefore essential to define such indicators that focus on the individuals in their roles. KBIs should reveal what the success of this role means, what behaviour is necessary for the success and what behaviour – that cannot be learned – is desired for the particular role (adaptability, motivation to work in a team, speed of learning etc.). Among the characteristics each employee should possess are communication, teamwork, strategic planning, ability to make decisions and leadership (Fridman, 2018).

Therefore, if an enterprise wants to fulfil its goals, those being both strategic and short term, it must – besides the KPIs – pay attention to the satisfaction and motivation of employees and should set objectives that comprise phenomena measurable through KBIs. For an enterprise, determining its own, tailored set of key indicators is inevitable in measuring its individual success.

## 3 Methodology

i The objective of the research was to determine those indicators by which Slovak SMEs measure the level of behavioural quality. The research used a method of questioning, specifically in the form of a questionnaire and the interview with enterprise representatives.

The identification part of the questionnaire consisted of questions that focused on identifying enterprises and their employees who participated in the research. We asked about the size of the enterprise according to the number of employees (micro-enterprise: 1–9 employees, small enterprise: 10–49 employees and medium enterprise: 50–249 employees), gender of respondents, length of their work in the enterprise, highest achieved education level, and their position in the enterprise (owner, manager of the 1st level, manager of the 2nd level, manager of the 3rd level, administration worker and line worker).

The research part of the questionnaire included 40 KPIs of the enterprise, which included KBIs. With each indicator, respondents were offered the following options: 1. I do not track the indicator; 2. I do not track the indicator, but I think it would be useful; 3. I track the indicator; and 4. I track the indicator, but it has no indicative value for me. The indicators were defined on the basis of studying the literature and as a result of consulting with professor Sedliačiková, who has dealt with the problem of controlling Slovak SMEs in her research.

To evaluate the research results, we used the methods of testing the statistical hypotheses (Chi-square, Friedman test, Wilcoxon signed rank test, Spearman test, Mann–Whitman test and correlation analysis) and the methods of descriptive statistics and data visualisation (mean, mode and frequency tables).

Based on the theoretical foundations to the given topic, as well as the empirical studies dealing with the problem (Benčiková, Malá, Ďaďo, 2019; Araújo et al., 2019; Avey, 2018; Cristofaro, 2020; Cronemyr et al., 2017; Kotter, Cohen, 2002; Mendez, 2018; Pan et al., 2019; Srinivasan, Kurey, 2014), we formulated the following hypotheses. We assume that

H1: … SMEs in Slovakia focus on tracking financial indicators more than behavioural indicators, and

H2: … the more behavioural indicators are tracked, the better behavioural values the enterprise's employees achieve.

The representativeness of the sample, according to the selected criteria – gender and size of the enterprise – was tested by the Chi-square test. The testing statistics of the Chi-square test are made up by the sum of the squared difference between observed and expected data, divided by the expected data in all possible categories (Kaščáková, Nedelová, 2010).

The Pearson Chi-square goodness-of-fit test is based on a frequency table and tests the statistical hypothesis that frequencies in the individual categories equal the expected (theoretical) frequencies (Kaščáková, Nedelová, 2010).

When evaluating the research, we used the statistical program SPSS, version 25. The 0.05 level of significance was used.

To test hypothesis H1, Friedman and Wilcoxon tests were applied. The Friedman test is a non-parametric alternative to the one-way ANOVA with repeated measures. The Wilcoxon test is a non-parametric alternative to the dependent samples t-test.

Hypothesis H2 was verified by Spearman correlation coefficient. Correlation is interdependence of two or more variable quantities, and the correlation coefficient may achieve values between -1 and +1. Values of -1 and +1 represent the highest negative and positive correlations, respectively, while value 0 signifies no correlation (Kaščáková, Nedelová, 2010).

## 4 Findings and discussion

l Altogether, 183 respondents participated in the research, with 101 male and 82 female respondents. The most respondents (23.5%) are the owners of their enterprise, 18.03% work in administration, 11.48% are top managers, 20.77% are middle managers and 21.31% are line managers. As to the length of their employment, the largest representation is by employees who have worked in the enterprise between 1 and 3 years (28.96%), 25.68% between 3 and 5 years, 19.67% more than 7 years, 15.30% between 5 and 7 years and 10.38% less than a year. Regarding the size of the enterprise, 3.83% of respondents were from middle-, 10.93% from small- and 85.25% from micro-enterprises.

The representativeness of the sample, according to the selected criteria – size of the enterprise (determined by the number of employees), and gender of respondents, was tested by the Chi-square test at the 0.05 level of significance. In both cases, representativeness was confirmed ($p$-value$_{size}$ = 0.992, $p$-value$_{gender}$ = 0.959).

Among the **10 most tracked** indicators are the following: rentability of services (74.32%), rate of profit growth (74.32%), behaviour of an employee at the workplace (69.95%), work productivity from the time point of view (69.40%), rate of task fulfillment by an employee (65.57%), percentage of satisfied customers (65.03%), maturity of liabilities (64.48%), rentability of costs (63.93%), investment return (62.84%) and work efficiency (62.30%). Four of these indicators measure the behaviour of employees (behaviour of an employee at the workplace, work productivity from the time point of view, rate of task fulfillment by an employee and work efficiency).

The 10 most common indicators that enterprises **track but see no indicative value in** are as follows: participation of employees in meetings (26.78%), employee health examination costs (26.23%), activity of an employee in meetings (25.14%), rate of employee fluctuation (25.14%), work productivity from quantity point of view (24.04%), employee proactiveness (21.86%), ability of employee to communicate (21.31%), employee error rate (20.22%), liquidity (20.22%) and economic added value (20.22%).

The 10 most common indicators that enterprises **do not track** are as follows: employee health examination costs (56.83%), percentage of used production capacity (38.80%), activity of an employee in meetings (38.25%), difficulty of the assigned tasks (37.7%), work performance of an employee (37.16%), rate of training efficiency

(36.61%), economic added value (33.33%), employee proactiveness (32.79%), percentage of non-conformities (32.79%) and revenues per customer (32.79%).

The 10 most common indicators that enterprises do not **track but it would be good to do so** are as follows: percentage of loyal customers (16.39%), employee error rate (14.75%), rate of training efficiency (14.21%), employee proactiveness (14.21%), ability of an employee to solve problems (13.66%), ability of an employee to communicate (12.57%), feedback from stakeholders regarding an employee (12.57%), percentage of satisfied customers (12.57%), behaviour of an employee at the workplace (11.48%) and revenues per customer (11.48%).

When comparing the rate of tracking the individual indicators, we have found that work productivity from the point of view of quantity, as well as liquidity, are indicators that are tracked with a high indicative value by 56.56% of enterprises on average, while on average, for 22.13% of enterprises, these are indicators they track but consider to have no indicative value.

Enterprises consider the percentage of satisfied customers, as well as the percentage of loyal customers rather important, and on average, 60.65% of them track these indicators; 14.48% do not track these indicators but assume it may be helpful to do so.

On the other hand, indicators such as employee proactiveness, employee health examination cost, ability of an employee to communicate and activity of an employee in meetings are not tracked by 39.20% of enterprises on average, while 23.64% do track them but do not consider them important.

Proactiveness of an employee such as the ability to communicate are tracked by 21.59% of enterprises on average, while these indicators are of no value for the given enterprises and 27.05% do not track them at all. On the other hand, 13.39% of enterprises do not track the two indicators but assume it would be good to do so.

Hypothesis 1 assumes that SMEs in Slovakia focus more on tracking financial indicators than behavioural indicators. The Wilcoxon signed rank test indicated that the *p*-value = 0.0, which confirms the validity of hypothesis 1 (Table 1). We can thus claim that Slovak SMEs focus on tracking financial indicators rather than behavioural ones.

Table 1. SMEs in Slovakia - The Wilcoxon signed rank test indicated that the *p*-value = 0.0

| **Wilcoxon signed rank test** | | | $mean_{financial}$ – $mean_{behavioural}$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Z | | | -3.879[b] |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | | 0.000 |
| Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed) | Sig. | | 0.000 |
| | 99% Confidence Interval | Lower Bound | 0.000 |
| | | Upper Bound | 0.001 |
| Monte Carlo Sig. (1-tailed) | Sig. ($p_{value}$) | | 0.000 |
| | 99% Confidence Interval | 0.000 | 0,000 |
| | | 0.000 | 0,000 |

a. Wilcoxon signed rank test
b. Based on positive ranks.
c. Based on 10,000 sampled tables with starting seed 2,000,000.

Hypothesis 2 assumes that the more behavioural indicators are tracked, the better behavioural values the enterprise's employees achieve. We attempted to find out if there is a statistically significant correlation between employee behaviour and its measuring. The independence test confirmed the assumption, but it was discovered that this assumption must be rejected because the *p*-value is less than 0.001.. The Spearman correlation coefficient was used to determine the intensity of dependence. A medium direct dependence has been found between the behavioural aspect of an employee and its measuring (rS = 0.442), which means that the more developed the behavioural aspect of employees is, the more enterprises focus on tracking the behavioural indicators (Table 2).

Table 2. SMEs in Slovakia - behavioural aspect of employees

| **Correlations** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | meanB | meanrS |
| Spearman's rho | meanB | Correlation coefficient | 1/000 | 442** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | <.001 |
| | | N | 183 | 183 |
| | meanS | Correlation coefficient | .442** | 1.000 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | <.001 | . |
| | | N | 183 | 183 |

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

The results showed a medium dependence (rs = 0.29), which confirmed the following: if the performance of an employee is tracked, which means they are under more pressure, they need help in handling stressful situations. According to Schreibauer et al. (2020), more than half of the employees consider their workload demanding. It is mainly overloading the employees which is why people feel stressed in their work. Furthermore, if there is more stress put on a person than they can handle, it contributes to lower productivity, decreased motivation and in the end, to higher absenteeism. Presumably the most frequent stress factor is the employee's workload and fulfilling the assigned tasks (work autonomy, task completeness or emotional demands). Simply put, if someone has a higher load of work than they are capable of handling – physically and psychologically – it leads to overwork and a feeling of failure, which directly results in stress. The role of managers is to create a culture that supports and enhances performance itself rather than the time spent in the workplace (Diamantidis, Chatzoglou, 2019), i.e. to train leaders in methods that lead to high performance.

In a discussion with enterprises we have agreed that no matter what form of stress is present in the workplace, it is important to give employees a chance to talk about it openly. If this is not enabled, the situation may deteriorate and get much worse. The possibility of discussing problems with colleagues or superiors always helps to find constructive solutions, including the elimination of stress.

One of the ways stress can be eliminated and stressful situations may be managed is through the development of emotional intelligence (Minárová, 2014). If managers neglect the development of their emotional intelligence, they may be facing emotional trauma, stress or fear more often, experiencing a greater deal of negative emotions such as anger, jealousy, envy or irrational feelings of guilt. These feelings represent a barrier to achieving internal victories, which in the end lead to public ones, i.e. the success of the enterprise the employees work for. The development of emotional intelligence is not at all a simple matter. It can be said that it is one of the hardest tasks managers are facing, regardless of their organisational level.

The research confirmed a medium-to-strong direct correlation between tracking work efficiency and following work standards (rs = 0.308) and revealed that employees prefer more demanding tasks (rs = 0.337). Standards should be understood as dynamic and developing values that the employees of an enterprise agree on in a consensus, with entire professional teams involved in their creation. By formulating standards, promotion of subjective interpretations of an enterprise's quality is restricted, as they provide a way to get oriented in the concept of quality (Moratis, 2018). Discussions with the enterprises have confirmed that at lower levels, standards are specified in the form of indicators by means of which the real performance of the enterprise is evaluated. These indicators are thus qualitative or quantitative parameters expressing the effectiveness of an enterprise, i.e. how they are codified in processes and how it is achieved in reality regarding all its monitored aspects.

We have also found a correlation regarding employee education, i.e. if an enterprise tracks the training efficiency rate, employees themselves share new information actively and intenstionally with their colleagues (strong direct correlation, rs = 0.317). As a result, an employee may attempt to solve more complex tasks and, along with this, achieve ambitious goals. Through specifically targeted employee education/training, it is possible to achieve higher level of solidarity and loyalty towards the enterprise and its values. This also leads to greater independence among employees, providing them with more opportunities for self-actualisation, mainly if, within this process, they obtain new knowledge and develop their skills relevant to their further professional growth in the enterprise (Altunay, 2016).

We have confirmed a strong, direct correlation (rs = 0.332) between tracking proactiveness and the employee preference for more demanding tasks. To be proactive means to make decisions and accept responsibility related to them, in contrast to taking a passive stance as an observer. Proactiveness also requires determination and patience, as it is necessary to evaluate one's possibilities, weigh the alternatives and make one's own decisions in order to achieve the goals. If an employee is proactive, he/she constantly thinks about alternative solutions to problems that may arise, even before they occur. Therefore, a proactive employee is able to propose relevant solutions, suggest new ideas or express and explain their own ideas to others. A proactive employee is ready for further challenges, as it is easier and more natural for him to choose more demanding tasks (Carsten et al., 2016).

Strong direct dependence was found between tracking of the ability to communicate (rs = 0.463) and solve problems (rs = 0.409), and the employee's preference for choosing more demanding tasks to do. Communication focused on solving work tasks is connected with a managerial style of directing employees and their work. Such communication is closely linked with a way of ordering tasks, fulfilling the orders, controlling if they have been fulfilled and evaluating them. In order for the manager's direction to be understood with regard to its goal, it is essential for the manager to use adequate ways of presentation. Within this communication focusing on the fulfillment of the work tasks, conflict may occur quite frequently, which is why the manager should be prepared to solve the conflicts in case they are inevitable (Harausová, 2013).

A medium, direct correlation was found between tracking the ability to solve problems and the employee's tendency to solve problems independently (rs = 0.295). Problem solving mainly involves the use of logic and

imagination, which ensure that employees are able to understand the situation and produce intelligent solutions. In reality, the most effective problem solvers are those who actively predict potential/future problems and act in such a way that prevents their occurrence or reduces their impact (www.targetjons.co.uk).

The research has confirmed a medium, direct correlation (rs = 0.246) between tracking the number of employee complaints and the employee's perception of the positive aspects of their job. The same conclusions were presented by Johnston (2001) and Taha et al. (2019), whose findings revealed that providing immediate solutions to employee complaints effectively contributes to their higher job satisfaction.

The last correlation determined by our research was a medium, direct dependence on tracking time management and following standards by the employee (rs = 0.25) and a rare occurrence of problems (rs = 0.232). The discussion with representatives of the enterprises has revealed that a lot of advice given in the area of time management concerns standardisation and 'routinisation' of activities in order to increase the efficiency of employees. Time earned by increasing the efficiency can be utilised otherwise, e.g. for activities that are important for achieving the enterprise's goals, which relates to the more effective use of time by those employees who are not engaging in activities that slow down their work. Using time management also leads to better planning and utilising the time of employees and to enhance a more specific priority setting, which – in business practice – leads to more effective communication and thus prevents the occurrence of problems.

## 5 Conclusions and recommendations

Our research has revealed that employees plan their work and try to adhere to work standards. They understand and work in line with the company's standards and culture. Employees can also set their working priorities while attempting to meet the deadline of their tasks. Furthermore, employees try to avoid problems with other colleagues, search for another task associated with their abilities after having fulfilled the previous one and accept responsibility for the tasks they have been given. They apply the knowledge and skills in fulfilling their tasks as effectively as possible, and if necessary, they participate in employee education and development of necessary skills. Next, employees seek creative tasks, manage stressful situations without major problems, and if a problem occurs, they try to solve it immediately. Finally, they try to share the acquired information with their colleagues.

Regarding the indicators that are tracked in enterprises, the research has confirmed more frequent tracking of financial rather than behavioural indicators. The most frequently tracked financial indicators are sales profitability and profit growth rate. Among the most frequently tracked behavioural indicators are work productivity (regarding time and quantity) and time management (keeping deadlines).

The research has also revealed that the more developed the behavioural aspect of employees is, the more frequently the enterprise focuses on tracking behavioural indicators. Targeting the behavioural aspects of employees means finding a link between performance and achieving the goals of an enterprise. Thanks to suitable ways of measuring and evaluating its performance, the enterprise achieves employee satisfaction, which has a direct effect on its growth. Focusing on the behavioural aspect also improves interpersonal relations, motivation, communication and management, which belong among the essential elements of a good quality enterprise. When the enterprise provides its employees with specific instruction and feedback regarding their performance and behaviour, the performance of employees is enhanced. Evaluating the behavioural aspect is one of the most precise approaches to evaluating performance. It is necessary for the behavioural approach to quality to become an inevitable part of managing an enterprise, although it may be advisable to implement it as early as in planning. We recommend integrating a behavioural approach into the organisational structure and into human resource management.

Based on the finding of this study, we recommend that the enterprise not establish too many KPIs, as this would indicate a lack of clarity in the enterprise's goals. At the top management level, using more than 10 KPIs is often counterproductive. Moreover, what should be assured at this level is the alternating use of financial indicators with qualitative and operational ones. Management of the enterprise should view its performance in the context of its external environment (market, economy, customers, competitors and macro). As an example, being economical in costs for purchased material may appear positive; however, if prices of the purchased commodity have dropped significantly in the market, the purchase may not have saved the enterprise as much as offered by the market.

Work performance and employee behaviour are affected by three basic characteristics: knowledge, skills and motivational decisions, which determine where, how and for how long employees will direct their effort. Other factors, such as values, attitudes, personal characteristics, as well as corporate standards and other interventions of an enterprise, contribute to the choice of appropriate employee behaviour, either through influencing the choice and direction of their work tasks or by providing them with knowledge and skills that are essential in fulfilling the tasks and applying the desired behaviour. It is important for an enterprise to distinguish between the performance and behaviour of an employee: performance is, in general, in line with the skills, abilities and knowledge of an

employee, while examples of behaviour, such as constant tardiness or sending inappropriate e-mails, indicate a problem in this regard.

To achieve good performance, employees must know what is expected from them. The extent of the expected performance may be broad; however, it can be generally divided into two categories: 1. Results, i.e. products or services generated by the employee, which are often measured along with fulfilling the goals and standards (measured through KPIs); and 2. Actions and behaviour, i.e. methods and ways used to produce a product, and behaviour and values demonstrated while performing the work (measured through KBIs).

An enterprise should measure the standard of its employees in five areas: performance, level of workload, level of creativity, level of accuracy and level of communication.

The first area to be measured is the level of performance. There is always a way to determine the priority of tasks. Employees must fulfil their obligations, be creative and perform their duties until they are completed. People who love what they do have a tendency to give excellent performances.

The second area is the level of workload. If employees lack sleep due to their overload, a decrease in performance level will be observed very soon. Enterprises should promote and support employee health and maintain a balance between work and leisure time. This will result in employees coming to work happy, enthusiastic and thus highly productive.

The third area that must be measured is the level of creativity, which is apparently one of the most important aspects of evaluating employee performance. Creative employees ask questions when looking for solutions; they think outside the box and are innovative. When evaluating this aspect, we recommend tracking the number of incidents the employee exhibits as a result of his/her creativity. What should be monitored is if the employee's performance is increasing without causing any distraction, and if an increase is recorded, high performers are identified and should be rewarded accordingly.

The fourth area of measuring is the level of accuracy. In order for the employees to do a good job, they must work with a high level of accuracy. If mistakes occur that cause the production to slow down, the enterprise loses money. Employees who often make mistakes may need further training or other, more targeted support. Evaluating performance helps identify problems and come up with solutions.

The last area to be measured is the level of communication. Lack of communication is a large problem, which is why employees whose communication skills are highly developed and applied often achieve very good results in their work. Should an employee cause a delay, e.g. due to mistakes in fulfilling the tasks, he/she should be encouraged to ask if instructions are not clear or for any other reason that disables the proper functioning of processes they are involved in. Communication is an essential skill employees should possess, and we recommend monitoring if an employee understands the views of others, accepts feedback and is able to learn from it, presents information to others in an effective way, possesses excellent writing and speaking communication skills, initiates a dialogue and includes others in the communication process while maintaining a good relationship with the environment.

**Acknowledgements**

The authors are thankful to the Slovak Research and Development Agency for their support through grant VEGA 1/0642/22.

## References

C Altunay, E. 2016. The Effect Of Training With Tqm On The Perception Of Teachers About The Quality Of Schools. In Universal Journal Of Educational Research, Vol. 4, Issue 9. Issn 2332-3205, Pp. 2126 – 2133, Doi: 10.13189/Ujer.2016.040925.

Araújo, R., Santos, G., Batista De Costa, J., Sá, J. C. 2019. The Quality Management System As A Driver Of Organizational Culture: An Empirical Study In The Portuguese Textile Industry. In Quality Innovation Prosperity, Vol. 23, Issue 1. Issn 1335-1745, Pp. 1-24, Doi: 10.12776/Qip.V23i1.1132.

Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., Luthans, F. 2018. Can Positive Employees Help Positive Organizational Change? Impact Of Psychological Capital And Emotions On Relevant Attitudes And Behaviors. In Journal Of. Apply Behavioral Science, Vol. 44, Issue 1. Issn 0021-8863, Pp. 48-70, Doi: 10.1177/0021886307311470.

Benčiková, D., Malá, D., Ďaďo, J. 2019. Intercultural Competences In Slovak Business Environment. In E & M Ekonomie A Management, Vol. 3, Issue Xxii. Issn 1212-3609, Pp. 51-66, Doi: 10.15240/Tul/001/2019-3-004.

Carsten, M., Klimchak, M., Morrell, D. 2016. Employee Entitlement And Proactive Work Behaviors: The Moderating Effects Of Narcissism And Organizational Identification. In Journal Of Leadership And Organizational Studies, Vol. 23, Issue 4, Issn 1939-7089, Pp. 1-10, Doi: 10.1177/1548051816636790.

Cox, R. F., Issa, R. R. A., Koblegard, K. 2005. Management's Perception Of Key Behavioral Indicators For Construction. In Journal Of Construction Engineering And Management, Vol. 131, Issue 3. Issn 0733-9364, Pp. 368–376.

Cristofaro, M. 2020. I Feel And Think, Therefore I Am: An Affect-Cognitive Theory Of Management Decisions, In European Management Journal, Vol. 38, Issue 2. Issn 1555-4015, Pp. 344-355, Doi: 10.1016/J.Emj.2019.09.003.

Cronemyt, P., Backstrom, I., Ronnback, A. 2017. Quality Culture Deployment - Using Behaviours To Explain, Diagnose And Improve A Quality Culture. In International Journal Of Quality And Service Sciences, Vol. 9, Issue 3-4. Issn 1756-669x, Pp. 498-518, Doi: 10.1108/Ijqss-02-2017-0008.

Diamantidis, A. D., Chatzoglou, P. 2019. Factors Affecting Employee Performance: An Empirical Approach. In International Journal Of Productivity And Performance Management, Vol. 68, Issue 1. Issn 1741-0401, Pp. 171-193, Doi: 10.1108/Ijppm-01-2018-0012.

Fridman, A. 2018. [Online]. Kpi Is Ready For A Sibling - Kbi (Key Behavior Indicator). 2018. [Cit. 2021-09-14]. Available On Internet: Https://Www.Linkedin.Com/Pulse/Kpi-Ready-Sibling-Kbi-Key-Behavior-Indicator-Adam-Fridman

Harausová, H. 2013. Komunikácia V Organizácii. Košice: Univerzita Pavla Jozefa Šafárika V Košiciach, 120 S. Isbn 978-80-8152-019-8.

Johnston, R. 2001. Linking Complaint Management To Profit. In International Journal Of Service Industry Management, Vol. 12, Issue 1, Issn 0956-4233, Pp. 60-69, Doi: 10.1108/09564230110382772.

Kaščáková, A.; Nedeľová, G. 2010. Štatistické Metódy Pre Spoločenské A Humanitné Vedy. Banska Bystrica : Univerzita Mateja Bela. 72 S. Isbn 978-80-557-0345-9.

Kotter, J. P., Cohen, D. S. 2002. Creative Ways To Empower Action To Change The Organization: Cases In Point. In Journal Of Organizational Excellence, Vol. 22, Issue 1, Issn 1531-1864, Pp. 73-82, Doi: 10.1002/Npr.10055.

Marr, B. 2012. Key Performance Indicators. Edinburg : Pearson Education Limited. 287 S. Isbn 978-0-273-75011-6. 287.

Mendez, J. 2018. Three-Dimensional Sustainability Of Kaizen. In Tqm Journal, Vol. 30, Issue 4, Issn 1754- 2731, Pp. 391-408, Doi: 10.1108/Tqm-12-2017-0179.

Minárová, M. 2014. Emocionálna Inteligencia Ako Súčasť Kompetentnosti Manažéra. Banská Bystrica : Vydavateľstvo Univerzity Mateja Bela V Banskej Bystrici – Belianum, 144 S. Isbn 978-80-557-0755-6.

Moratis, L. 2018. Signalling Responsibility? Applying Signalling Theory To The Iso 26000 Standard For Social Responsibility. In Sustainability, Vol. 10, Issue 11, Issn 2071-1050, Pp. 1-20, Doi: 10.3390/Su10114172.

Namešanská, J., Pačaiová, H. 2013. [Online]. Návrh Štruktúry Kľúčových Ukazovateľov Pre Meranie Výkonnosti Procesov. [Cit. 2021- 03-17]. Available On Internet: Https://Www.Sjf.Tuke.Sk/Transferinovacii/Pages/Archiv/Transfer/25-2013/Pdf/204-207.Pdf

Nekrashevych, O. V., Kovrigo, Y. M. 2019. [Online]. Overview Of Key Performance Indicators. In Modeling, Control And Information Technologies: Proceedings Of Iii International Scientific And Practical Conference, [Cit. 2021-09-15]. Available On Internet: Https://Doi.Org/10.31713/Mcit.2019.65.

Pan, X., Hao, A., Guan, C., Hsieh, T. J. 2019. Affective And Cognitive Dimension In Cultural Identity: Scale Development And Validation. In Asia Pacific Journal Of Marketing, Vol. 32, Issue 6, Issn 1355-5855, Pp. 1362-1375, Doi: 10.1108/Apjml-03-2019-0200.

Problem Solving: The Mark Of An Independent Employee. 2021. [Online]. Ek : Target Jobs. [Cit. 2021-10-16]. Available On Internet: Https://Targetjobs.Co.Uk/Careers-Advice/Skills-For-Getting-A-Job/Problem-Solving-Mark-Independent-Employee

Profiles Asia Pacific. 2018. [Online]. Key Behavioral Indicators For Employees. 2018. [Cit. 2021-09-07]. Available On Internet: Https://Www.Profilesasiapacific.Com/2018/04/24/Key-Behavioral-Indicators-For-Employees/

Schreibauer, E. Ch., Hippler, M., Burgess, S., Rieger, M., Rind, E. 2020. Work-Related Psychosocial Stress In Amall And Medium-Sized Enterprises: An Integrative Review. In International Journal Of Environmental Research And Public Health, Vol. 17, Issue 20, Issn 1660-4601, Pp. 1-23, Doi: 10.3390/Ijerph17207446.

Srinivasan, A., Kurey, B. 2014. Creating A Culture Of Quality. In Harvard Business Review, Vol. 92, Issue 4, Issn 0017-8012, Pp. 23-25.

Stentoft, J., Freytag, P. V., Eckhardt, S. 2019. Unleashing The Full Potential Of Sales & Operations Planning By Recognizing Key Behavioral Indicators. In Supply Chain Management Review, Vol. 23, Issue 4, Issn 1521-9747.

Sweeney, E. Evangelista, P., Passato, R. 2013. Putting Supply-Chain Learning Theory Into Practice: Lessons From An Irish Case. In International Journal Of Knowledge And Learning, Vol. 1, Issue 4, Issn 1741-1017, Pp. 357-372.

Taha, O., Esenyel, I. 2019. The Effect Of Internal Complaints Systems On Employee Retention And Turnover Intention: The Mediating Role Of Organizational Justice. In African Journal Of Hospitality, Tourism And Leisure, Vol. 8, Issue 2, Issn 2223-814x, Pp. 1-28.

The Hartford. 2021. [Online]. How To Define Employee Performance Metrics. [Cit. 2021-10-27]. Available On Internet: Business Owners' Playbook: Https://Www.Thehartford.Com/Business-Insurance/Strategy/Employee-Performance/Defining-Metricslark, T., Woodley, R., De Halas, D., 1962. Gas-Graphite Systems, In “Nuclear Graphite”. In: Nightingale, R. (Ed.). Academic Press,

New York, Pp. 387.

Deal, B., Grove, A., 1965. General Relationship For The Thermal Oxidation Of Silicon. Journal Of Applied Physics 36.2, 37–70.

Deep-Burn Project: Annual Report For 2009, Idaho National Laboratory, Sept. 2009.

Fachinger, J., Den Exter, M., Grambow, B., Holgerson, S., Landesmann, C., Titov, M., Podruhzina, T., 2004. Behavior Of Spent Htr Fuel Elements In Aquatic Phases Of Repository Host Rock Formations, 2nd International Topical Meeting On High Temperature Reactor Technology. Beijing, China, Paper #B08.

Fachinger, J., 2006. Behavior Of Htr Fuel Elements In Aquatic Phases Of Repository Host Rock Formations. Nuclear Engineering & Design 236.3, 54.