

INTEGRATING AFFILIATION NEED AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: A DUAL APPROACH TO EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION AND STRATEGIC GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

Introduction

Performance management systems rely on key performance indicators (KPIs) to guide behavior and communicate strategic priorities. As KPIs act as carriers of organizational information [Niemiec, 2019], they are expected to promote clarity and alignment. Yet they often produce unintended consequences such as fear [Clifton, 2012], gaming [Smith, 1995] and resistance [Parmenter, 2009]. A key unresolved issue is why identical indicators motivate some employees but feel stressful or unfair to others. Growing evidence suggests that performance cues are filtered through the relational and motivational orientations employees bring to workplace.

Studies across organizational contexts show that interpersonal experiences shape how expectations and feedback are interpreted and how employees engage with their work [e.g., Nwachukwu et al., 2022; Furrer, Skinner, 2003; Camilleri, Troise, Morrison, 2024]. Research on workplace cyberbullying demonstrates that identical stressors may trigger withdrawal or engagement depending on relational sensitivity [Kukreti et al., 2025], indicating that social dynamics act as interpretive lenses.

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) provides a strong basis for understanding these patterns. Satisfaction of psychological needs, especially relatedness, predicts engagement, well-being and commitment [Ryan, Deci, 2017; Van den Broeck et al.,

* **Andrzej Niemiec, Associate Professor** – University of Szczecin. ORCID: 0000-0002-9441-7290.

** **Małgorzata Golasieńska, PhD. Eng.** – Grupa Azoty Zakłady Chemiczne Police S.A., University of Szczecin. ORCID: 0000-0003-2097-8906.

2016]. Individuals high in affiliation need tend to internalize organizational goals more deeply and invest more emotionally in interpersonal relations [Baard et al., 2004]. Evidence from research on motivation profiles [Howard et al., 2021], ethical self-leadership [Amundsen, Martinsen, 2015] and knowledge sharing [Chen et al., 2023] further shows that connected employees display greater cooperation, openness and meaning-focused engagement.

Recent engagement research highlights that affective, cognitive and social engagement respond differently to relational contexts: emotional climate shapes affective engagement [Kahn, 1990], clarity and meaning shape cognitive engagement [Saks, 2019], and belonging and interaction quality underpin social engagement [Bakker et al., 2023].

Despite these advances, little is known about how relational needs influence reactions to KPI-based systems. Studies on fairness [Colquitt et al., 2013], stress [Sonnentag, Frese, 2012] and autonomy [Gagné et al., 2015] do not consider whether employees with stronger affiliation needs interpret KPIs differently from those with weaker social motivation.

Objective: The study examines how the need for affiliation, understood within Self-Determination Theory as a core relational need, shapes employee engagement and, in consequence, perceptions of KPI-based performance management systems.

1. Literature review

Performance Management

Research on managerial control shows that performance management functions not only as a technical system, but as a behavioral and relational process embedded in daily work. Control frameworks argue that tools such as KPI hierarchies and the Balanced Scorecard shape attention and guide interpretation [Simons, 1995; Malmi, Brown, 2008]. Diagnostic controls translate strategy into indicators but may create pressure or narrow focus [Henri, 2006], whereas interactive controls rely on dialogue and joint interpretation, supporting learning and involvement [Chen, Lill, Vance, 2020].

Employee perceptions are central. Trust, voice and perceived legitimacy determine whether KPIs motivate or generate stress. Engagement research shows that social and affective connection enhances positive control effects, while poor relational quality increases withdrawal. Cognitive engagement is similarly shaped by goal clarity and transparent indicators, whereas inconsistent KPIs undermine focus and alignment [Hall, 2008]. Relationally oriented employees interpret KPIs through social meaning structures [Tellenbach, Bidault, Haddock-Millar, 2025].

Cultural and social controls also play an important role: inclusive communication and collaboration make performance management feel supportive rather than punitive [Abernethy, Brownell, 1999]. Across the literature, a consistent conclusion emerges: performance systems succeed when employees cognitively understand them, emotionally accept them and socially participate in them.

The role of affiliation need in Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

A key conceptual clarification concerns the distinction between relatedness in Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and affiliation need in McClelland's theory of acquired needs. Although both constructs describe relational orientations, they are not theoretically interchangeable. SDT conceptualizes *relatedness* as a universal, innate psychological need – a fundamental condition for internalization, well-being and optimal functioning [Ryan, Deci, 2000; Deci, Ryan, 2017]. In contrast, McClelland's need for affiliation represents an individual difference that varies across people and reflects a motivational preference for harmonious social relationships [McClelland, 1961].

Despite this difference in origin – basic need vs. learned motive – the two constructs share a common relational core: both capture the extent to which individuals seek connection, responsiveness and positive social bonds at work. Recent research acknowledges that SDT needs and acquired motives can operate jointly, with dispositional relational motives shaping how strongly individuals pursue or interpret relatedness-supportive cues in organizations [e.g., Niemiec, Spence, 2016]. This complementarity provides a theoretically coherent basis for integrating the two perspectives.

In the present study, the need for affiliation is treated explicitly as an individual-difference expression of relational motivation, which channels the way employees engage affectively, cognitively and socially. SDT is used not to redefine affiliation, but to explain the mechanism through which relational motives shape engagement and, consequently, how employees make sense of KPI-based performance systems. This positioning preserves the conceptual boundaries between the two theories while enabling a unified motivational account of the findings.

H1: Employees' need for affiliation is positively associated with their social engagement in the relationship with their supervisor.

This follows directly from SDT's assertion that relatedness satisfaction fosters meaningful interpersonal connections and collaborative behavior [Deci, Ryan, 2000; Baard et al., 2004] and aligns with evidence showing that relationally motivated employees engage more actively in communication, teamwork and social interaction [McClelland, Koestner, 1992; Yamaguchi, 2003].

Employee engagement

Employee engagement has increasingly been conceptualized as a multidimensional construct comprising affective, cognitive and social components, each linked to distinct patterns of workplace functioning. Across the engagement literature, affective engagement is consistently associated with emotional connection, enthusiasm and sensitivity to interpersonal cues. Studies drawing on knowledge work, higher education and service contexts show that employees with strong affective engagement respond more intensely to supervisory behaviors, recognition and the relational climate of evaluation processes [e.g., Furrer et al., 2025; collaborative learning and engagement studies]. These findings suggest that affectively engaged employees are more likely to interpret performance management interactions through an emotional and relational frame, rendering them particularly responsive to perceived fairness, tone of feedback and the motivational qualities of KPIs.

H2: Affective engagement is positively associated with perceptions of fairness in performance evaluation.

H3: Affective engagement is positively associated with KPI-related stress.

H4: Affective engagement is positively associated with the motivational impact of KPI systems.

Cognitive engagement reflects the extent to which employees invest mental effort, concentrate on goals and seek clarity in performance expectations. Research on engagement in hybrid work, knowledge-intensive environments and structured peer-learning demonstrates that cognitively engaged individuals tend to seek precision, clarify ambiguities and align their work with explicit performance priorities. These tendencies resonate with patterns observed in employees who adopt a task-focused approach, request clarifications and orient themselves around procedural accuracy. Literature across organizational behavior and management education shows that cognitive engagement enhances goal comprehension and supports sustained performance standards even under pressure.

H5: Cognitive engagement is positively associated with understanding of strategic goals.

H6: Cognitive engagement is positively associated with perceived quality of work under KPI-based systems.

Social engagement captures the relational aspects of participation at work, including collaboration, voice, advice-sharing and communication patterns. Evidence from reverse mentoring, inclusive leadership, peer learning and municipal advice-sharing consistently demonstrates that socially engaged employees interact more actively with colleagues, exchange ideas in broader forums and place high value on dialogue-based

communication processes. Such employees tend to frame performance requirements through collective meaning-making, actively contribute suggestions and seek reciprocal validation for their ideas. Consequently, social engagement is likely to shape how employees participate in performance dialogues and how clearly, they perceive communication surrounding Balanced Scorecard (BSC) indicators and KPI priorities.

H7: Social engagement is positively associated with the willingness to present ideas and solutions.

H8: Social engagement is positively associated with perceived clarity of performance management communication.

2. Method

The study employed a qualitative design to explore how employees make sense of KPI-based performance management systems in their everyday work. Semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions were used, following best practice for interpretive qualitative inquiry [Dowling, Lloyd, Suchet-Pearson, 2015]. During the research, employees at various organizational levels were categorized according to the needs that motivate them, in line with D. McClelland's theory (based on Anna Paszkowska-Rogacz's needs questionnaire). The selection of the research sample was driven by the logic of replication, rather than sampling. The sampling strategy therefore followed the principle of theoretical replication, not statistical representativeness [Yin, 2014]. Participants were selected to capture variability across hierarchical levels, job roles and exposure to KPI systems. This approach allowed cases to be compared for predictable contrasts (e.g., different engagement profiles) and for confirming or disconfirming evidence to emerge. Inclusion criteria required at least two years of experience in a KPI-driven environment and active participation in performance review processes.

Table 1. Age and seniority with the company of the survey participants – standard deviation, variance, and mean of the data (own elaboration)

	Age	Seniority with the company
Count (n)	35	35
Sum (Σx)	1,499	537
Mean (μ)	42.829	15.343
Variance (σ^2)	49.57	81.06
Coefficient of Variation	0.1644	0.5868
Standard Error of the Mean (SE)	1.19	1.52
Standard Deviation	7.0406	9.0031

Source: own study.

Interviews were conducted between March 2022 and May 2023 with 35 managers working in a large industrial organization (Table 1). Participants were provided with interview questions in advance to facilitate reflection. The average interview lasted slightly over 30 minutes. Each conversation was audio-recorded with consent, transcribed verbatim, and supplemented with contextual field notes. Alongside interview data, basic demographic and organizational information (age, tenure, managerial level) was collected to support interpretation and case comparison.

The final sample consisted of 80% men and 20% women; 51.4% held lower-level managerial roles, 25.7% middle-level positions, and 22.9% in senior management. Table 1 summarizes the descriptive characteristics of the participants, including mean age (42.83 years) and mean tenure with the company (15.34 years), together with variance and standard deviation. These metrics provide a transparent profile of the organizational experience represented in the sample.

Data analysis followed an iterative coding process. Transcripts were coded manually using a hybrid strategy: initial deductive codes reflected constructs from SDT and engagement theory, while inductive codes captured emergent interpretations of KPI systems. Coding was conducted by the lead researcher and cross-checked on 20% of transcripts by a second coder to enhance reliability. Divergences were resolved through discussion. The logic of replication guided analysis, with each case treated as a theoretically informative unit contributing to pattern identification and verification.

3. Results

Need for affiliation → employee engagement

Employees differed markedly in how they described their day-to-day interactions with management, and these differences aligned closely with their affiliation levels. Low-affiliation employees consistently portrayed their dealings with supervisors as *functional*, *role-bound* and *procedural*. Their accounts emphasized clarity, task execution and the avoidance of unnecessary relational involvement. A respondent noted: *"I follow orders, report my observations. I ask for additional guidance if something is not precisely defined. I strive to keep relationships strictly professional, approaching my work in a task-oriented manner"* (W2310). Such statements illustrate a pattern in which contact with management is framed as an exchange of operational information rather than a relational experience.

In contrast, high-affiliation employees depicted interactions with supervisors as inherently relational and often socio-emotionally meaningful. They highlighted accessibility, support and a sense of equality in the relationship: *"I think I have good relations with management. I can count on their help in various situations. The*

relationships are more on a casual level; there's no feeling of superiority" (W2304). For these individuals, contact with management appears embedded in a broader search for connection, mutual support and interpersonal security.

Taken together, these findings indicate that affiliation shapes how employees construe the relational texture of leadership interactions. Low-affiliation employees orient themselves to structure and task clarity, whereas high-affiliation employees orient to warmth, reciprocity and support. **This pattern provides clear qualitative support for H1, which proposes that higher affiliation is associated with stronger social engagement in the employee – supervisor relationship.**

Affective engagement → performance management perceptions

Employees' affective engagement – defined as emotional investment, attachment and the experience of work as personally meaningful – emerged as a central mechanism shaping how participants interpreted the fairness, stressfulness and motivational force of KPI-based systems.

Respondents with low affective engagement described evaluation processes as technical and largely impersonal. Their accounts emphasized objectivity, clarification of discrepancies and procedural transparency rather than interpersonal meaning. As one participant noted, *"assessments can never be entirely objective... but I clarify misunderstandings directly"* (W2310). These employees treated evaluation as a functional transaction, not as feedback on their standing within a relational context. Consequently, they were less sensitive to emotional cues in the evaluation process and rarely interpreted KPI outcomes as threatening or stressful. Statements such as *"For me, it is not stressful"* (W2203) and *"For me, no"* (W2211) illustrate a pragmatic, low-arousal response to KPI-related demands.

In contrast, employees with high affective engagement interpreted performance management through a relational and emotional lens. Evaluations were experienced not only as judgements of work quality but also as signals of recognition, respect and social standing. Participants emphasized interpersonal consequences – how they were perceived by supervisors, whether communication felt supportive, and whether assessments acknowledged relational effort. This sensitivity extended to KPI pressure: achieving targets was framed as a collective obligation, and KPI deviations as potential relational strain. As one respondent explained, *"the set goals require team engagement... and issues are often reported due to problems with executing them according to assumptions"* (W2208). KPI stress was thus embedded in concerns for group performance and interpersonal dynamics rather than in task difficulty alone.

Taken together, these patterns show that employees with stronger affective engagement experience performance management systems more intensely – positively when feedback is supportive and fair, negatively when goals feel misaligned or socially

burdensome. Those lower in affective engagement respond more instrumentally, evaluating KPIs and assessments in terms of clarity and task relevance rather than relational implications.

This supports hypotheses H2–H4: affective engagement is positively related to perceived fairness (H2), positively related to KPI-related stress due to emotional sensitivity to relational dynamics (H3), and positively related to the motivational force attributed to KPI systems when evaluations feel affirming and supportive (H4).

Cognitive engagement → performance management perceptions

Cognitive engagement refers to the degree to which employees concentrate on their tasks, seek clarity, and invest mental effort in understanding organizational goals and performance expectations. In the interviews, employees low in relatedness consistently displayed a task-focused, analytical style. They emphasized precision, procedures, and the need for unambiguous guidelines. Their statements reflect a form of cognitive engagement centered on grasping targets, indicators and operational requirements. For example, a respondent explained: *“I follow orders, report observations, and ask for additional guidance if something is not precisely defined”* (W2310). This pattern suggests that low-relatedness employees rely on cognitive engagement to reduce ambiguity and maintain control over their role, making them more likely to interpret KPI systems through the lens of clarity and functional usefulness.

Employees high in relatedness displayed a different profile. Their cognitive engagement was less focused on procedural clarity and more embedded in interpersonal meaning-making. They tended to interpret goals in relational terms – how targets affect their team, how work aligns with group expectations, and whether strategic priorities are communicated in a way that supports collective functioning. Examples include descriptions of seeking clarification not only to understand tasks but also to ensure alignment with team rhythms and collaborative requirements. These employees often expressed difficulty when KPIs lacked contextual explanation or when communication about priorities was perceived as detached from everyday team realities.

This divergence in cognitive engagement helps explain differences in performance management perceptions. **Employees with low relatedness and strong task-oriented cognition tend to evaluate KPI systems positively when indicators are precise, stable and logically constructed (H5). Conversely, those with higher relatedness may find the same system less transparent if communication is not relationally framed or if goals seem disconnected from team processes.**

Cognitive engagement also shaped views on the quality of work under performance measurement. Low-relatedness employees described KPIs as mechanisms that highlight gaps and allow for individual improvement, emphasizing efficiency

and procedural alignment (W2310). **In contrast, high-relatedness employees frequently linked work quality to social and contextual factors, noting that clear indicators support them only when the interpersonal climate and team dynamics are stable. When these conditions were weak, KPIs were seen as less effective, even counterproductive (H6).**

Together, these findings support the proposition that cognitive engagement functions as a cognitive – interpretive filter, structuring how employees judge the clarity, meaningfulness, and usefulness of performance management systems.

Social engagement → performance management perceptions

Social engagement reflects employees' investment in interpersonal interaction and collaboration. Research consistently shows that relationally embedded employees communicate more openly, engage in joint problem-solving and use dialogue to interpret organizational practices [Farndale et al., 2025; Othman et al., 2022]. For them, managerial processes – including performance management – are experienced as socially mediated, shaped by conversation, feedback quality and inclusive communication.

The qualitative data from the present study mirror these mechanisms. Employees low in social engagement adopt a more functional, task-focused style (*“ideas are presented and discussed in a smaller group during daily morning production meetings...”*, W2310). They view KPI communication and BSC discussions as procedural tasks rather than relational exchanges, consistent with findings that low social engagement narrows information sharing and limits interpersonal sense-making [Bakker, Albrecht, 2018].

By contrast, employees high in social engagement rely on dialogue, shared interpretation and interpersonal reassurance (*“we discuss... I also present my ideas to employees”*, W2320). For them, KPIs acquire meaning through interaction with managers and co-workers, aligning with evidence that social engagement increases sensitivity to transparency, responsiveness and relational quality [Kaur, Sharma, 2024; Furrer et al., 2025].

These patterns imply distinct perceptual pathways: low-engagement employees assess performance systems through technical clarity, whereas high-engagement employees judge them through the interpersonal context in which indicators are communicated and enacted. Where dialogue is supportive, the system is seen as legitimate; where communication is thin, credibility declines.

Accordingly, qualitative data support two hypotheses:

H7: Higher social engagement increases employees' willingness to present ideas within performance management processes.

H8: Higher social engagement improves perceived clarity and communicative transparency of KPI-based systems.

4. Discussion

The findings indicate that the need for affiliation, understood as a dispositional tendency to seek close and supportive interpersonal bonds, plays a meaningful role in shaping employees' social forms of engagement with their supervisors, in line with the propositions of self-determination theory (SDT). Research grounded in SDT consistently shows that the quality of interpersonal exchanges is central to sustaining autonomous motivation, well-being, and engagement [Baard et al., 2004; Deci et al., 2017; van den Broeck et al., 2016]. Empirical work across several leadership traditions demonstrates that developmental [Yang et al., 2025], health-promoting [Zhang, Liu, 2023], ethical and emotionally responsive [Ouakouak et al., 2020], and spiritual leadership [Udahemuka et al., 2024] foster engagement by strengthening autonomous motivation and employees' sense of meaning and connectedness. Conversely, negative interpersonal behaviors – such as incivility [Shin, Hur, 2020], abusive supervision [De Oliveira, Najnudel, 2023], and cyberbullying [Kukreti et al., 2025] – undermine engagement by intensifying stress, uncertainty, and amotivation. Within this context, the need for affiliation appears to heighten social sensitivity: employees high in affiliation respond more strongly to the quality of their relationship with their supervisor, which translates into greater social engagement, consistent with evidence from research on psychological capital and individual differences in prosocial involvement [Toth et al., 2023]. The results also align with work on job crafting and relational motives [Lin, Meng, 2024], mentoring and interpersonal support [Firzly et al., 2022], and the importance of person – organization fit for intrinsic motivation and engagement [Hazzaa et al., 2021]. Notably, our findings suggest that affiliation should not be understood as a direct equivalent of SDT's construct of relatedness; rather, it operates as a dispositional moderator that shapes how individuals enact their relational needs in organizational settings.

Conclusion

This study shows that employees' need for affiliation – a dispositional sensitivity to relational cues – shapes social engagement with supervisors, extending SDT research that highlights interpersonal behavior as a key driver of need satisfaction and engagement [Baard et al., 2004; Ryan, Deci, 2017]. Across motivation and engagement studies, a consistent pattern emerges: supportive and autonomy-enhancing relational experiences foster deeper involvement and communication. Our findings align with this evidence by showing that individuals high in affiliation respond more

strongly to the relational qualities of supervisory interactions, translating relational motives into greater connection and participation.

The results suggest that relationship-focused leadership – such as autonomy-supportive, health-promoting or empowering approaches – is likely to be especially effective for highly affiliative employees [Jungert et al., 2022; Zhang, Liu, 2023]. In relationally intensive settings such as sales or hospitality, these employees may be valuable contributors, though they require sustained interpersonal support. Conversely, negative behaviors like incivility or bullying may be particularly harmful [Koopman et al., 2020], underscoring the need for careful monitoring of social norms and timely intervention.

The study points to three areas for future research. First, affiliation may have adaptive limits, with evidence suggesting that prosocial motives can produce overload under certain conditions [Roussillon Soyer et al., 2022]. Second, temporal and cultural dynamics remain underexplored; longitudinal designs and cross-cultural comparisons are needed given substantial variation in relational norms [Gupta, 2020; Nwachukwu et al., 2022]. Third, affiliation likely interacts with other psychological resources such as hope, resilience or optimism [Toth et al., 2023], requiring more integrative models.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The cross-sectional design restricts causal claims; self-report data introduce potential perceptual bias; and the sample context may limit generalizability. Future studies should employ longitudinal designs, behavioral indicators and more diverse organizational settings, as well as examine affiliation alongside other relational motives.

Bibliography

- [1] Abernethy M.A., Brownell P. [1999], The role of budgets in organizations facing strategic change: An exploratory study, *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 24(3): 189–204.
- [2] Amundsen S., Martinsen Ø.L. [2015], Linking empowering leadership to job satisfaction, work effort, and creativity: The role of self-leadership and psychological empowerment, *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 22(3): 304–323.
- [3] Baard P.P., Deci E.L., Ryan R.M. [2004], Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 34(10): 2045–2068.
- [4] Bakker A.B., Albrecht S. [2018], Work engagement: Current trends, *Career Development International* 23(1): 4–11.

- [5] Bakker A.B., Xanthopoulou D., Demerouti E., Taris T.W. [2023], A multi-level model of job demands, resources, burnout and work engagement, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 28(1): 1–17.
- [6] Breevaart K., Tims M. [2019], Crafting social relationships at work, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 104(1): 140–150.
- [7] Camilleri M.A., Troise C., Morrison A.M. [2024], Motivations and commitment to work in the hospitality industry: Investigating employee psychology and responsible organizational behaviors, *Tourism Review* 79(1): 85–103, <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-12-2022-0611>.
- [8] Camilleri M.A., Troise C., Morrison A.M. [2024], Motivations and commitment to work in the hospitality industry: Investigating employee psychology and responsible organizational behaviors, *Tourism Review* 79(1): 85–103, <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-12-2022-0611>.
- [9] Chen C., Zhang D. [2023], How innovation types affect users' continuous knowledge sharing intention: A self-determination perspective, *Aslib Journal of Information Management* 75(2): 297–317.
- [10] Chen C., Lill J., Vance T. [2020], Measurement systems, incentives, and motivation in performance evaluation, *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 81: 101079.
- [11] Clifton B. [2012], *Advanced web metrics*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., Indianapolis.
- [12] Colquitt J.A., Scott B.A., Rodell J.B., Long D.M., Zapata C.P., Conlon D.E., Wesson M.J. [2013], Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 98(2): 199–236.
- [13] De Oliveira L.B., Najnudel P.S. [2023], The influence of abusive supervision on employee engagement, stress and turnover intention, *Revista de Gestão* 30(1): 78–91, <https://doi.org/10.1108/REG-02-2021-0025>.
- [14] Deci E.L., Ryan R.M. [2000], The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior, *Psychological Inquiry* 11(4): 227–268.
- [15] Deci E.L., Ryan R.M. [2017], *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*, Guilford Press.
- [16] Dowling R., Lloyd K., Suchet-Pearson S. [2015], Qualitative methods II: 'More-than-human' methodologies and/in geography, *Progress in Human Geography* 40(6): 846–854.
- [17] Farndale E., Vidovic M. [2025], Employee engagement, in: Wilkinson A., Dundon T. (Eds.), *Contemporary human resource management: Text and cases* (7th ed., Chap. 15), SAGE. School of Labor and Employment Relations.
- [18] Firzly N., Chamandy M., Pelletier L.G., Lagacé M. [2022], An examination of mentors' interpersonal behaviors and mentees' motivation, turnover intentions, engagement, and well-being, *Journal of Career Development* 49(6): 1317–1336, <https://doi.org/10.1177/08948453211039286>.

- [19] Furrer C., Skinner E. [2003], Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic engagement and performance, *Journal of Educational Psychology* 95(1): 148–162, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.148>.
- [20] Gagné M. et al. [2015], The multidimensional work motivation scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 24(2): 178–196.
- [21] Ghosh D., Sekiguchi T., Fujimoto Y. [2020], Psychological detachment, intrinsic motivation and engagement, *Personnel Review* 49(9): 1789–1804.
- [22] Gupta V. [2020], Leadership, work motivation and employee innovation, *Personnel Review* 49(7): 1363–1379.
- [23] Hall R. [2008], Identity, values and learning, *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 7(1): 25–41.
- [24] Hazzaa R.N., Oja B.D., Jung H. [2021], The importance of value congruence: An analysis of college recreation employees and organizations, *Managing Sport and Leisure* 26(3): 161–174, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2020.1728703>.
- [25] Henri J.-F. [2006], Management control systems and strategy: A resource-based perspective, *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 31(6): 529–558.
- [26] Howard J.L. et al. [2021], Motivation profiles at work: A self-determination theory perspective, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 127: 103584.
- [27] Ifinedo P. [2019], Cybersecurity behaviours in organizations: A self-determination theory perspective, *Computers & Security* 86: 131–144.
- [28] Jungert T., Gradito Dubord M.-A., Högberg M., Forest J. [2022], Can managers be trained to further support their employees' basic needs and work engagement? A manager training program study, *International Journal of Training and Development* 26(3): 472–494, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12267>.
- [29] Kahn W.A. [1990], Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, *Academy of Management Journal* 33(4): 692–724.
- [30] Kalra A., Singh R., Badrinarayanan V., Gupta A. [2025], How ethical leadership and ethical self-leadership enhance the effects of idiosyncratic deals on salesperson work engagement and performance, *Journal of Business Ethics* 196(1): 169–188, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05717-9>.
- [31] Kaur S., Sharma N. [2024], Understanding an emerging maker community in India: Socio-demographic traits, motivations, and satisfaction factors, *Industry and Higher Education*, Vol. 39(5) 568–585, <https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222241297519>
- [32] Kukreti M., Sami A., Ullah S., Shaukat M.R., Dangwal A., Yousaf M.I. [2025], Social responses to workplace cyberbullying: Engagement, withdrawal, and their impact on innovation, *Journal of Chinese Human Resources Management* 16(2): 121–137, <https://doi.org/10.47297/wspchrmWSP2040-800507.20251602>.

- [33] Lin X., Meng L. [2024], Why do employees craft their jobs? A qualitative analysis of job crafting motives from actor and observer perspectives, *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 39(2): 162–184, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2023-0279>.
- [34] Malmi T., Brown D.A. [2008], Management control systems as a package – opportunities, challenges and research directions, *Management Accounting Research* 19(4): 287–300.
- [35] McClelland D.C. [1961], *The achieving society*, Princeton University Press.
- [36] McClelland D.C., Koestner R. [1992], The need for affiliation and leadership, in: Smith P.C. (Ed.), *Motivation and personality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 205–222.
- [37] Nazir O., Islam J.U., Rahman Z. [2021], Effect of CSR participation on employee sense of purpose and experienced meaningfulness: A self-determination theory perspective, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 46: 123–133, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.12.002>.
- [38] Niemiec A. [2019], *Spójność systemu pomiaru dokonań*, Difin, Warszawa.
- [39] Niemiec C.P., Spence G. [2016], Self-determination theory and psychological well-being, in: *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of Positive Psychological Interventions*, Wiley, London: 386–404.
- [40] Nwachukwu C.E., Vu H.M., Chládková H., Agboga R.S. [2022], Psychological empowerment and employee engagement: Role of job satisfaction and religiosity in Nigeria, *Industrial and Commercial Training* 54(4): 666–687, <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-05-2022-0028>.
- [41] Nwachukwu C.E., Vu H.M., Chládková H., Agboga R.S. [2022], Psychological empowerment and employee engagement: Role of job satisfaction and religiosity in Nigeria, *Industrial and Commercial Training* 54(4): 666–687, <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-05-2022-0028>.
- [42] O'Donoghue D., Van der Werff L. [2022], Empowering leadership and autonomous motivation, *Personnel Review* 51(4): 1205–1220.
- [43] Ouakouak M.L., Zaitouni M.G., Arya B. [2020], Ethical leadership, emotional leadership, and quitting intentions in public organizations: Does employee motivation play a role? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 41(2): 257–279, <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-05-2019-0206>.
- [44] Parmenter D. [2009], *Key performance indicators: Developing, implementing, and using Winning KPIs*, Wiley, London.
- [45] Passalacqua M., Léger P.-M., Nacke L.E., Fredette M., Labonté-LeMoine É., Lin X., Caprioli T., Sénécal S. [2020], Playing in the backstore: Interface gamification increases warehousing workforce engagement, *Industrial Management & Data Systems* 120(7): 1309–1330, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-08-2019-0458>.
- [46] Roussillon Soyer C., Balkin D.B., Fall A. [2022], Autonomous motivation, distributive justice and engagement, *European Management Review* 19(1): 138–153.

- [47] Ryan R.M., Deci E.L. [2017], *Self-determination theory*, Guilford Press, New York.
- [48] Saks A.M. [2019], Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited, *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness* 6(1): 19–38.
- [49] Shin Y., Hur W. [2020], Supervisor incivility, job insecurity and amotivation, *Journal of Psychology* 154(1): 38–59.
- [50] Simons R. [1995], *Levers of control*, Harvard Business School Press, Brighton.
- [51] Smith P. [1995], On the unintended consequences of metrics, *Public Administration Review* 55(6): 590–596.
- [52] Sonnentag S., Frese M. [2012], Stressors and strains at work, w: Kozlowski S.W. J. (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Psychology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford: 560–592.
- [53] Tellenbach S., Bidault F., Haddock-Millar J. [2025], Effect of hybrid working models in the Swiss financial industry, *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, advance online publication, <https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-11-2024-2870>.
- [54] Toth I., Heinänen S., Kianto A. [2023], Disentangling the elements of PsyCap as drivers for work, organization and social engagement in knowledge-intensive work, *Personnel Review* 52(7): 1936–1952, <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2021-0031>.
- [55] Udahemuka F.F., Walumbwa F.O., Ngoye B. [2024], Enhancing meaningful work: The roles of spiritual leadership, intrinsic motivation, and employees' gender, *International Journal of Business and Society* 25(2): 713–735, <https://doi.org/10.33736/ijbs.7624.2024>.
- [56] Ullah S. [2025], Social responses to workplace cyberbullying: Engagement, withdrawal, and their impact on innovation, *Journal of Chinese Human Resources Management*.
- [57] Van den Broeck A., Ferris D.L., Chang C.H., Rosen C.C. [2016], A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological needs at work, *Journal of Management* 42(5): 1195–1229.
- [58] Yamaguchi S. [2003], Collectivism and power distance in Japan, w: Lonner W.J. et al. (Eds.), *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*.
- [59] Yang C., Tang C., Xu N., Lai Y. [2025], Developmental human resource practices, thriving at work, and employee agility: The moderating role of workplace spirituality, *Journal of Management & Organization* 31(2): 645–660, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2024.15>.
- [60] Yin R.K. [2014], *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (5th ed.), Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- [61] Zhang C., Liu L. [2023], Health-promoting leadership and relational civility, *Management Decision* 61(9): 2582–2602.

INTEGRATING AFFILIATION NEED AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: A DUAL APPROACH TO EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION AND STRATEGIC GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

Abstract

The study examines how the need for affiliation, understood within Self-Determination Theory (SDT) as a core relational need, shapes employee engagement and, in consequence, perceptions of KPI-based performance management systems.

A qualitative case study design was applied, using semi-structured interviews with managers and employees operating within a KPI-driven environment.

The results show that affiliation needs differentiates how employees interpret KPIs, evaluations and strategic goals. Individuals with low affiliation need adopt a task-oriented stance, focusing on clarity, procedures and personal improvement. Those high in affiliation interpret the same system through relational meaning structures, valuing support, dialogue and collective functioning. These differences are expressed through three forms of engagement: affective (emotional investment), cognitive (goal understanding) and social (interaction and collaboration). Engagement acts as a perceptual filter shaping perceived fairness of evaluation, KPI-related stress, motivational effects and perceived quality of work.

Performance management systems should not be treated as neutral, universal tools. Employees with high affiliation need benefit from relationally sensitive systems emphasizing collaboration, recognition and supportive communication, while those with lower affiliation needs require procedural clarity and autonomy. Accounting for motivational profiles enhances fairness, reduces dysfunctional stress and strengthens strategic alignment.

The study introduces an SDT-based mechanism linking affiliation need to multidimensional engagement and to performance management perceptions, offering microfoundations for individualized performance management design.

KEYWORDS: MOTIVATION, PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT, ENGAGEMENT, NEED FOR AFFILIATION, KPIs

JEL CLASSIFICATION CODES: D91, J24, M54

INTEGRACJA ZARZĄDZANIA POTRZEBĄ AFILIACJI I WYDAJNOŚCIĄ: PODWÓJNE PODEJŚCIE DO MOTYWACJI PRACOWNIKÓW I OSIĄGANIA CELÓW STRATEGICZNYCH

Streszczenie

Systemy zarządzania wynikami oparte na KPI wywołują skrajnie odmienne reakcje pracowników, jednak dotychczasowe badania nie wyjaśniają, dlaczego te same wskaźniki jednych motywują, a innych obciążają lub demotywują. Celem artykułu jest zbadanie, w jaki sposób potrzeba afiliacji – rozumiana w ramach *Self-Determination Theory* (SDT) jako potrzeba relacji – kształtuje zaangażowanie afektywne, poznawcze i społeczne, a następnie wpływa na percepcję systemów KPI. W badaniu zastosowano jakościowe studium przypadku oraz częściowo ustrukturyzowane wywiady z pracownikami funkcjonującymi w systemie KPI. Osoby o niskiej potrzebie afiliacji przyjmują podejście zadaniowe: skupiają się na klarowności celów, precyzji procedur i autonomii działania. Traktują KPI jako narzędzie poprawy własnej efektywności. Pracownicy o wysokiej potrzebie afiliacji interpretują te same systemy poprzez pryzmat relacji – zwracają uwagę na wsparcie przełożonego, uznanie, atmosferę współpracy i wpływ wskaźników na funkcjonowanie zespołu. Różnice te ujawniają się poprzez trzy formy zaangażowania: emocjonalne (reakcje na informację zwrotną), poznawcze (rozumienie celów i priorytetów) oraz społeczne (współpraca, dzielenie się pomysłami). Zaangażowanie pełni funkcję filtra percepcyjnego wpływającego na ocenę sprawiedliwości, stresu KPI, motywacyjności oraz jakości pracy. Systemy zarządzania wynikami powinny uwzględniać zróżnicowane potrzeby afiliacyjne pracowników. Osoby o wysokiej afiliacji wymagają rozwiązań relacyjnych – dialogu, wsparcia, współpracy – natomiast osoby o niskiej afiliacji oczekują jasności, struktury i autonomii. Ujęcie to zwiększa motywacyjność KPI i ogranicza negatywne skutki stresu zadaniowego. Artykuł wprowadza koncepcję indywidualizacji systemów KPI w oparciu o potrzeby psychologiczne pracowników, łącząc SDT, wielowymiarowe zaangażowanie oraz percepcję *Performance Management*. Przedstawia mikrofundamenty wyjaśniające, dlaczego te same KPI wywołują różne reakcje, rozwijając teorię motywacji i praktykę controllingu.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: POTRZEBA AFILIACJI, MOTYWACJA, ZAANGAŻOWANIE PRACOWNIKÓW, KPI, SYSTEM ZARZĄDZANIA DOKONANIAM

KODY KLASYFIKACJI JEL: D91, J24, M54

