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ABSTRACT

This study sought to identify the causes of employee resistance towards the Performance Management process at Destiny Electronics (Pvt) Ltd. The focus was on the Harare branch (Head office) over the period January 2011 to June 2013. The study was carried out using the positivist (quantitative) approach. Motivation to carry out the study was due to the fact that the PM process at Destiny Electronics had not been able to achieve most of its stated goals. During the period under study, the Human resource manager continuously reminded management of the submission of quarterly and annual PM progress reports and appraisals but would not receive them in time and would continuously change the submission dates but still some would never be submitted. This happened until the CEO of the company said he will personally follow up with the reports since the process was not being taken seriously. The research was limited to the Harare branch where a total of forty-five (45) employees which included managerial and non-managerial employees were selected for the research as part of data gathering. A total of forty-five (45) self-administered questionnaires were physically distributed to the selected sample. A follow up interview was also carried out with the Human Resources Manager to verify and understand some of the gathered data thus the research used mixed methods.

The factor analysis was used and proved that the main causes of employee resistance towards the PM process were lack of knowledge of the purpose and benefits of PM, poor implementation of the PM process and PM assessors who could not effectively manage the process. All these aspects were hindering the PM process from achieving its intended goals. The research recommended that both managerial and non-managerial employees should be educated about the PM process, its purpose and benefits, commitment should be obtained from all employees so as to effectively implement PM by way of involvement, refresher courses should be continuously offered to all supervisors on how to effectively manage performance. An area for further study would be an investigation on how the PM process which was initially developed for western cultures can be modified to suit cultures of developing nations like Zimbabwe.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter looks at the introduction of the study and the background of the company under study, the statement of the problem, research objectives, justification and the scope of the research. A SWOT analysis of Destiny Electronics was done and the Performance Management (PM) policy of the company was also discussed to enable the reader to gain an understanding of the company.

The PM process at Destiny Electronics had not been able to achieve most of its stated goals. During the period under study, the Human resource manager continuously reminded management of the submission of quarterly and annual PM progress reports and appraisals but would not receive them in time and would continuously change the submission dates but still some would never be submitted. This happened until the CEO of the company said he will personally follow up with the reports since the process was not being taken seriously (Destiny Electronics Management meeting minutes4 February 2013). This was evidence that there was resistance towards the PM process. According to Feldman (1972) indicators of resistance include, task avoidance, postponement, hostility (stated or unstated), resignation and underproduction.

Organizations are now faced with increasing competition and a continuously changing environment. The world has become a global village. This, therefore, means that if a firm is to survive in such an environment, it has to improve its performance. This can be done by reducing costs, being innovative and responding to market changes (Luthans & Sommer, 2005). Organizations, the world over can improve performance by concentrating on the capabilities and potential of their human resources through increasing knowledge, motivation and commitment – which is part of performance
management (Luthans & Sommer, 2005). The attitudes of these human resources (employees) towards the performance management process are then very crucial for the effectiveness of any organization (Melikeh, Ali-Nezhad, & Nekoie-Moghadam, 2012). Employee attitudes, as well as their commitment, can be affected by performance management practices. Good managers are linked to effective and high quality employees because they value their attitudes and commitment (Weatherill, 2009).

Performance management is one of the most important requisites to a successful business and human resource policy. However, employee resistance towards the process hinders its effectiveness. The PM activities influence how much effort employees put into their work, and also their attitudes and commitment to the organisation. Good managers are associated with high-quality, effective employees who are engaged with their work and want to remain in the organization (Witherhill, 2009). The power used by managers in workplaces influence employee work behaviours either positively or negatively. Employee positive attitudes to management processes enhance commitment to the organisation. Employee resistance is evidenced by the negative attitudes which they may express (Sashkin, Marshall, & Williams, 1990).

1.1 BACKGROUND OF DESTINY ELECTRONICS (PVT) LTD

Destiny Electronics (Pvt) Ltd is a wholly owned Zimbabwean company which operates in the Lighting, Consumer lifestyle, Business communications and Medical systems Industry. The company has its origins in Philips (Pvt) Ltd which operated in Zimbabwe since 1952 and then became Destiny Electronics after a Management Buy Out in 2004. In 2011 the company changed its shareholding to 51% Scotia Holdings and 49% Shareholder group. Destiny Electronics is the official distributor of Philips and Nippon Electronic Company (NEC) products in Zimbabwe and some SADC countries since 2004. The Company’s activities are selling, leasing and repairing of electrical and
electronic equipment and healthcare equipment (Destiny Electronics Company profile, 2013)

1.1.1 Vision

The company's vision is “To be the preferred regional supplier of exceptional quality electronic products and services” (Destiny Electronics Company Profile, 2013:3).

1.1.2 Mission

The mission is “To provide innovative electronic based solutions for home, business and health applications that creates value for all stakeholders” (Destiny Electronics Corporate Profile, 2013:4).

1.1.3 Values

The values are as follows;

- Excellency
- Teamwork
- Positive Attitude
- Customer Focus
- Integrity
- Respect and Caring

One of the company’s core values is that of a positive attitude, this is very crucial to achieve its vision and mission and to be able to survive in a dynamic environment.
1.2 SWOT ANALYSIS

The researcher used the SWOT analysis to analyse Destiny Electronics. SWOT stands for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The tool was originated by Albert S Humphrey in the 1960s. It is a very useful tool used to analyse and understand the position of an organisation as well as its opportunities and threats ahead (Oetomo, 2012).

1.2.1 Strengths

Destiny Electronics Lighting and Consumer lifestyle (CARE) division supplies genuine Philips light bulbs. The products include energy savers, which save up to 80% of electricity and lasts longer than most competitors’ brands (3-6 years). The main strength which Destiny Electronics has is the strong internationally recognized brands (Philips and NEC) and well known products in the market. The company also has exclusive distributorship agreements with Philips Electronics on lighting and medical services and products which legally gives it the right to be the sole distributor of the Philips products. The increased geographical footprint in the country, with satellite offices in Bulawayo, Gweru, Mutare, Masvingo and Triangle, allows the company to service nearly all parts of the country. The company has a technical training and support arrangement with Philips where technicians can go for training on new or current equipment in South Africa, Netherlands or locally (Destiny Electronics Company Profile 2013).

1.2.2 Weaknesses

Destiny Electronics’ weaknesses include a fragile balance sheet and lack of working capital to finance the purchase of stocks and spares as well as failure to meet monthly commitments. The company has an aging fleet of vehicles which is expensive to maintain and not reliable for business purposes. This has tarnished the image of the company, considering that the vehicles used by technicians are very old and always
have problems and breakdowns on the road. This also affects the motivation of employees, especially when they continuously get promises from management (of correcting the situation) which are never fulfilled due to lack of funds. The company has limited funds for advertising and therefore lacks the publicity which can enable it to grow and increase its market share. The company also has challenges in its human resources as it has inadequate key personnel in some divisions (Destiny Electronics Risk Management Report, 2012).

1.2.3 Opportunities

Destiny has many opportunities which it can make use of, provided it has the right personnel with positive attitudes. Its Business Communications division has an opportunity to grow much faster due to ICT growth worldwide. The price of systems and infrastructure is likely to come down or the features will increase, dropping the unit cost per system. There is great potential for significant technology changes in the Business Communications landscape. For instance, VOIP (Voice over internet protocol) is likely to change the industry landscape. In addition, telecommunication operators are now offering virtual PABX bundled with a host of enterprise applications. Institutions like ZESA are pushing for energy saving lighting systems and this brings an opportunity for a significant number of lighting projects for the Lighting division in that regard (Destiny Electronics Risk Management Report, 2012).

1.2.4 Threats

The threats being faced by Destiny Electronics include stiff competition in all its product lines from rivalry companies as well as substitute products. The introduction of the Fly Emirates plane which is open to everyone allows people to go to Dubai and purchase genuine Philips products cheaply. Usually the buyers will be individuals with no overhead costs like companies and therefore they can sell the same products at lower prices. This negatively affects the sales for Destiny Electronics as its products are very
expensive due to overhead costs. Chinese products in the market are a very big threat to the company as many people have a low buying power and therefore prefer cheap products. For example, Philips irons can cost $55.00 whilst Chinese irons can cost $15.00. The Philips brand competes with other big brands like, Samsung, LG, Panasonic, Sony, Russel Hobbs, Kenwood, Salton and other cheap Chinese brands which are not well known. The NEC brand competes with Panasonic, Hipath, Mitel, Siemens, Alcatel and other small brands. Companies which compete with Destiny Electronics in PABXs (telecommunications) include Comar, STC, General leasing, Siemens, and Exodus, as well as individuals. Another threat is that of the developments in the telecommunications industry which will affect the future viability of the physical PABX. Given an ever-changing environment of ICTs, there is need to have employees with an attitude of learning and willing to adapt to change and enable the organisation to survive as a complex adaptive system. The industry structure for the Lighting and Consumer Lifestyle division is relatively unstructured, with extremely low entry barriers. The competition is stiff, with little room to add value. The Business Communications and Medical Systems divisions are still relatively viable but the market is now filled with cheap Chinese substitutes as well.

Destiny Electronics has overdue liabilities that need to be settled. These can result in the company facing serious disruption in business operations or even liquidation due to garnishing or legal cases. These liabilities inter alia are for ZIMRA, NSSA, ZESA and TelOne (Destiny Electronics Risk Management Report, 2012). Zimbabwe lost credit worthiness among external suppliers due to the on-going implementation of the indigenization and economic empowerment laws, and the preparation for the national elections for 31 July 2013, continued to weaken external investor confidence (Zimbabwe monthly economic review, 2011). This has also affected Destiny Electronics which requires funding from investors (Destiny Electronics Risk Management Report, 2012).
1.3 DESTINY ELECTRONICS PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT POLICY

The PM policy for Destiny Electronics according to the Destiny Electronics Company Policies and procedures (2006) stated that PM is the recognition, assessment and development of individual performance so that the organisation's performance can be maximised. The company’s key objective in employing personnel is for them to make a personal contribution towards meeting specific business goals and objectives for which the company rewards them accordingly. These objectives are meant to result in the growth of the financial and other resources of the company. Each employee therefore, needs to add value to the business processes. This value-addition is called performance or productivity. As part of the performance, employees need to exhibit the company’s core values and successful behavioural standards in the company’s strategic plan. One of the PM business goals and objectives of the company is, retaining productive employees. This therefore requires positive attitudes from employees.

1.3.1 Destiny Electronics Performance business goals and objectives

The company’s key goals and objectives in performance management as stated in the Company policies and procedures (2012) are as follows;

- To have reliable and adequate supply of products and services to the market at competitive prices
- To have adequate financial resources to run a profitable business
- To be a preferred supplier of electronic products and services
- To project a positive Philips and NEC brand with Destiny as the official distributor of the brands
- To retain productive employees
1.3.2 Balanced Scorecard

In setting operational goals and objectives, the company adopted a balanced scorecard approach. According to the Company policies and procedures (2012), this covered the following:

a. **Financial goals and objectives**
   - Growth in cash
   - Growth in profit
   - Growth in return and equity
   - Cost control

b. **Customer goals and objectives**
   - Customer acquisition
   - Customer retention
   - Customer satisfaction
   - Customer profitability

c. **Employee goals**
   - Employee satisfaction
   - Employee retention
   - Employee productivity

d. **Internal business processes**
   - Upgrading the Quality Management Systems and raise standards.
   - Effective internal control
   - Introduction of new and innovative products and services.
1.4 DESTINY ELECTRONICS COMPANY PERFORMANCE (PROFIT)

As mentioned above, the company is divided into four different divisions namely:

a. CARE – Lighting and Consumer lifestyle
b. Business Communications (DBC)
c. Healthcare
d. Holdings (Corporate)

One way to measure performance of companies is to look at the profitability. This was used in this study as evidence that during the period under study, the performance of Destiny Electronics was decreasing.
1.4.1 Destiny Electronics company performance per division - 2011

The three operational divisions did not meet their budgeted profits in 2011. The Holding division had budgeted a loss of more than $200,000 but managed to cut expenses. This still resulted in a loss of slightly less than $100,000 as shown in figure 1.1 below.

Figure 1.1 shows the loss made by the company in 2011

![Figure 1.1 Destiny Electronics 2011 Company performance](image)

**Figure 1.1 Destiny Electronics 2011 Company performance**

(Source: Destiny Electronics 2011 Performance Report, 2012)
1.4.2 Destiny Electronics Company performance per Division – 2012

In 2012, only one division DBC was able to exceed its budgeted profit performance. The rest had very huge losses which ate into the profit from DBC.

Figure 1.2 shows the loss made by the company in 2012

![Bar chart showing Destiny Electronics 2012 Company Performance](image)

**Figure 1.2: Destiny Electronics 2012 Company Performance**

*(Source: Destiny Electronics 2012 Performance report, 2013)*
1.4.3 Destiny Electronics Total company performance 2011 & 2012

The graph below shows the performance for the whole company in terms of profitability. Both years show that the company failed to meet its budgeted profit and the loss increased in 2012. Figure 1.3 shows the total company performance for 2011 to 2013.

![Graph showing Destiny Electronics Total company performance 2011 & 2012](image)

**Figure 1.3: Destiny Electronics Total company performance - 2011 and 2012**

*(Source: Destiny Electronics 2011 and 2012 Performance reports)*

The low performance for the three divisions and the company as a whole was as a result of different challenges being faced by the company as listed below:

- Lack of stocks
- Reduction in customer base (some were closing down)
- Low motivation in employees and increased staff turnover
- Lack of working capital
- Accrued liabilities
- Short-term and expensive bank facility
- Non-availability of trade credit lines for Healthcare and CARE divisions
- Long lead times for Consumer Lifestyle and Lighting products
- High overheads compared to revenue generated
- Increased competition from both formal and informal sectors.
1.5 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As pointed out above under 1.4.1 to 1.4.3 the organisation has not been performing well. For instance in 2011 there was a negative budget variance of $371,000 which resulted in a loss of $25,000 and in 2012 the negative budget variance increased to $816,000 and resulted in a loss of $256,000. Also as pointed out under 1.3.1 the company’s key goals and objectives of the performance management process among others are to have adequate financial resources and to be a more profitable organisation by ensuring growth in profit. Destiny Electronics has a Performance Management system in place which is the Balanced Scorecard. The PM process had not been able to achieve most of its stated goals. During the period under study, the Human resource manager continuously reminded management of the submission of quarterly and annual PM progress reports and appraisals but would not receive them in time and would continuously change the submission dates but still some would never be submitted. This happened until the CEO of the company said he will personally follow up with the reports since the process was not being taken seriously in the organisation (Destiny Electronics Management meeting minutes of 4 February 2013). Some of the indicators of resistance as cited by (Feldman, 1972) include, task avoidance and postponement. The researcher strongly believes that performance is key for the organisation to achieve its goals and this performance is greatly affected by employee attitudes and their acceptance or resistance to the process. The results of PM should be performance improvement. Each year the PM process continues yet the performance does not improve. The problem is that the efforts of PM are not being complemented with the required employee attitudes and actions.
1.6 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The main research objective was: To investigate the causes of employee resistance towards the PM process?

1.6.1 The specific sub objectives:

a. To analyze the PM process at Destiny Electronics with the view of identifying obstacles towards its effective operation.

b. To find out levels of managerial competencies in managing the PM process at Destiny Electronics.

c. To find out how to overcome employee resistance towards the PM process so as to enable Destiny Electronics to achieve its organizational goals.

d. To make appropriate recommendations in light of findings from the study.

1.7 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The main research question was; What are the causes of employee resistance towards performance management?

1.7.1 The Research Sub-Questions:

a. What is the status of the PM process at Destiny Electronics with respect to obstacles towards its effective operation?

b. What are the levels of managerial competencies in managing the PM process at Destiny Electronics?

c. What are the ways of overcoming employee resistance towards PM process at Destiny Electronics?

d. What recommendations can be made following findings from the study?
1.8 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

H₀ - Employee resistance towards the PM process at Destiny Electronics is not caused by lack of knowledge, understanding and acceptance of the process by both managerial and non-managerial employees.

H₁ - Employee resistance towards the PM process at Destiny Electronics is caused by lack of knowledge, understanding and acceptance of the process by both managerial and non-managerial employees.

1.9 JUSTIFICATION OF RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to find out the causes of employee resistance towards performance management. The study aims to help Destiny Electronics on how to deal with employee resistance toward performance management and also how to try to align employee attitudes to the organisational goals. The study will assist managers on how to effectively manage performance and the need to consider and deal with employee attitudes during the process. Non-managerial employees will also benefit from the research since management will become aware of their concerns and be able to address them for the benefit of the employees and the organisation. Addressing the concerns of the employees will boost their morale and also their performance. The study contributes to the body of knowledge on the reasons for employee resistance towards PM in general and particularly in the world of academia. Organisations in the same industry with Destiny Electronics will also take some lessons from the research. This research also helped me as the researcher to complete my MBA studies.

1.10 SCOPE OF RESEARCH

The study was an investigation of the causes of employee resistance towards PM and it focused on Destiny Electronics (Pvt) Ltd. The respondents of this study were drawn from Destiny Electronics’ Harare branch (Head office). The research was for the period January 2011 to June 2013.
1.11 RESEARCH OUTLINE

The study is structured in 5 chapters as follows:

Chapter 1 presents the background of the study, purpose, justification and the scope of the study.

Chapter 2 reviews literature on performance management and causes of employee resistance towards the process. The review also provides benchmarks for the discussion of results in chapter four.

Chapter 3 discusses the research methodologies that can be used and the one selected for the study. The chapter also discusses data collection methods used for the research.

Chapter 4 provides the research findings and the analysis of the same.

Chapter 5 presents conclusions and the recommendations derived from the findings.

1.12 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Destiny Electronics has a PM process which is well written and detailed. The main goal of the process is to improve the performance of its personnel and to ensure the profitability of the organisation by using the BSC. However most of the goals are not being met as intended. Though the company has weaknesses and is faced by threats in the environment, the company has great potential of being competitive through the PM process. The process is however affected by resistance, some of which is evident at the company by way of task avoidance, delays and postponement in performing the required tasks which complete the process.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The performance of employees is very crucial if an organisation is to achieve its goals. Performance is the outcome of the interaction between an individual’s desires, perception of the outcome required and the total effort, energy and capability that individuals have to apply to the task at hand (Harrison, 1997).

This chapter reviews the current and previous literature on PM and managerial competencies in managing performance. Effects of employee resistance towards performance management will be discussed as well as how to overcome the resistance so as to align employee actions towards organisational goals and to enable performance management to be effective.

2.1 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

PM can be defined as a continuous process of recognizing, assessing and developing the performance of individuals and teams and aligning performance with strategic goals of the organisation (Aguinis, 2009). This definition is similar to that of Waal, (2007) who also viewed PM as a continuous process and also adds that it enables the mission, strategy and objectives of the organisation to be measurable through critical success factors and key performance indicators. Davis & Rodgers, (2002) defined it slightly different as they regard PM as a system consisting of the processes used to identify, encourage, assess, evaluate, develop and reward employee performance at work. This definition is silent on the key issue of aligning the performance to the mission, strategic
goals and objectives of the organisation but rather it focuses on evaluating employees so as to reward them. According to Hartog (2004) PM aims at dealing with the challenges faced by organizations in defining, measuring, and stimulating employee performance with the ultimate goal of improving organizational performance.

From the above definitions, it can be inferred that; firstly, PM is a continuous process of setting goals, observing performance and getting feedback. Secondly PM is about aligning employee actions to organisational goals. Thirdly PM requires continuous interaction between the supervisors and the subordinates being managed. The first definition by Aguinis, (2009) above can be said to be one of the best definitions of PM as it encompasses all the key aspects.

The concept of PM adopts a future-oriented strategic focus and is applied to employees in an organisation so as to capitalize on their existing performance and future potential (Atkinson & Shaw, 2006). The increased focus on performance in organisations arises from the pressures of globalisation and the associated necessity to create competitive advantage in order to survive in an international market place and a dynamic environment (Elias & Scarbrough, 2004). This is also supported by Walsh, Buchaman, & Fahy (2002) who stated that organisational changes resulting from competitive forces, such as flatter structures, leaner staffing levels and multi-skilled cross-functional teams have a huge impact on performance management. Human capital, the value-creating skills, capabilities, and abilities of an organisation’s personnel are a crucial factor in creating such competitive advantage (Mayo, 2001).

2.1.1 Characteristics of PM

(Armstrong, 2006) argued that PM is a planned process of which the key elements are agreement, measurement, feedback, constructive reinforcement and discussion. Its aim is to assess output from the delivered performance compared with the expected objectives. He further explained that its focus is on targets, standards and performance
measures or indicators. The components of PM according to Ana-Maria, Constantin, & Catalina (2006) are strategy formulation, target setting, forecasting, performance assessing, performance evaluation and incentive compensation. These incorporated sub-processes from the performance driven behaviour of the human resource that is required to become and continue as world-class.

2.1.2 Performance measures

The CIPD survey of PM in 2003 according to Armstrong & Baron (2004) revealed that the following performance measures can be used:

1. Attainment of set objectives.
2. Competence.
3. Excellence.
4. Input to team.
5. Customer care.
6. Working relationships.
7. Efficiency.
8. Flexibility.
10. Lining up individual objectives with the organization’s goals.

2.1.3 The Performance Management Cycle or Process

For the purposes of this research, the performance management process by Aguinis (2009) was used and discussed in detail relating to other PM processes. The process follows the following six stages;
i. **Pre-requisites,**

The prerequisites are knowledge of the organization’s vision, mission and strategic goals as well as knowledge of the job in question (Maimela, 2010). This is also supported by Waal (2002) who called this stage the excellent strategy development stage. According to Lee & Strong (2004), it is important for organisations to have clear goals and objectives as it enables individual performance to be aligned to the organisation’s goals. Some PM processes combine this stage with the planning stage.

ii. **Performance planning,**

This is when the supervisor meets with the employee at the beginning where the performance management process will be discussed and agreed. The discussions will include what needs to be done and how it should be done, as well as the expected results, behaviours and the developmental plan (Maimela, 2010). This stage is also similar to the Budgeting or target setting stage as sited by Waal (2002) in his stages of the PM process. Hay Group (2008) also supported this and added that at the planning stage, employees play an important role and together with their supervisors they identify and deal with obstacles to good performance. According to Koontz & Craig (2012), employees at all levels of the organisation must have clearly stated goals and objectives that directly relate to those of the organisation. Objectives are sometimes expressed as Key Result Areas or Accountabilities (Lucas, Lupton, & Mathieson, 2006). The awareness of the goals and objectives is part of the pre-requisite stage above, when using Aguinis’ PM process.

iii. **Performance execution,**

At the execution stage, the employee produces results and tries to display the behavior agreed upon at the performance planning stage. The employee also works on the developmental needs (Maimela, 2010). Alston, (2009) also argued that this stage is the responsibility of both the supervisor and the individual being supervised. Managers should create conditions that motivate the employee, eliminate performance problems, provide development opportunities, and reinforce effective behaviour.
iv. **Performance assessment,**
At this stage, the manager and the employee assess the extent to which the results have been met and the extent to which the agreed behavior has been displayed. They also evaluate the extent to which the goal stated in the development plan has been met (Maimela, 2010). HayGroup (2008) argued that at this stage, two-way communication is very important and initial self assessment is crucial.

v. **Performance review,**
This is when the employee and manager meet to review the former’s assessment and it is usually called the appraisal meeting. The employee gets feedback on their performance at this stage (Maimela, 2010). The performance management process according to (Wall, 2002) also has this stage and it is also called performance review. Mullins (1999) also suggested that this stage should be done periodically to provide feedback as well as preventive and corrective action to the employees so as to enable them to meet their objectives.

It is important to know that performance management is different to performance appraisal. Performance appraisal only forms this final part of the PM process (performance review). In other words, PM is a forward-looking process, taking frequent measures as work occurs and responding to small steps forward, on the other hand performance appraisal is a backward-looking process of performance which measures what happened in the past (Armstrong 2006).

vi. **Performance renewal and reconstructing.**
This is the final stage of PM which is similar to performance planning (Aguinis, 2009). According to Gusdorf (2009) this stage is about readjusting the process if necessary and preparing for the next PM cycle.
2.1.4 Performance Management Systems

According to (Armstrong & Baron, 2005) performance management system is a helpful framework for companies to use when communicating important messages to employees. It can be used for the following functions; as a way of communicating organisational goals; identifying improvement requirements, developing individual and team performance, planning for the future and the assessment of results and outcomes.

The two main types of PM which will be discussed in this section are the Balanced Scorecard and the 360 Degree Feedback.

2.1.4.1 Balanced Scorecard (BSC)

The balanced scorecard is a method for strategic evaluation which was developed in the 1990s by Kaplan and Norton. The method seeks to align business actions to the vision and strategy of the organization, advance internal and external communications, and monitor the organization’s performance against strategic goals (http://www.balancedscorecard.org accessed on 20 May 203). Traditional methods of measuring performance were centred on the financial aspects only which were short-term (Latshaw & Choi, 2002). The Balanced scorecard emphasizes that financial and nonfinancial measures are all components of a system that gives information to every part of the organization (Brewer & Spech, 2000). It has four aspects which are;

- Financial,
- Customers,
- Internal business processes, and innovation,
- Learning and growth

The Balanced scorecard enables organizations to strike a balance between the four aspects above which will collectively enable the organization to achieve its vision.
The diagram below is an illustration for the BSC and shows the four aspects of the system.

Figure 2.1 below shows the Balanced Scorecard

![Balanced Scorecard Diagram](http://www.balancedscorecard.org)

Source: [http://www.balancedscorecard.org](http://www.balancedscorecard.org) accessed on 18 May 2013

The four aspects are explained below:

**a) Financial Perspective**

It measures the ‘bottom line’ of the organisation, for example, growth, return on investment revenue growth, costs, profit margins, cash flow and other traditional measures of business performance. Vector Study (2013) also added that this perspective seeks to examine if the company’s implementation of the strategy is contributing to the bottom line. The financial perspective is a result of commitment, efficient processes, renewal and innovation, and of value creation (Waal, 2007).
b) Internal Business processes and innovation

The internal perspective measures the effectiveness of the processes by which the organization creates value (Waal, 2007). The perspective is centred on the innovative processes that enable an organization to create and deliver value to customers efficiently (http://vectorstudy.com/management-theories/balanced-scorecard).

c) Customer Perspective

The customer perspective measures performance in terms of how the customer experiences the value created by the organization. It is largely dependent on the internal perspective because efficient processes allow the organization to offer improved service to its customers (Waal, 2007). The measures that are used in this perspective should measure the value delivered to the customer such as period taken, quality, service, cost and the results that come as a result of the value proposition which include customer satisfaction and increased market share. The value proposition is mainly centred on, operational excellence, customer intimacy or product leadership. (http://vectorstudy.com/management-theories/balanced-scorecard).

d) Learning and growth

The innovative perspective measures how often an organization introduces new products, services or techniques. By continuously improving through innovation, the organization ensures that it does not become complacent but continuously renews itself. Some organizations add ‘people’ factors to this perspective, which measure the well-being, commitment and competence of people in the organization (Waal, 2007). The perspective is the bases of any strategy and focuses on the intangible assets of an organization, especially the internal skills and capabilities that are required to support the value-creating internal processes. It is concerned with human capital, information capital and the organisational capital (http://vectorstudy.com/management-theories/balanced-scorecard)
2.1.4.1.1 Limitations of the Balanced Scorecard

According to Rillo (2010), the Balanced Scorecard has some aspects where there are deficiencies that need to be taken into account. Some of these deficiencies will be discussed below.

a. **Cause-and-effect relations are not time-wise connected**

The Balanced Scorecard is a static model without dimension of time that would establish or follow sequential setup of measures of Balanced Scorecard, and therefore, there may not be a causal relationship. Furthermore, in building up a strategy map according to the method presented by Kaplan and Norton, cause-and-effect relations are built up in a subjective way that does not necessarily refer to time factor (Rillo, 2010).

b. **External environment and several interest groups are out of picture**

Kanji (2000), states that the Balanced Scorecard does not take into consideration any important interest groups but shareholders and clients only. Also no attention is paid to daily activities of competitors yet organizations have to take into consideration the rapidly changing external environment. Neely (2002) also argues that the most difficult problem of Balanced Scorecard is that it lacks several important interest groups in its structure: such as suppliers, cooperation partners and close neighbours.

c. **Unsuitability to unique or unhealthy enterprises**

The model was built while bearing in mind organisations in relatively good health and in the development stage. However, in practice it is possible to see that several companies do not follow under the category of stable organisations. Therefore the practice has also proven that in many cases where the organisations need more thorough reengineering the Balanced Scorecard traditional approach does not provide reasonable results (Rillo, 2010).
2.1.4.2 360 Degree

It is also known as “multi-rater feedback”, “multi-source feedback”, or “multi-source assessment” (Fleener & Prince, 2007). A 360 degree performance review is a process where an individual gets feedback from different individuals or “raters” who frequently interact with the person under review. The objective is to give the learner feedback on their performance behaviours and outcomes as well as their potential, while identifying and establishing development goals. As a result of this feedback, the learner is required to be able to set targets for self-development which will sustain the development of their careers and in turn benefit the organization (Alexander, 2006). The raters may include learner’s boss, peers, subordinates, customers and sometimes even their significant others. Their own self assessments complete the circle.

Figure 2.2 below shows the 360 Degree feedback.

![360 Degree Feedback Diagram](http://simonjamesclegg.co.uk/360-degree-feedback, 2011)

**Figure 2.2: 360 degree feedback**

Source (http://simonjamesclegg.co.uk/360-degree-feedback, 2011)
360 degree feedback can affect people’s egos and self-esteem though sometimes it can be for a short time. Employees may then start to think and plan of the behavioural adjustments required according to the feedback given (Goppelt, 2009). Organizations only benefit from the process if the feedback is accepted and when action is taken to improve. The feedback results in learners very motivated to change behavior and become dedicated to the process, or they become de-motivated and discontinue participation (Alexander, 2006).

According to Armstrong (2009) the advantages and limitations of the 360 degree feedback are as listed below;

**2.1.4.2.1 Advantages of the 360 degree feedback**

- Individuals get a broader perspective of how they are perceived by others than previously possible.
- It gives people a more rounded view of their performance.
- It enhances awareness of and relevance of competencies.
- Increased awareness by senior management that they too have development needs.
- Feedback is perceived as more valid and objective, leading to acceptance of results and actions required.

**2.1.4.2.2 Limitations of the 360 degree feedback**

- People do not always give frank or honest feedback.
- People may be put under stress in receiving or giving feedback.
- Lack of action following feedback.
- Over-reliance on technology.
- Too much bureaucracy.
- Costly and time consuming since a group of individuals should evaluate one person
2.1.5 The purpose of PM in an organisation.

Performance management is done for different reasons in organisations. Information collected during the PM process is mostly used for salary administration, performance feedback and identification of employee strengths and weaknesses (Maimela, 2010). (Millian, Nason, Zhu, & De Ciere, 2002) argued that the purposes of the PM process should be reasonable and realistic and more emphasis should be placed on the implementation of the process. According to (Aguinis, 2009) the purposes of PM can be put into six categories as follows:

**Strategic purpose**
According to Lucas et al (2006), it is a strategic process in that it is aligned to the organisation’s broader objectives and long-term direction. Maimela (2010) also supported this view and stated that the main purpose of PM is to enable top management to achieve the strategic business objectives. This is done by linking the organisational goals with those of the individuals and it reinforces behaviour consistent with the attainment of organisational goals.

**Administrative purpose**
PM also provides information for making administrative decisions about employees like, salary adjustments, promotions, employee retention or termination of service, recognition of superior individual performance, identification of poor performers, layoffs and merit increases (Aguinis, 2009). This view is supported by (Williams, 2002) who states that many organisations improve performance by linking it to pay and this is called performance related pay (PRP) however he adds that there are different views on whether PRP improves performance or not.
**Informational purpose**

PM is an important way of communicating. It informs employees of their performance and the areas they need to improve (Maimela, 2010). It also informs supervisors of the organisation’s expectations related to the strategic purpose and the important work aspects. Communication is part of all the stages in PM therefore it is a great tool of communication (Aguinis, 2009). PM enhances communication and understanding and it is based on an agreement between a manager and an individual, a shared understanding and continuing dialogue about an individual’s goals and the standards expected and the competencies needed, together with an appreciation of the organisation’s wider mission, values and objective (Lucas et al, 2006).

**Developmental purpose**

The feedback from PM can be used for coaching and improving performance on an ongoing basis. The feedback identifies the strengths and weaknesses and the causes of performance deficiencies. The developmental stage is linked to the planning stage of the PM cycle (Maimela, 2010). This is also supported by (Lucas, Lupton, & Mathieson, 2006) who cited that employee enhancement aims to ensure that employee efforts are goal-directed and performance improvement is supported by the development of employees’ capabilities.

**Organisational maintenance purpose**

PM provides information which assists in workforce planning as it enables the allocation of human resources where they can be most effective. It also enables assessing of future training needs (Maimela, 2010).

**Documentational purpose**

According to Aguinis, (2009) PM systems allow organisations to gather helpful information which may be used for several documentation purposes. First, performance data can be used to confirm newly proposed selection instruments. Second,
performance management systems enable the documentation of essential personnel decisions. This information can be especially useful in the case of litigation.

Although performance management is critical for the success of organisations and has many advantages to both the organisation and its employees, it is bound to face resistance in many ways.

2.1.6 Limitations of Performance Management

According to Aguinis (2009), Performance management is limited in that it is a highly personal and often threatening process for both managers and employees. Another limitation of the process is that managers are often reluctant to provide candid feedback and have honest discussions with employees for fear of reprisal or damaging relationships with the very individuals they count on to get work done. In some cases, employees feel that their managers are unskilled at discussing their performance and ineffective at coaching them on how to develop their skills. Many complain that performance management systems are cumbersome, bureaucratic and time consuming. As a result managers and employees treat performance management as a necessary evil of work life that should be minimized rather than an important process that achieves key individual and organizational outcomes. According to Maimela (2010) the Appraisal stage in the Performance management process has limitations such as, bias, halo effect and stereotyping. This affects the way managers rate their subordinates since they may not be rated fairly.
2.2 RESISTANCE

Managers have many ways of looking at resistance, “pushback”, “not buying-in”, “criticism”, “foot dragging”, and “work-arounds”, among other views. These portray different behaviours, such as not responding to requests in time, making critical or negative comments and agreeing to do something and then not doing it. Resistance is virtually every type of behaviour, ranging from a roll of the eyes to overt sabotage (Ford & Ford, 2010). On the other hand, Ansoff (1990) defines resistance as a phenomenon that affects the change process, delaying or slowing down its beginning, obstructing or preventing its implementation, and increasing its costs. Beer & Eisentat (1996) add that it is a conduct that tries to keep the status quo, and therefore it is the same as inertia. However, Beer & Eisentat (1996) also say that resistance has also been considered as a basis of information, being useful in learning how to develop a more successful change process and therefore must be seriously considered. This view is also supported by Johnson (2008) who states that it is important for managers to realise that resistance is not always invalid or bad. In some cases employees know better than their managers and may therefore resist flawed processes.

2.3 INDICATORS OF EMPLOYEE RESISTANCE

Unfortunately, resistance to change sometimes goes beyond a healthy unease for the unknown, as some researchers have discovered. Feldman (1972) studied a series of changes in the Tulsa Public Library system and found the following types of employee resistance: task avoidance or postponement, hostility (stated or unstated), resignation, and underproduction (meeting only the minimum expectations of one’s work). A few years later, other library researchers found several more indicators of employee resistance to change: increased absenteeism, increased employee impatience, frustration, and sabotage (Plate & Stone, 1974).
2.4 CAUSES OF RESISTANCE TOWARDS PM

PM is a highly personal and often threatening process for both managers and employees (Pukalos, 2004).

There are different reasons which lead to resistance towards Performance management. These have been grouped into the following causes:

   a. Resistance caused by lack of knowledge

When staff and management do not understand the need for PM or when it is not clear, there is bound to be resistance (Rick, 2011). One of the main characteristics for a successful implementation of the PM process is the training on the process (Maszal, 2009).

   b. Resistance caused by the PM process

According to Asfaw (2007) Employees feel that PM and performance rating should be related to what they do in the organization and should also reflect the amount of work and challenges faced in performing tasks assigned to them. According to Napier & Latham (1986) as cited in(McCathy & Garavan, 2001), most of the times employees see no value in the PM process especially the Performance appraisal interview which they regard as an organisational intervention which does not have a significant effect on their performance as well as their development. This view is supported by Winstanley & Stuart-Smith (1996) who argue that it cannot be concluded that PM leads to business growth but it can actually produce undesirable side effects like demoralization and de-motivation of employees as well as the management and can also lead to bureaucratisation.

Aguinis (2009) argues that PM systems always cost money and time. The resources are wasted even more when the systems are poorly designed and implemented. Pulakos (2004) also adds that many complain that performance management systems are
cumbersome, bureaucratic and too time consuming for the value added. As a result, managers and employees will treat PM as a necessary evil of work life that should be minimized rather than an important process that leads to the realisation of organisational goals.

Resistance may result where there is a past record of using false or misleading information. This may happen where there is no standardised system in place which gives room for fabricating information about an employee’s performance (Aguinis, 2009). Exhaustion or Saturation is another reason for resistance towards the PM process. Compliance should not be mistaken for acceptance. Sometimes people are overwhelmed by the process to the extent that they just comply but with no motivation. You have them in body, but you do not have their hearts (Rick, 2011).

c. Resistance caused by PM supervisors

According to Asfaw (2007), it does not matter how the PM process is detailed on paper and how the methods of PM are used in managing employees, there must be qualified supervisors with the necessary knowledge, skill and experience in relation to managing performance of the employees. The ability of supervisors to accurately manage employees is one of the major factors that determine the acceptance and resistance of employees towards PM. Torrington, Hall, & Taylor (2005) also argued that managers play an essential role in the PM process by motivating, coaching, enabling performance, organising resources, facilitating any development opportunities, monitoring and also revising performance expectations and objectives. Employees are concerned with aspects such as, the organization assigning qualified supervisors to manage performance, supervisors knowing what the employees are doing, supervisor understanding the job requirements and difficulty and the supervisor also having knowledge of the PM and rating procedures. This is because the PM process is owned and driven by line management rather than by the HR function Lucas et al (2006). Edwards & Calvin (1998) also argued that most of the times supervisors are either not
willing or ready to conduct appraisals, or may not have the required skills to do so thus resulting in employee negative attitude toward the process. Employees feel that their managers are inexperienced at discussing their performance and ineffective at teaching them on how to develop their skills (Pulakos, 2004).

Rick (2011) argues that where there is low trust there is bound to be resistance. When employees do not have confidence that the company can completely manage the PM process, they will not support the process. Aguinis (2009) also writes about trust and fairness from another angle and argues that biases can replace standards where personal values and relationships are likely to replace organisational standards. Employees are usually aware of these biases and this will demoralise them. The PM process may damage relationships among the involved individuals and sometimes this may be permanent and results in a tense working environment.

In some cases, the line managers have negative attitudes towards the PM process. According to Armstrong (2006) many line managers, usually from harsh experiences, resent the bureaucracy which may surround systems favoured by HR people, such as traditional performance appraisal schemes. In such situations, these managers will not ensure effectiveness of the PM process and their actions may in turn negatively influence the attitudes of their subordinates.

d. Resistance caused by the PM feedback

According to Asfaw (2007) feedback is a major component of PM especially in the performance appraisal stage where after the supervisor rates the employees, they let them know of their progress and this is usually a necessary procedure. The attitude of employees can be negatively affected if feedback is not given regularly or if it is not given at all and this will lead to resistance towards the process in future. The employees’ main concern is that the feedback given should be in relation to the job they are doing in the organization and that the performance expectations measure what they
actually do in the organization. On the other hand Pukalos (2004) argues that in most cases managers are reluctant to give correct and honest feedback in the discussions with employees as they fear damaging relationships with the individuals they rely on to get work done.

According to Schweiger & Sumner (1994) the effect of expectation on performance is that employees who perceive a positive relation between performance and reward are more likely to be high performers. In a good and successful appraisal the employees should be able to link their performance to career and salary development. Another factor that leads to resistance from employees as cited by Edmonstone (1996) is that the developmental aspects of PM are often ignored, sometimes training in never done for employees that have developmental needs.

Aguinis (2009) argues that self-esteem may be lowered in cases where feedback is not provided accurately or appropriately thus leading to employee resentment. He also adds that poor communication leads to resentment where employees do not have knowledge of how their ratings were generated and how they relate to the rewards. In some cases the standards and ratings may vary and may also be unfair.

It is also very important to know that no one is perfect, and it is usually unsettling to know the truth. Constructive feedback is not easily accepted. It therefore means it is everyone’s duty to ensure that there is for extra effort to address performance issues (http://www.beacons.co.uk/docs).

**e. Resistance caused by PM decisions and outcomes**

According to Asfaw (2007) the feedback on its own is not a guarantee for ensuring employee satisfaction and positive attitude towards the PM process. Research suggests that feedback discussions are more effective when applied by organizations to reduce the ambiguity surrounding results of the feedback so as to increase employee acceptance of their performance feedback and result. The supervisors should therefore
explain their feedback and educate employees on how their performance is being measured and assessed. From a different angle, (Rick, 2011) argues that the benefits and rewards of a process may lead to resistance. If the benefits are outweighed by the time and trouble involved in the PM process, there is bound to be resistance. He also add that in most cases the outcome is the need for change in skills and some people feel that they may not be able to cope with the requirements.

f. Resistance caused by individual perception

Resistance may occur where people tend to perceive selectively those things that fit most comfortably to them. People may therefore prepare to listen to what they agree to (Asfaw, 2007).

g. Resistance caused by individual personality

Some aspects of an individual’s personality (e.g., dogmatism or dependency) may predispose that person to resist change. The highly dogmatic individual is close-minded and more likely to resist change than is a less dogmatic person (http://hrmba.blogspot.com/2009/10/resistance-to-change.html). Another example is dependency. If carried to extremes, dependency on others can lead to resistance to change. People who are highly dependent on others often lack self-esteem. They may resist change until those that they depend on endorse it. Employees who are highly dependent on their supervisors for performance feedback probably will not accept any new techniques or methods for doing their jobs unless their supervisors personally support the changes and indicate how these changes will improve performance and/or otherwise benefit the employees (http://hrmba.blogspot.com/2009/10/resistance-to-change.html).

Managers must be careful to avoid overemphasizing the role played by personality in resistance to change because they can easily make the fundamental attribution error. There is a tendency to “blame” resistance to change in the workplace on individual
personalities. Although personality may play a role, it seldom is the most important factor in a situation involving change (Rick, 2011).

2.5 EFFECTS OF EMPLOYEE RESISTANCE

It is important to know and understand the negative effects of resistance towards the PM process as this will enable the authorities to see the urgency of the need to address the resistance (http://smallbusiness.chron.com/negative-effects-resistance-change-organization).

2.5.1 Low Morale

When employees resist a process like the PM process, they will feel less hopeful about their professional future in the company. This is even more when there is lack of communication and education regarding the process. This will result in low morale which may spread throughout the entire organisation and will cause issues with both recruiting and retention (http://smallbusiness.chron.com/negative-effects-resistance-change-organization).

2.5.2 Reduced Efficiency

Sometimes employees may spend time focusing on resisting the PM process in the workplace and become less focused on doing their daily tasks. This will result in reduced efficiency and output and will in turn affect the company’s bottom line (http://smallbusiness.chron.com/negative-effects-resistance-change-organization).
2.5.3 Disruptive Work Environment

Resistance results in disruption of the work environment. Employees may cause commotion with outbursts about some aspects of the process or they may have an aggressive attitude towards management. This type of attitude and negativity may be spread among other staff members thus resulting in unrest in the organisation. (http://smallbusiness.chron.com/negative-effects-resistance-change-organization).

2.6 OVERCOMING RESISTANCE TOWARDS THE PM PROCESS

All business advantages sustained from the PM process will be achieved through people, not just through a network of business processes and technologies. This therefore means there is need to ensure that the people are aligned to the organizational goals to ensure the success of the process. (www.people-performancesolutions.com).

Literature has different ways of dealing with and overcoming resistance to PM though most of it is on resistance to change. Most of the resistance towards PM is due to the performance review meetings and feedback stage. Below are 12 golden rules on how to manage performance so as to reduce or overcome resistance.

2.6.1 Conducting PM

According to (Armstrong, 2009) there are 12 golden rules for conducting performance management as follows;

- Be prepared. - Managers should be ready and be able to refer to the agreed objectives and notes on the performance throughout the period being appraised. Changes which took place should also be considered. The individuals being assessed should also be prepared to identify success and problems, and be ready to assess their own performance.
b. **Work to an understandable structure.** – Whenever managers and their subordinates meet to discuss performance, there should be proper planning which will cover all crucial points to be discussed. Enough time should also be given for full discussions.

c. **Create the right atmosphere for performance and discussions** - Successful PM is dependent on the creation of an informal environment where there can be an honest and friendly exchange of ideas and views.

d. **Provide good feedback.** – Subordinates are interested in knowing how they are performing. In order for the feedback to be effective, it must be based on honest facts and it should refer to results, events, critical incidents and significant behaviours that have affected performance in specific ways. Feedback must be given in a way that allows the recipients to accept its truthful nature – it must be a report of what has happened and not a judgement. Positive feedback should be given on the things that the individual did well in addition to areas for improvement. The feedback process is very crucial in PM and individuals are more likely to work at improving their performance and developing their skills if they feel empowered by the process.

e. **Use time effectively.** Supervisors must always ensure that subordinates understand their tasks by allowing enough time for them to express their views, ask questions and seek clarity. PM meetings should also take the form of dialogue.

f. **Use praise.** During the PM process managers should recognise and praise specific achievements which are deserved by the individuals so as to encourage them.
g. **Allow individuals to talk.** Allowing individuals to talk will enable them to speak out their views and feel that they are part of the whole process.

h. **Invite self-assessment.** Individuals should first assess their own performance which will then be discussed with their managers.

i. **Manage performance not personality.** The discussions on the PM process must be based on factual evidence, not opinion. Reference should always be made to actual events or behaviour. Individuals must be given plenty of scope to clarify why something did or did not happen.

j. **Encourage analysis of performance.** Supervisors should not just give praise or blame. Both the supervisor and the subordinate should analyse objectively why things went well or badly and ways to sustain a high standard and avoid problems in the future.

k. **Do not deliver unexpected criticisms.** There should be no surprises. The discussion should only be concerned with events or behaviours that have been noted at the time they took place. Feedback on performance should be immediate; it should not wait until the end of the year. The purpose of the formal review is to reflect briefly on experiences during the review period and on this basis to look ahead.

2.6.2 **Gaining Commitment from all employees**

It is much easier to gain commitment from managerial employees if they are consulted and if their opinions have been considered. Managers may even be involved as members of project teams in coming up with a new process. If this is done, organizations can achieve ownership and commitment from managers.
Commitment from non-managerial employees may also be obtained by keeping them well informed of any proposals, why they were made and how they will affect them. These employees would also want to participate in the development of any new employment practices and would be interested to know if their contributions were accepted and incorporated in decision making.
2.7 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Jabareen (2009) defines a conceptual framework as a network, of interconnected ideas or concepts that when combined will give a complete and comprehensive understanding of a phenomenon. From the above reviewed literature, the conceptual framework shown in figure 1.2 below can be formulated which indicates that employee resistance towards the PM process can be caused by lack of knowledge of the PM process, the PM process itself, PM supervisors, PM feedback, PM decisions and outcomes, individual perceptions, and individual personalities.

Causes of employee resistance towards the PM process

Figure 2.3: Causes of employee resistance towards the PM process.
2.8 CHAPTER SUMMARY

PM is a continuous process and not an event and its effectiveness depends on the contributions of the PM supervisors and those being supervised. PM should result in an organisation aligning individual goals to organisational goals which enables companies to achieve their stated goals. However, the success of the process may be hindered by resistance which may come from managerial or non-managerial employees. It is important to know the causes of resistance so that organisations can deal with them for the good of the organisations as well as the employees. The causes for resistance identified in this chapter include, lack of knowledge, unqualified or unprepared supervisors, the PM process aspects, individual perceptions and personalities.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The chapter presents the research methodology and this includes the research design, the target population of the study and the methods used by the researcher to achieve the objectives of the research. An account of the data collection techniques used and data analysis and interpretation will be presented. Issues of the validity and reliability of the study are also discussed as well as the ethical issues and limitations of the research.

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design gives general direction for the gathering and analysis of data of a research. It is important because it provides an important relationship between the theory and argument that informed the research and the empirical data collected (Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). A choice of research design ‘reflects decisions about the priority being given to a range of dimensions of the research process. Bryman & Bell (2007) argued that this will influence methodological procedures for example sampling and statistical packages. (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2007) defined research design as a blueprint which allows researchers to get answers to the questions under study in any given research project. It provides a clear research plan, constraints as well as ethical issues that a study will certainly come across.

3.2 RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY

According to Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Lowe (2002), research philosophy is about the way a person thinks about the development of knowledge. This will in turn assist a
researcher in selecting the best and most suitable design which will work. There are two broad categories for a research philosophy which are followed in conducting a research, these are, positivists (quantitative) and phenomenological (qualitative / interpretivist) philosophy. The key features of the two philosophies are shown below in table 3.1.

**Table 3.1: Research Philosophy Paradigms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positivist Paradigm</th>
<th>Phenomenological Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Beliefs</strong></td>
<td><strong>The world is external and objective</strong></td>
<td><strong>The world is socially constructed and subjective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Observer is independent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Observer is part of what is observed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Science is value free</strong></td>
<td><strong>Science is driven by human interests</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher should</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focus on facts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focus on meanings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Look for causality and fundamental laws</strong></td>
<td><strong>Try to understand what is happening</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reduce phenomenon to simplest elements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Look at the totality of each situation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Formulate hypothesis and test them</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop ideas through induction from data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred methods include</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operationalizing concepts so that they can be measured</strong></td>
<td><strong>Using multiple methods to establish different views of phenomena</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Taking large samples</strong></td>
<td><strong>Small samples investigated in depth over time</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The study used the mixed method approach of both quantitative and qualitative research methods.
3.3 RESEARCH METHODS / STRATEGIES

Strategies that are used to carry out research can be linked to positivistic and phenomenological approaches as shown in table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Research Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positivistic / Objectivist</th>
<th>Phenomenological / Subjectivist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Surveys</td>
<td>• Case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experimental studies</td>
<td>• Action research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Longitudinal studies</td>
<td>• Participative research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cross-sectional studies</td>
<td>• Grounded theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Collis & Hussey, 2003)

Some of the strategies in the table are briefly explained below.

3.1.5.1 Surveys
Surveys are normally used where large volumes of data are involved with quantitative methods of analysis (Collis & Hussey, 2003).

3.1.5.2 Experiment
Experiments are used to observe the effects of individual factors in detail and discover relationships with materials being investigated. Experiments are also used to test existing theories (Coolican, 1998).

3.1.5.3 Longitudinal studies
Liang & Zeger (1996) defined a longitudinal study as an investigation where participant outcomes and perhaps treatments or exposures are gathered at multiple follow-up times.
3.1.5.4 Cross-sectional studies

Cross-sectional surveys are aimed at determining the regularity of a particular aspect, in a given population at a given point in time.

3.1.5.4 Case study research

Case studies focus on one or more instances of a specific experience with a view of giving an in-depth report of events, associations, experiences or processes taking place in that specific case. They may be positivist or interpretivist in nature, depending on the researcher’s approach, the gathered data and the analytical techniques used (Denscombe, 2008).

3.4 POPULATION AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

3.4.1 Target Population

According to Saunders et al (2007), a population is the full set of cases from which a sample will be taken. It is the target group of interest to the researcher from which results of the study will be generalisable.

The targeted population for this study was all the employees of Destiny electronics which are managerial and non-managerial. The organisation is widespread with a staff complement of 55 employees including managerial employees.

3.4.2 Sampling

In research terms a sample is a group of people, objects, or items taken from a larger population for measurement (Kemper, Stringfield, & Teddie, 2003). A sample should reflect the characteristics of the population from which it is drawn since the purpose of sampling is to draw conclusions about the entire population (Cooper & Schindler, 2001)
There are two methods of sampling and according to Cooper & Schindler (2001) these are, non-probability sampling and probability sampling. These are discussed below.

3.4.2.1 Probability sampling methods

Probability sampling methods are based on randomised selection. According to Gay (1996) the method is complex, costly and time consuming as compared to non-probability sampling.

a. Simple random sampling

In simple random sampling, each element has an equal chance of being selected as part of the sample. Its advantage is that it is easy to implement. However it requires a listing of the population elements which may take time and result in more costs. It is also prone to producing large errors (Cooper & Schindler 2003).

a. Stratified sampling

When a population has a different number of categories, it can be divided into subpopulation or strata. A sample will then be drawn from these strata using any sampling method on each strata (Gay, 1996). The advantages of this method are that the researcher controls sample size in the strata and it enables use of different sampling techniques in each sample. However, there can be an increased error when subgroups are selected at different rates and it can be expensive to carry out (Cooper & Schindler 2003). Examples of strata can include, sex, age, marital status and religion.
b. Cluster sampling

Cluster sampling is when the population is divided into groups or clusters (Krishnaswamy, Bawa, Ganeshaiah, & Kiran, 2009). Some clusters are then selected randomly to represent the population and then all units from these selected clusters become the sample. Units from the non-selected clusters are not selected to be part of the sample. The method is an example of a two-stage sampling or multistage sampling where in the first stage, a sample area is selected then in the second stage sample respondents within the areas are selected. Examples of cluster sampling include selecting respondents from certain areas or certain periods (Gay, 1996).

c. Systematic sampling

Systematic sampling is also known as interval sampling since there are intervals between the selection of each element. It is the selection of every \( i^{\text{th}} \) element of the population after randomly selecting the first one for example every \( 7^{\text{th}} \) element of the population (Krishnaswamy et al, 2009).

3.4.2.2 Non-probability sampling

The difference between non-probability and probability sampling is that non-probability does not involve random selection of elements. Non-probability is based on the assumption that there is an even population distribution of characteristics in the population (Gay, 1996).
a. Quota sampling

According to (Pilot & Beck, 2006), the population is first divided into mutually exclusive sub-groups, subjects are then selected from each segment based on a specific proportion. It is less expensive than random sampling and it is easy to administer. The method is effective when information is immediately required and can be carried out independent of existing sampling frames.

b. Judgmental sampling

Judgment sampling is when a sample is selected based on certain judgments on the population. The assumption is that the researcher selects elements that will represent the population though according to (Cooper & Schindler 2003), there is no way of checking and verifying if the sample is a true representation of the population. The method is therefore subject to the researcher’s bias.

c. Snow ball sampling

In snowball sampling the first step is to identify an element or someone who meets the criteria for inclusion in the study and that person will be asked to recommend or identify others who also meet the criteria. It is mainly used in unknown or rare populations (Krishnaswamy et al, 2009).

d. Volunteer sampling

Volunteer sampling is when people volunteer their service for a specific study (Gay, 1996). The use of voluntary participants may have strong biases.
e. Convenience sampling

(Krishnaswamy et al, 2009) argued that convenience sampling involves the study of elements taken from a group that is conveniently accessible to a researcher. The main advantage of this technique is that it is easy to access and requires less effort and time. However, Gay (1996) criticized it since it suffers from a major disadvantage in that it may not be an accurate representation of the population. Use of a convenience sample is quite popular and prevalent, and it can be valid under certain conditions. This method was used by the researcher as the sampling technique as it was the most applicable for the study.

3.4.3 Sampling Procedure

The sampling technique used for this research was the convenience sampling method for practical reasons such as time constraints and accessibility to respondents. The researcher selected all the Harare branch employees to be the respondents of the questionnaires since they were the ones which were easily accessible.

3.3.4 Justification of sampling procedure

The total population for Destiny electronics employees both managerial and non-managerial was 55. The Harare branch constitutes the greater number of the population which is 45. All Harare branch employees were selected to be respondents to the research as they were conveniently accessible to the researcher. Though literature argues that convenience sampling may not be accurate, in this case it was the most suitable sampling technique since the sample was more than three quarters of the population, the population was homogeneous in the sense that the remaining branches also had Destiny Electronics employees and the PM policy used at the Harare branch was the same throughout the other branches. According to Crossman (2013)
convenience sampling can also be used if other sampling techniques are not possible. In this study, it was the only method that was possible considering that the Harare branch was selected for easy access and all the respondents from the branch were selected.

### 3.3.5 Sample size

Table 3.3: Sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population size</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial employees</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial employees</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selected sample size as shown above is a representative of all the Destiny Electronics as it is more than three quarters of the total population.

### 3.4 DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Data collection enables the researcher to collect facts about the research objects so as to be able to answer research questions in a conclusive way (Annie, 2009). According to Crossman (2013) data collection tools include, secondary date, interviews, questionnaires, focus group discussions, projective techniques, mapping and scaling. For the purposes of this research, questionnaires were used and company records from the Human resource department like previous PM reports and appraisals. Some data collection methods will be discussed below:
3.4.1 Secondary Data

This is data collected by someone else and not the user. It is searched for and obtained from different sources (Krishnawasmy et al., 2006). Examples of secondary data includes, accounting records, company reports, in-house journals and publications. The advantage of secondary data is that it saves time and provides a larger database. However, secondary data may not be complete and precise and may have been collected for a different purpose.

3.4.2 Primary Data

This is original data collected for a specific goal. Primary data collected may be qualitative or quantitative in nature. Tools that may be used to collect primary data include, experiment, surveys, field studies, observation, interviews and questionnaires. The primary data collection tool used for this study was in the form of self-administered questionnaires Crossman (2013).

3.4.3 Questionnaires

A questionnaire is a data collection instrument used to structure the data collection process (Krishnawasmy et al., 2006). It is a popular means of collecting data but may be difficult to construct and may require re-construction before the final one is produced Crossman (2013). Questionnaires can be emailed, faxed, posted and can cover a large number of people (Gay, 1996). For the purposes of this study, questionnaires were the main research technique used to collect data from respondents.

The researcher ensured that the type, order, structure and wording of the self-administered questionnaires met the objectives of the research and attracted the required responses.
The questionnaires were divided into six sections as follows:

- Section 1 – Demographic information
- Section 2 – Skills and knowledge
- Section 3 – Performance management process
- Section 4 – Performance management goals
- Section 5 – Performance management assessors
- Section 6 – Performance Management feedback and outcomes.

The researcher also followed some of the ways on how to increase completion rates on self-administered surveys cited on (http://www.adolphus.me.uk/emx/surveys/method.htm) which are as follows:

1. Making the questionnaire easy to fill in - surveys that follow the KISS principle, i.e. fairly short, with simple questions, are more likely to be returned.
2. Ensuring that the questionnaire looks professional – instructions should be clear and plenty of white space should be used.
3. Stating the purpose of the questionnaire – for example if it will be used for research purposes. The researcher explained that the research was part of the MBA study.
4. Assuring the respondents that their responses will remain confidential.
5. Being polite and courteous – since it involves their time. Words such as “please” and “thank you” were used in the questionnaire.

3.4.3.1 Pre-testing the Questionnaire

According to (Campanelli, 1997), a pre-test sample need not be a representative cross section of the population and can be small. For the purpose of this research, a pre-test of the questionnaire was done on four employees. Of these selected, two were managerial and the other two were non-managerial employees. The managerial self-administered questionnaire was different from the non-managerial self-administered questionnaire. Changes were then made so that all questions become clear and the required responses are received so as to achieve the research objectives.
3.4.3.2 Administration of the Questionnaire

The main ways of delivering questionnaires are through mail, email, by internet or physically distributing to the respondents. Questionnaires physically delivered can be returned by mail, email or can be collected individually.

For the purposes of this research, the researcher physically distributed the questionnaires to respondents at the Head office in Harare.

3.4.3.3 Justification for using Questionnaires

The researcher decided to use questionnaires because of the following reasons which were cited by Leedy & Ormrod (2001):

a. Questionnaires allow respondents to answer during their own spare time and therefore are not disturbed.
b. The method is cost effective in terms of money and time
c. The method reduces researcher bias considering that they were also self-administered questionnaires.
d. Questionnaires allow to cover a large sample at the same time
e. Self-administered questionnaires allow a researcher to retain confidence of respondents due to anonymity.

3.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Research ethics provide guidelines for the responsible conduct of research. Research ethics also educates and monitors researchers conducting research to ensure a high ethical standard (http://www.ahc.umn.edu/img/assets/26104/Research_Ethics.pdf). The researcher obtained permission from Destiny Electronics authorities for all the studies
concerning the organisation see appendix 4. Copies of questionnaires were submitted to the Human Resources department before distribution to respondents.

### 3.6 DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

The received questionnaire responses were quantified, categorised and then they were subjected to statistical analysis. The following steps according to Leedy & Ormrod (2001) were followed closely in this study:

a) Arrange facts in a logical order
b) Identify categories of data that help to classify data into meaningful groups
c) Examine specific documents, occurrences and other bits of data for the specific meanings that they may have in relation to the case
d) Identify patterns – Scrutinise data and their interpretations for underlying themes and other patterns
e) Synthesise and generalise – draw conclusions that may have implications beyond the specific case

In this study where possible, composite scores from likert scale variables were calculated in order to measure the causes of employee resistance towards the Performance Management Process. The likert scale variables were first converted into dichotomous variables, distinguishing between those who agree and those who did not agree. A dummy value of “zero” was assigned to those who disagree and a “one’ to those who agreed. Variables were then transformed using the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 21. The reliability test for each composite score was measured to show the level of internal consistence of the selected variables in this study. Principal component analysis (PCA) was also used to identify the major determinants of employee resistance at Destiny.
3.7 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE STUDY

Saunders et al (2009) defined reliability as the consistency of findings whether one would get similar results when the same study was done and it is mostly used in quantitative studies. Keates (2000) defined validity as whether or not a selected research instrument measures what the researcher wants to measure. For the purposes of this study, self-administered questionnaires were used to gather data and some questions were repeated in a different way to ensure consistency. Composite scores variables from likert scale variables were developed in order to measure the causes of employee resistance towards the PM process. The likert scale variables were first converted into dichotomous variables, distinguishing between those who agree and those who did not agree. A dummy value of “zero” was assigned to those who disagree and a “one’ to those who agreed. Variables were then transformed using the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 21. The reliability test for each composite score was measured to show the level of internal consistency of the selected variables in this study (See table 3.4).

Table 3.4: Test for reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes of employee resistance towards the Performance Management Process.</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills and knowledge</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management process</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management system</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management goals</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management assessors</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management feedback and outcomes</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

The organisation is geographically widespread with branches in Harare, Masvingo, Mutare, Triangle and Gweru. It was not possible to visit all the branches and only the Harare Head office branch was used for the research. Since the researcher was also an employee of Destiny Electronics and based at the head office, it is possible that participants were not comfortable enough to give accurate information for fear that the information may be used against them or may be seen by their managers. Time constraint was another limitation as the dissertation was to be submitted within a period of 6 months as part of the study of MBA.

3.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The researcher used the quantitative approach for the methodology. The target population for the research was all the Destiny Electronics employees. The convenience sampling method was used focusing on all employees at the Harare branch. Self-administered questionnaires were used for data gathering and the response rate was high since the researcher had easy access to all the respondents. Data analysis was then done using the SPSS and the results will be shown and discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results, analysis as well as the discussions of the same. The findings are based on the returned self-administered questionnaires and will be linked to the reviewed literature in chapter 2. Presentation of the results is quantitative and this will be illustrated in the form of tables, graphs and charts. The main purpose of the study was to investigate the causes of employee resistance towards PM.

4.1 RESPONSE RATE

Response rate can be defined as the percentage of people who respond to a survey. This means a high response rate would ensure that the results are representative of the total survey population (Dillman, 2000). A survey that gathers very little data may not contain substantial information. According to Saunders et al (2005) a response rate of 60% is valid and reliable. The formula for calculating the response rate is as follows:

\[
\text{Response rate} = \frac{\text{Number of complete surveys}}{\text{Number of participants contacted}}
\]

The targeted respondents for the research were all the employees at the Harare head office branch (managerial and non-managerial). The response rate was high at 89% and thus valid and reliable and a good representation for the study. Forty five self-administered questionnaires were distributed and forty were collected and usable.
The response rate for this study is shown in table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distributed Questionnaire</th>
<th>Responded questionnaires</th>
<th>Response rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial employees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial employees</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 RESEARCH FINDINGS

The research findings and discussions are based on the concepts discussed in chapter two which were used to prepare the self-administered questionnaires.

4.2.1 Demographics of the study

The information sought by the managerial and non-managerial self-administered questionnaires included years of service in the organisation and on the current job, age-group and the staff category
4.2.1.1 Years of service in the organization

Figure 4.1 shows that most of the respondents (80%) in the research were in the organisation for more than four years which means they were familiar with the PM process and system at Destiny Electronics and they were also suitable for the study considering the period under study (January 2011 – June 2013)

Figure 4.1: Years of service in Destiny Electronics
4.2.1.2 Years of service on the current job

Figure 4.2 shows that 73% of the respondents had worked on the same job for more than four years. Of this percentage, 20% were on the current job between four to five years, 27.5% were between six to ten years and 25% were on the same job for more than ten years. This means they were able to answer the questions more effectively as they were aware of the requirements of their jobs as well as the challenges they face in the organisation.

![Bar chart showing years of service on the current job](image)

**Figure 4.2: Years of service on the current job**
4.2.1.3 Staff Age group

Figure 4.3 reveals that from the respondents, 40% were 26 to 40 years, 42.5% were 41 to 50 and 17.5% were 51 to 60 years old. Majority of the employees are therefore between 41 and 50 years old which constitutes those who still have more years before the retirement age at Destiny Electronics which is 60 years old. This means that the way the PM process is handled is of much concern to them as it affects their future in the organisation.

Figure 4.3: Staff Age group at Destiny Electronics
4.2.1.4 Staff Category

Most of the respondents (73%) were non-managerial employees and the other 27% were managers who managed performance. This is a normal situation as managers should be fewer than the employees they manage. This also means that the research findings are more biased in favour of the non-managerial employees.

Figure 4.4: Staff category for Destiny Electronics
4.2.2 Skills and knowledge

Figure 4.5 shows that majority of the survey respondents (85%) indicated that they were aware of the purpose of PM in their organization. Further analysis shows that all managers were aware and 79.3% of the employees were aware. Despite this difference there is no statistically significant difference at 95% level of testing. The situation is good where all managers should know the purpose of PM, this is also shown in Figure 4.6 which shows that the perception on skills and knowledge of managers is higher than that on non-managers. Half (50%) of the forty interviewed staff indicated that they had received training on performance management. More than half of managers (63.7%) received this training while 44.8% of the non-managers received this training. This may mean that of the 85% respondents who said they know about PM, some may have just a general idea about the PM process even without receiving training. It may also mean that those who have not received formal education on the PM process may assume they know about the process yet in actual fact they do not have enough knowledge. This may negatively affect the implementation of the process since the interpretations
will be different. According to Masztal (2009), one of the main characteristics for a successful implementation of the PM process is the training on the process.

4.2.2.2 Average perception on skills and knowledge

![Bar chart showing average perception on skills and knowledge](image)

Figure 4.6: Average perception on skills and knowledge

The general average score for skills and knowledge was 76.9% based on the knowledge and skills parameters outlined in table 4.2. The average for the managers (80.8%) was higher than that of non-managers (75.5%). The reliability statistical test, Cronbach's alpha was 0.67, which indicates a high level of internal reliability for our scale with this specific study. The Cronbach's alpha statistics is the overall reliability coefficient for a set of knowledge and skills parameters outlined in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2: Skills and Knowledge parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills and knowledge parameters</th>
<th>%Agree</th>
<th>Non managers</th>
<th>Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My qualifications are suitable for the job I am doing</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I constantly update my knowledge and know how</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destiny has aided me in attaining the knowledge that I have</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always eager to learn new ways of doing work and make suggestions for performance improvement</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my company I have specific and clear results defined that I can control for my job role</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my job I know precisely the critical on-going things to do to help me deliver my results</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees should be trained about the performance management process</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the adequate resources required for me to perform my duties efficiently</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management helps in identifying training needs</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 30% of the respondents indicated that they have the adequate resources required to perform their duties efficiently and this is a great obstacle to the effectiveness of PM. The majority of respondents (85%) agreed that PM helps in identifying training needs but 60% of the respondents have received training from Destiny Electronics to aid their knowledge. All employees agreed that they should be trained about PM. The findings suggest that employees may have the right qualifications, know the purposes and importance of the PM process but still their performance may be low. These findings suggest that there is lack of commitment from those who know about the process or they were not properly trained about the process. The findings also show that Destiny Electronics is selective about the people who are trained on PM since not all employees
had received training. It then becomes difficult to implement the process when some employees are not fully educated about the process.

Table 4.3: Relationship between skills and knowledge, and other variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship between skills and knowledge, and the p-value following variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of service in the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service on the current job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of the purpose of Performance management in your organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows that there is no statistical significance between the outlined variables and staff skills and knowledge except for the staff members who are aware of the purpose of PM in the organization because the p-value is less than 0.05 (the p-value measures the degree of association between two variables). Hence awareness of the purpose of PM in the organization is critical. This point is supported by Rick (2011) who argued that staff and management do not understand the purposes and the need for PM and when the process is not clear, there is bound to be resistance, hence awareness is very crucial.
4.2.3 Performance Management process

![Bar chart showing average perception on PM process at Destiny Electronics.

N=40

Managers: 43.6%
Non-managers: 46.9%
Overall: 46.0%

Figure 4.7: Average perception on PM process at Destiny Electronics

The views of employees towards the actual PM process which explain the average perception in Figure 4.7 are shown in the Table 4.4.
Table 4.4: Performance Management process parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Management process parameters</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Non-managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management System helps people set and achieve meaningful goals</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management leads to organizational growth</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My leadership and interpersonal skills are developed due to Performance Management System</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management is a worthwhile activity</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance management implemented as Destiny creates a participative environment</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance of employees at Destiny has improved due to current Performance Management System</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the factors facilitating and hindering performance are taken into consideration while appraising my performance</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system of your organization?</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management is taken seriously in the organization by both managerial and non-managerial staff</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is need to adjust or totally change the process at Destiny Electronics</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability statistical test, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.75, which shows a high level of internal reliability for the scale with this specific study. The overall average score for the PM process perceived by the staff was 46.0% which is less than half (50%). The average perception by managers was 43.6% while perception by the non-managers was 46.9%.

Only 20% of the respondents agreed that the PM process at Destiny Electronics creates a participative environment, only 25% agreed that the performance of employees has improved due to the current PM process, only 25% were satisfied with the current PM process.
system being used, only 37.5% agreed that all the factors facilitating and hindering performance are taken into consideration while appraising performance, only 30% agreed that PM is a worthwhile activity at Destiny Electronics. These findings indicate that there are problems in the implementation of the PM process at Destiny Electronics and these findings are in line with what was cited by Millian et al. (2002) that the purposes of the PM process should be reasonable and realistic and more emphasis should be placed on the implementation of the process. This is because the implementation determines the success and acceptance of the process to a great extent. An interesting finding shown in Table 4.4 is that only 18.2% of the managerial employees were satisfied with the current PM process at the company and yet they have the duty of managing the performance of their subordinates, this meant that 91.8% of managers were not satisfied with the process. One of the possible explanations to this finding is from Armstrong (2006) who stated that many line managers, usually from harsh experiences, resent the bureaucracy which may surround systems favoured by human resource personnel, such as traditional performance appraisal schemes. This finding is also supported by Edwards& Calvin (1998) who argued that most of the times supervisors are either not willing or not ready to conduct appraisals, or may not have the required skills to do so thus resulting in employee negative attitudes toward the process. However, the finding contrasts with Lucas et al. (2006) who argued that the PM process is owned and driven by line management rather than by the human resource function.
4.2.3.2 Performance management system

Figure 4.8 reveals that employees are not fully involved in determining performance ratings and of most importance goal formulation. The findings revealed that 52.7% were moderately involved in goal formulation, while 47.5% were involved at a low level. This may affect the commitment of employees towards the process as they may feel side lined from the process. This finding contrasts to Lee & Strong (2004), who argued that it is important for organisations to have clear goals and objectives as it enables individual performance to be aligned to the organisation’s goals and this can be done by involving the employees is goal formulation. Though 66.7% said the techniques used in rating performance were accurate and the supervisors were also fair in rating performance, it is important to note that onl 12.5% of the respondents were fully aware of the appraisal system in place. This may mean that some respondents may not be able to know if the supervisors are implementing the appraisal system well.
4.2.3.3 Contribution of the PM process

Figure 4.9: Contribution of the PM process

Figure 4.9 shows that the main advantage of PM as perceived by Destiny Electronics staff was employee development and empowerment (32.5%). This finding is supported by Maimela (2010) who stated that the feedback from PM can be used for coaching and improving performance on an ongoing basis. The feedback identifies the strengths and weaknesses and the causes of performance deficiencies and seeks to develop employees. Only 12.5% agreed that PM improves decision making. This clearly shows that the employees are fully aware of the purpose of PM or it may mean that PM at Destiny Electronics is not used in decision making. According to Aguinis (2009), PM provides information for making administrative decisions about employees like, salary adjustments, promotions, employee retention or termination of service, recognition of superior individual performance, identification of poor performers, layoffs and merit...
increases. Figure 4.9 also shows that only 22.5% agreed that PM contributes to revenue generation, only 25% agreed that it enhances the corporate image, only 22.5% agreed that it leads to product and service innovation and only 22.55% agreed that it improves customer focus. All the elements in Figure 4.9 are supposed to improve if the PM process is implemented properly. These findings suggest that there is poor implementation of the PM process.

**Performance management goals**

When asked whether the staff were aware of Destiny organisational goals, the majority indicated that they just know some of the goals (69.2%) while the remaining 30.85% knew all the goals. According to Aguinis (2009), PM is about aligning employee actions to organisational goals. This means, if employees are not aware of the organisational goals they may not be working towards the stated goals. This also affects their innovativeness to achieve the organisational goals.

**Table 4.5: Performance management goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals set for performance management are mutually decided</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My individual goals are aligned to organizational goals</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in the strategic planning process of Destiny Electronics</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed of the strategic planning outcomes</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees should be involved in the strategic planning process</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know and fully understand the Mission for Destiny Electronics</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability statistical test, Cronbach's alpha was 0.45, which shows a moderate level of internal reliability for our scale with this specific study. The average score for performance management goals perceived by the staff was 57.7%, managers (66.7%) and non-managers (54.2%).
4.2.4 Performance management assessors

4.2.4.1 PM assessors rating

Figure 4.10: PM Assessors rating

Figure 4.10 shows that most managerial assessors understand the PM process know the tasks of their subordinates and are generally fair in carrying out the PM assessments. This finding is in line with what was cited by (Winstanley & Stuart-Smith, 1996) who argued that the PM process should ensure respect for the individual, procedural fairness and transparency of decision-making. The research findings are also supported by Asfaw (2007) who stated that employees are concerned with aspects such as, the organization assigning qualified supervisors to manage performance, supervisors knowing what the employees are doing, supervisor understanding the job requirements and difficulty and the supervisor also having knowledge of the PM and rating procedures. According to Torrington, Hall, & Taylor (2005) managers play an essential role in the PM process by motivating, coaching, enabling performance, organising resources, facilitating any development opportunities, monitoring and also
revising performance expectations and objectives. However, the findings contrast with Pukalos (2004) who argued that usually managers are inexperienced at discussing their performance and ineffective at teaching them on how to develop their skills.

### 4.2.4.2 PM assessors’ factors

For the assessors’ parameters, the reliability statistical test, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.80, which shows a high level of internal reliability for the scale used for the study.

**Table 4.6: PM assessors’ factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM assessors’ parameters</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I always feel free to express to my appraiser, my disagreements regarding the appraisal</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destiny provides me with training that is suitable for the proper execution of tasks</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor uses my previous performance appraisals to identify my training needs</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The raters have the required knowledge, experience and training that is necessary to rate the performance of employees</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am performing I receive fairly frequent-and-specific recognition and appreciation for the things I am doing well</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I perform I clearly know what my goals are (level of performance), and can easily accomplish them</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measures of my job are well defined and allow me to collect objective data about my performance every day</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is always prepared before the performance appraisal</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor knows how to give feedback to enable me to understand my developmental needs without killing my self esteem</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor accepts my suggestions</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average score for PM assessors perceived by the staff was 54.0%, managers (64.5%) and non-managers (50.0%). The results in table 4.6 above show that 47.5% disagreed that supervisors are always prepared for performance appraisals. This is supported by Edwards & Williams (1998) who argue that most of the times supervisors are either not ready to conduct appraisals or may not have the required skills to do so thus resulting in employee negative attitude toward the process. The finding indicates that 52.5% of the respondents agreed that their supervisors know how to give effective feedback to enhance development. The remaining 47.5% could be attributed to the fact cited by Pukalos (2004) that in most cases managers may be reluctant to give correct and honest feedback in the discussions with employees as they fear damaging relationships with the individuals they rely on to get work done. This is turn will result in unproductive feedback. Only 45% of the respondents said they receive frequent and specific recognition and appreciation for the work they are doing well which may discourage them since people generally want to be appreciated.

4.2.5 Performance management feedback and outcomes

From the research findings, 65.0% indicated that there was feedback on performance. Most of the respondents (81.1%) agreed that the feedback process was useful. Feedback is indeed useful as advocated by Asfaw (2007), who highlighted that feedback is a major component of PM especially in the performance appraisal stage where after the supervisor rates the employees, they let them know of their progress and this is usually a necessary procedure.
Figure 4.11 shows how often feedback is given or received in the organisation.

Figure 4.11: Feedback frequency

Figure 4.11 shows that 21.1% said feedback is never given, 50% said it is given weekly, 2.6% said fortnightly, 10.5% said monthly and 15% had no specific timing. These findings would imply that there is no uniformity in how feedback is given in the organisation. Further analysis showed that the average score for PM feedback perceived by the all employees was 34.2%, managers (18.2%) and non-managers (40.2%). The reliability statistical test, Cronbach's alpha was 0.51, which shows a moderate level of internal reliability.

4.3 CORRELATION MATRIX OF FACTORS THAT CAUSE RESISTANCE

The study further checked the relationship between the main causes of employee resistance. Most of the factors are related to each other as shown in table 4.7 below. Just to mention one relationship, perception on the PM process was positively related to staff knowledge and skills. The correlation coefficient of \( r=0.595 \) was significant at \( p \)
<0.01. This significance value shows that the probability of this correlation is not by chance.

**Table 4.7: Correlation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge and skills</th>
<th>PM process</th>
<th>PM goals</th>
<th>PM assessors</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>PM system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge and skills</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.595**</td>
<td>.393*</td>
<td>.651**</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance management process</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.595**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.619**</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td>.387*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance management goals</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.393*</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance management assessors</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.651**</td>
<td>.619**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance management system</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.387*</td>
<td>.322*</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>.453**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
4.4 APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS

In order to apply the Principal component Analysis (PCA) the developed composites score variables were used. PCA was used to identify the major determinants of employee resistance. The PCA offered opportunities for data reduction and interpretation based on unobservable structures between variables. In this study, extracted components with Eigen values greater than 1 were retained for analysis. One of the criterions for the PCA is that sampling adequacy must be above 0.50. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy for the study was 0.67 which indicates relatively compact patterns of correlations between variables and hence justifying the use of PCA (Dunteman, 1994).

Using the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to determine principal determinants of employee resistance towards the Performance Management Process, the study found out that there was just one Eigen-value greater than 1 with 52.5% variance explanation. Thus there is one unobservable factor which is best explained by all the explained factors:

Table 4.8: Explanation of the total variance of principal components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigen values</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.153</td>
<td>52.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>15.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>13.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>9.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>5.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>3.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Table 4.8 above indicates that there is just one component to be extracted for these variables and would explain 52.5% of the total variance.

Table 4.9: Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Matrix</th>
<th>Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management Process</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management Goals</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management Assessors</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management System</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge And Skills</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (Rotation converged in 5 iterations).
Factor analysis proves that all the above factors are determinants of employee resistance towards the PM process at this organization. This test reveals that PM assessors and the PM System as well as knowledge and skills are the major contributors of resistance towards the PM process within the organization.

4.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The response rate was high at 89% and thus reliable for the study. Most of the respondents were non-managerial employees. The majority of the respondents were between 41 to 50 years and therefore still had more years at the company. Though most of the employees were aware of the purpose of PM, not all received training about the process. Most of the respondents indicated that there was feedback on the PM process and the feedback was very useful. Less than half of the respondents indicated that they have the adequate resources required to enable them to improve their performance.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 INTRODUCTION

The chapter draws conclusions to the research based on the research objectives in chapter one. The required policy research-related recommendations were also made basing on the research findings in chapter four. The study was an investigation into the causes of employee resistance towards the PM process at Destiny Electronics (Pvt) Ltd.

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were drawn basing on the objectives in chapter one.

5.1.1 Analysis of the PM process at Destiny Electronics and the obstacles to effective operation

The research concluded that;

- Most non-managerial employees are not involved in the strategic planning process and some do not get feedback from the same.
- The PM at the company does not create a participative environment.
- Employee performance has not improved much from the current PM system.
- Not all factors that facilitate or hinder individual performance are taken into account during performance appraisals.
5.1.2 Levels of managerial competencies in managing PM process at Destiny Electronics

The research concluded that;
- Not all managers are always prepared for the performance appraisals
- Not all managers know how to give feedback to their subordinates
- Some supervisors are not willing to accept suggestions from their subordinates
- Most supervisors are aware of the duties of their subordinates and have the required knowledge, experience and training that is necessary to rate the performance of employees.

5.1.3 Measures to be taken by Destiny Electronics to improve the PM process

The research concluded that;
- All employees agreed that they must be aware of the strategic plans and should be part of the goal formulation.

5.1.4 Causes of resistance towards PM

The research findings concluded that some of the main causes of employee resistance towards the PM process at Destiny Electronics were as follows:
- Lack of commitment from both managerial and non-managerial employees,
- Poor implementation of the process,
- Low involvement in goal formulation.
5.2 TESTING THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

The research hypothesis was: *Employee resistance towards the PM process at Destiny Electronics is caused by lack of knowledge, understanding and acceptance of the process by both managerial and non-managerial employees.* The evidence from the research findings shows that to a greater extent employee resistance towards the PM process is caused by lack of knowledge, understanding and acceptance of the process. The findings also revealed other causes of resistance apart from those indicated in the hypothesis such as, lack of commitment, poor feedback, and lack of adequate resources to enhance performance and the possible negative outcomes of the process to the employees being managed.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations based on the study findings are as follows;

5.4.1 Educate all employees of PM

Not all non-managerial employees received education about the PM process and therefore may not effectively participate in the process; therefore everyone in the organisation should be aware of the purpose of the process. Though managers have all been educated about PM, there is still need for refresher courses so that they are continuously reminded of its purpose, importance and the most effective ways to ensure the process is a success.

5.4.2 Enhance commitment from Management

Top managers may be educated about PM but this alone will not be effective is they are not committed to the process. Therefore the culture should be one that has commitment
towards making the process a success and be able to contribute ideas where there is need to improve the process so that it not just more of a yearly ritual but it is done for the success of the organisation.

5.4.3 Enhance commitment from non-managerial employees

The PM system should be fairly rewarding in terms of incentives so as to gain the required commitment from non-managerial employees.

5.4.4 Communicate and ensure transparency and effective feedback

Communication and feedback should be continuous in the PM process and this should also include coaching and counselling.

5.4.5 Train and development employees

One of the end results of a PM process should be training and development where it is needed. However this is not evident in the company. The training and development needs identified during the PM process must be dealt with during the same period if possible.

5.4.6 Avail adequate resources

Employees are more satisfied to perfume when they are given the required resources. These resources include efficient vehicles especially for technicians and sales personnel who drive to customer’s every day, material used by technicians for installations and service repairs financial resources such as salaries should be paid in time.
5.5 RESEARCHER’S CONTRIBUTION TO LITERATURE

The researcher established that the reasons for resistance towards the PM process are more or less the same as those for resistance to change processes. The PM process requires commitment from both managerial and non-managerial employees for it to achieve its goals. The attitudes of employees in the PM process should always be considered as it is a great determinant of the success of the process.

5.6 AREAS OF FURTHER STUDY

An area for further study would be an investigation on how the PM process which was initially developed for western cultures can be modified to suit cultures of developing nations like Zimbabwe.
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7. APPENDIX 1: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Sir / Madam

My name is Dzidzai Mushininga and I am a final year MBA student at the Graduate School of Management, University of Zimbabwe.

As part of my dissertation studies I am currently doing a research study on the causes of resistance towards the performance management process using Destiny Electronics as a case study.

Kindly assist by filling in the questionnaire attached with your honest and objective opinion. Please note that this research is purely for academic purposes and all responses will be treated in strict confidence.

I will greatly appreciate it if you send your responses by 12 July 2013.

Thank you

DzidzaiMushininga

Cell: 0772 271 487

Email: dmwarozva@destiny.co.zw
8. APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EMPLOYEES

Section 1 – Demographic Information

(Please tick the appropriate box)

1. Years of service in the organization
   Less than one year □
   1-3 years □
   4-5 years □
   6-10 years □
   Over 10 years □

2. Years of service on the current job
   Less than one year □
   1-3 years □
   4-5 years □
   6-10 years □
   Over 10 years □

3. Your age
   18-25 □
   26-40 □
   41-50 □
   51-60 □

Section 2 - Skills and knowledge

4. Are you aware of the purpose of Performance management in your organization
   a. Yes □  b. No □

5. Have you received any training on performance management
   a. Yes □  b. No □

6. Below is a Likert scale which requires you to tick appropriately against the statements that are provided in the table below.  SA = Strongly Agree.  A = Agree.  N=Neutral.  D= Disagree.  SD= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My qualifications are suitable for the job I am doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I constantly update my knowledge and know how</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Destiny has aided me in attaining the knowledge that I have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. I am always eager to learn new ways of doing work and make suggestions for performance improvement

e. In my company I have specific and clear results defined that I can control for my job role

f. In my job I know precisely the critical ongoing things to do to help me deliver results

g. Employees should be trained about the performance management process

h. I have the adequate resources required for me to perform my duties efficiently

i. Performance management helps in identifying training needs

### Section 3 – Performance Management process

7. Please tick appropriately against the statements that are provided in the table below.

SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. N=Neutral. D = Disagree. SD= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Performance Management System helps people set and achieve meaningful goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>My leadership and interpersonal skills are developed due to Performance Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Performance management is a worthwhile activity for the growth of the company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>The Performance management implemented at Destiny creates a participative environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>The performance of employees at Destiny has improved due to current Performance Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f. All the factors facilitating and hindering performance are taken into consideration while appraising my performance

g. I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system of my organization?

h. Performance management is taken seriously in the organization by both managerial and non-managerial staff

i. There is need to adjust or totally change the process at Destiny Electronics

j. The time and cost of performance management is justified.

8. How do you rate the performance management system at Destiny Electronics in terms of the following – Tick your answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Employee involvement in goal formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Employee involvement in determining performance ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Staff knowledge of the appraisal system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Supervisor’s fairness in conducting appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Accuracy of techniques used in rating performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you think that effective implementation of the performance management process is one of the best ways to achieve competitive advantage for Destiny Electronics in the long run?

Strongly agree ☐  Agree ☐  Disagree ☐  Strongly Disagree ☐
10. To what extent does performance management contribute in achieving the following at Destiny Electronics
(Circle the appropriate number against each factor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a lesser extent</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Improving competitive advantage 1 2 3 4
b. Improving customer focus 1 2 3 4
c. Product and service innovations 1 2 3 4
d. Enhancement of corporate image 1 2 3 4
e. Employee development and empowerment 1 2 3 4
f. Revenue growth 1 2 3 4
g. Improved decision making 1 2 3 4

Section 4 – Performance management goals

11. Are you aware of the Destiny organizational goals

a. Yes all of them  b. Some of them  c. No

12. Please tick appropriately against the statements that are provided in the table below.

SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. N=Neutral. D = Disagree. SD= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Goals set for performance management are mutually decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My individual goals are aligned to organizational goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I am involved in the strategic planning process of Destiny Electronics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I am informed of the strategic planning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Employees should be involved in the strategic planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I know and fully understand the Mission for Destiny Electronics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 5 – Performance management assessors

Assessment scale – 1- Very low 2- Rather low 3 – Medium 4 – Rather high 5 – Very High

13. How would you rate your assessors in terms of:

   a. Fairness
   b. Knowledge of your job and tasks
   c. Understanding of the PM process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. |   |   |   |   |   |
   b. |   |   |   |   |   |
   c. |   |   |   |   |   |

14. Please tick appropriately against the statements that are provided in the table below.

SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. N=Neutral. D = Disagree. SD= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I always feel free to express to my appraiser, my disagreements regarding the appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Destiny provides me with training that is suitable for the proper execution of tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My supervisor uses my previous performance appraisals to identify my training needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The raters have the required knowledge, experience and training that is necessary to rate the performance of employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. When I am performing I receive fairly frequent and specific recognition and appreciation for the things I am doing well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. When I perform I clearly know what my goals are (level of performance), and can easily accomplish them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Performance measures of my job are well defined and allow me to collect objective data about my performance every day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. My supervisor is always prepared before the performance appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
i. My supervisor knows how to give feedback to enable me to understand my developmental needs without killing my self esteem

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

j. My supervisor accepts my suggestions

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Section 6 – Performance management feedback and outcomes

15. Is there a feedback process?
   a. Yes [ ]  
   b. No [ ]

16. How often do you receive feedback from your supervisor apart from the appraisal time
   - Never [ ]
   - Weekly [ ]
   - Fortnightly [ ]
   - Monthly [ ]
   - Other [ ]

17. Is the feedback useful in clarifying performance expectations
   a. Yes [ ]  
   b. No [ ]

18. Please tick appropriately against the statements that are provided in the table below.
   SA= Strongly Agree. A= Agree. N=Neutral. D = Disagree. SD= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Destiny Electronics provides a process whereby employees can formally comment on and appeal their performance evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Performance management outcomes are effectively used for providing a basis for making operational human capital decisions like salaries and promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Promotions should be based on performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I discuss my performance with my supervisor apart from the prescribed times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Have you encountered any resistance in carrying out the performance management process:
   a. Yes □
   b. No □

20. Are you satisfied with the current performance management system:
   a. Yes □
   b. No □

21. If your answer above is No, what are the causes of your dissatisfaction?
   You are allowed to tick more than one cause.
   a. Lack of knowledge and understanding of the process □
   b. Unskilled supervisors to manage performance □
   c. Lack of proper and timely feedback □
   d. Lack of resources to do the required tasks □
   e. Fear of the outcomes and decisions of the process and appraisal □
   f. Negative individual perceptions □

22. How can performance management be improved at Destiny Electronics?
   You are allowed to tick more than one box
   a. Educate all non-managerial employees about the process □
   b. Educate all managers on how to manage performance □
   c. Change the current system – Balanced Scorecard □
   d. Effective feedback to all employees about the company’s strategy □
   e. Fairness in performance management □

END OF QUESTIONNAIRE

THANK YOU VERY MUCH
9. APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MANAGERS

Section 1 – Demographic Information

(Please tick the appropriate box)
1. Years of service in the organization
   Less than one year □
   1-3 years □
   4-5 years □
   6-10 years □
   Over 10 years □

2. Years of service on the current job
   Less than one year □
   1-3 years □
   4-5 years □
   6-10 years □
   Over 10 years □

3. Your age
   18-25 □
   26-40 □
   41-50 □
   51-60 □

Section 2 - Skills and knowledge

4. Are you aware of the purpose of Performance management in your organization
   a. Yes □     b. No □

5. Have you received any training on performance management
   a. Yes □     b. No □

6. Below is a Likert scale which requires you to tick appropriately against the statements that are provided in the table below. SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. N=Neutral. D= Disagree. SD= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section 3 – Performance Management process**

7. Please tick appropriately against the statements that are provided in the table below.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k. Performance Management System helps people set and achieve meaningful goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. My leadership and interpersonal skills are developed through the Performance Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Performance management is a worthwhile activity for the growth of the company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. The Performance management implemented at Destiny creates a participative environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. The performance of employees at Destiny has improved due to current Performance Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the factors facilitating and hindering performance are taken into consideration while appraising performance.

I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system of my organization?

Performance management is taken seriously in the organization by both managerial and non-managerial staff.

There is need to adjust or totally change the process at Destiny Electronics.

The time and cost of performance management is justified.

| p. All the factors facilitating and hindering performance are taken into consideration while appraising performance |
| q. I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system of my organization? |
| r. Performance management is taken seriously in the organization by both managerial and non-managerial staff |
| s. There is need to adjust or totally change the process at Destiny Electronics |
| t. The time and cost of performance management is justified. |

8. How do you rate the performance management system at Destiny Electronics in terms of the following – Tick your answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Employee involvement in goal formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Employee involvement in determining performance ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Staff knowledge of the appraisal system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Supervisor’s fairness in conducting appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Accuracy of techniques used in rating performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you think that effective implementation of the performance management process is one of the best ways to achieve competitive advantage for Destiny Electronics in the long run?

Strongly agree ☐ Agree ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree ☐
10. To what extent does performance management contribute in achieving the following at Destiny Electronics
(Circle the appropriate number against each factor)

Not at all 1  To a lesser extent 2  Moderately 3  To a great extent 4

h. Improving competitive advantage 1 2 3 4
i. Improving customer focus 1 2 3 4
j. Product and service innovations 1 2 3 4
k. Enhancement of corporate image 1 2 3 4
l. Employee development and empowerment 1 2 3 4
m. Revenue growth 1 2 3 4
n. Improved decision making 1 2 3 4

Section 4 – Performance management goals

11. Are you aware of the Destiny organizational goals

a. Yes all of them  b. Some of them  c. No

12. Please tick appropriately against the statements that are provided in the table below.
SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. N=Neutral. D = Disagree. SD= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g. Goals set for performance management are mutually decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. My individual goals are aligned to organizational goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I am involved in the strategic planning process of Destiny Electronics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. I inform my subordinates of the strategic planning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Employees should be involved in the strategic planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. I know and fully understand the Mission for Destiny Electronics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 5 – Performance management assessors

Assessment scale – 1- Very low 2- Rather low 3 – Medium 4 – High 5 – Very High

13. How would you rate yourself as an assessor in terms of:

   d. Fairness
      
      e. Knowledge of subordinate job and task
      1 2 3 4 5

   f. Understanding of the PM process
      1 2 3 4 5

14. Please tick appropriately against the statements that are provided in the table below.

   SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. N=Neutral. D = Disagree. SD= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section 6 – Performance management feedback and outcomes**

15. Is there a feedback process?
   a. Yes   b. No

16. How often do you give feedback to your subordinates apart from the appraisal time
   Never
   Weekly
   Fortnightly
   Monthly
   Other

17. Is the feedback useful in clarifying performance expectations
   a. Yes   b. No

18. Please tick appropriately against the statements that are provided in the table below.
   SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. N=Neutral. Disagree. SD= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. Destiny Electronics provides a process whereby employees can formally comment on and appeal their performance evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Performance management outcomes are effectively used for providing a basis for making operational human capital decisions like salaries and promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Promotions are based on performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Have you encountered any resistance in carrying out the performance management process
   a. Yes   b. No

20. How was the resistance manifested?:
   a. Verbal criticism
   b. Delays in submitting requirements
21. What do you think were the causes of the resistance
    You are allowed to tick more than one cause.
    a. Lack of knowledge and understanding of the process
    b. Unskilled supervisors to manage performance
    c. Lack of proper and timely feedback
    d. Lack of resources to do the required tasks
    e. Fear of the outcomes and decisions of the process and appraisal
    f. Negative individual perceptions

22. How can performance management be improved at Destiny Electronics?
    You are allowed to tick more than one box
    a. Educate all non-managerial employees about the process
    b. Educate all managers on how to manage performance
    c. Change the current system – Balanced Scorecard
    d. Effective feedback to all employees about the company’s strategy
    e. Fairness in performance management

END OF QUESTIONNAIRE

THANK YOU VERY MUCH
15 February 2013

Attention: THE CEO

Dear Sir

APPROVAL TO CARRY OUT A RESEARCH AT DESTINY ELECTRONICS

I am seeking approval to carry out a research project at Destiny Electronics (Pvt) Ltd. I am a student with the University of Zimbabwe – Graduate School of Management) and wish to investigate the causes of employee resistance towards the performance management process: A case of Destiny Electronics for the period January 2011 to June 2013. This is in partial fulfilment of my MBA programme. The research will be used purely for academic purposes and a copy of this dissertation will be availed to the Authority upon completion.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours faithfully

Dzidzai Mushininga

Cc: The Human Resources Manager