

**Exploring the effectiveness of a performance enhancement  
programme within an electricity supply company**

**Tsepiso Patricia Lekaota**

21863776

Mini-dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
*Master of Business Administration* at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North-West  
University.

**Study Leader:** Retha Scholtz

November 2011

## **Abstract**

Poor employee performance is one of employer's most common challenges. The study aims to explore the effectiveness of a Performance Enhancement Programme (PEP) used within an electricity supply company and identifying the contributing factors for managers and supervisors not utilizing the programme.

The research method consists of two parts, a literary review and an empirical study. The empirical study was done by means of a survey conducted on a sample of 210 Eskom supervisors and managers of the North Western Region of Eskom. The measuring instrument consisted of a structured questionnaire, developed by the researcher.

The results revealed that supervisors and managers are using PEP and that they see it as a good tool to manage poor performance. Respondents indicated very clearly that they need training to be able to address poor performance. The findings concerning the effectiveness of the PEP were inconclusive.

The small sample size was a limitation to the study. The questionnaire proved to be lacking in determining the effectiveness of the Performance Enhancement Programme. The sample only included supervisors and managers in the North Western Region of Eskom. Further research needs to be conducted with a larger sample including employees on all levels.

**Key words:** Performance Enhancement Programme (PEP), Eskom, employee performance, training

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank and acknowledge several people who assisted me in the process of completing this mini-dissertation:

- To my Mother, Selina Tsalinyane Lekaota, for raising and supporting me all the way.
- My beautiful daughter, Paballo Bandile Shandu, and my siblings, for being there for me.
- A special word of thanks to the Engineering Manager of Eskom (NWR), Mr Sidney Makaleng, for believing in me and for his support through my studies.
- To my study leader Retha Scholtz, from the North-West University, for her leadership and encouragement.
- To all my MBA lecturers at the Vanderbijlpark Campus of the North-West University, who have made a lasting impression during the past three years of my studies.
- To Antoinette Bisschoff, who conducted a full language edit on this mini-dissertation.
- To Sibusiso Ndzukuma of the North-West University, who assisted me with the statistical analysis.
- To my Vahluri group members (Blessing Buthelezi, Reuben Kgagara, Joseph Dlodlo, Lourence Chauke and Stanley Ngobeni), for their support and hard work, if it was not because of their commitment to the team we would not have made it.
- Lastly to God, for giving me the health and strength to complete my MBA studies.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1 INTRODUCTION	9
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT	11
1.3 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY	12
1.3.1 Primary objective	12
1.3.2 Secondary objective	12
1.4 SCOPE OF THE STUDY	12
1.5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	13
1.5.1 Phase 1: Literature review	13
1.5.2 Phase 2: Empirical study	13
1.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	13
1.7 LAYOUT OF THE STUDY	14
1.8 SUMMARY	14
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
2.1 INTRODUCTION	15
2.2 PERFORMANCE	15
2.3 POOR PERFORMANCE	17
2.3.1 Causes of under-performance	18
2.3.2 Researched causes of poor performance	19
2.4 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	20
2.5 PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL	26
2.6 SOUTH AFRICA'S PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL DILEMMA	31
2.7 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS	32
2.8 TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT OR SYSTEM APPROACH	32
2.9 PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT	32
2.10 REWARD SYSTEM	38
2.11 PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMME	38

<b>2.12</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>38</b>
 <b>CHAPTER 3: EMPIRICAL STUDY</b>		
<b>3.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>GATHERING OF DATA</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.3.1</b>	<b>Development and construction of questionnaire</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.3.2</b>	<b>Data collection</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION OF THE RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>3.5</b>	<b>THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PEP</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>3.6</b>	<b>CONTRIBUTING FACTORS FOR MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS TO USE PEP</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>3.7</b>	<b>CONTRIBUTING FACTORS FOR MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS NOT TO USE PEP</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>3.8</b>	<b>RELIABILITY ANALYSIS</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>3.9</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>68</b>
 <b>CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
<b>4.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>4.4</b>	<b>CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE STUDY</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>4.5</b>	<b>SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>4.6</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>76</b>
 <b>REFERENCE</b>		 <b>77</b>
 <b>Annexure A</b>		 <b>81</b>
<b>Annexure B</b>		<b>87</b>
<b>Annexure C</b>		<b>89</b>
<b>Annexure D</b>		<b>92</b>

## List of Tables

Table 2.1:	Twenty key requirement for an effective performance management system	23
Table 3.1:	Gender	42
Table 3.2:	Age group	44
Table 3.3:	Mangrade	44
Table 3.4:	Area of work	45
Table 3.5:	Experience	45
Table 3.6:	Departments	46
Table 3.7:	Question B1	46
Table 3.8:	Question B2	47
Table 3.9:	Question B3	47
Table 3.10:	Question B4	48
Table 3.11:	Question B5	48
Table 3.12:	Question B6	49
Table 3.13:	Question B7	49
Table 3.14:	Question B8	50
Table 3.15:	Question B9	50
Table 3.16:	Question B10	51
Table 3.17:	Question B11	51
Table 3.18:	Question B12	52
Table 3.19:	Question B13	52
Table 3.20:	Question B14	53
Table 3.21:	Question C1	53
Table 3.22:	Question C2	54
Table 3.23:	Question C3	54
Table 3.24:	Question C4	55
Table 3.25:	Question C5	55
Table 3.26:	Question C6	56
Table 3.27:	Question C7	56
Table 3.28:	Question C8	57
Table 3.29:	Question C9	57
Table 3.30:	Question C10	58
Table 3.31:	Question C11	58
Table 3.32:	Question C12	59

Table 3.33:	Question D1	59
Table 3.34:	Question D2	60
Table 3.35:	Question D3	60
Table 3.36:	Question D4A	61
Table 3.37:	Question D4B	61
Table 3.38:	Question D5	62
Table 3.39:	Question D6	62
Table 3.40:	Question D7	63
Table 3.41:	Question D8	63
Table 3.42:	Question D9	64
Table 3.43:	Question D10	64
Table 3.44:	Question D11	65
Table 3.45:	Question D12	65
Table 3.46:	Question D13	66
Table 3.47:	Question D14	66
Table 3.48:	Class A Reliability Statistics	67
Table 3.49:	Class B Reliability Statistics	67
Table 3.50:	Class C Reliability Statistics	68

## List of Abbreviations

BCS	-Balance Scorecard
BEM	-Behaviour Engineering Model
EPE	-Employee Performance Enhancement
HPE	-Human Performance Enhancement
HPT	-Human Performance Technology
HR	-Human Resource
NBIC	-Nanotechnology, Biotechnology, Information Technology and Cognitive Science
NWR	-North Western Region
PA	-Performance Enhancement
PEP	-Performance Enhancement Programme
TQM	-Total Quality Management
USA	-United States of America



# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. INTRODUCTION

Research by White (2008:66) indicates that underperforming employees are more likely to be absent from work, fail to meet their work objectives, and have generally a lower working standard than their colleagues. The longer the manager allows this behaviour to go uncorrected, the more fellow employees will follow this unabated attitude and soon poor performance becomes the new expectation. Poor employee performance is one of employer's most common challenges. Managers faced with difficulty conversations about work standard and potentially litigious staff often avoids dealing with it or do not handle it very well. Russel (2010:28) further debates that ignoring the issue can de-motivate other staff; therefore poor performance should be dealt with. Armstrong & Baron (2005:136) agrees that managers need to deal with poor performance; dealing with poor performance is necessary to establish that there is a problem, diagnose its cause, and decide on what needs to be done by the manager or the individual to overcome the problem.

Sometimes, it is tempting to quickly just rid an organisation of poor performers however, a poor performer must rather be offered help to overcome a deficiency. Even if a poor performing employee has been trained, it is wise to retrain. This may be redundant. Regardless, it is best to always give the employee the benefit of the doubt and provide remedial training when a poor performer lingers (Stanley, 2007:9). Employee Performance Enhancement (EPE) or Human Performance Enhancement (HPE) is the field focused on systematically and holistically improving present and future work results achieved by people in organisational setting (Rothwell, 2005:36).

The idea that science and technology can and should be used to enhance human performance was first elaborately developed in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Prior to this, science and technology played only a minor role in theorizing about improving human performance, if at all. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century this situation changed under the influence of rapid developments in the natural sciences and technology. As achievements mounted, the idea of using scientific and technological means to enhance human performance, gradually emerged (Gordijn, 2006:726). Cognitive enhancements are envisioned by many as a future component of education and by some as a future component of jobs (Wolbring 2008:28). Eugenics and

performance enhancement through sports were both based on a rationale of preventative biological social engineering (Hau 2008:407).

Individuals may perform badly because of a lack of ability or insufficient motivation. Poor performance may not be their fault; it could arise from a defective system of work, inadequate leadership or guidance, the allocation of inappropriate tasks, placement in jobs that are beyond their capabilities or insufficient training. The performance management sequence of planning, monitoring and review provides the ideal framework for managing performance generally and for dealing with poor performance when it occurs (Armstrong & Baron, 2005:135).

Performance refers to how well an employee is fulfilling the requirements of the job. Basically, an employee's performance is determined by a combination of three factors - effort, ability and direction (Rue & Byars, 2010:291). Employee performance common to most jobs includes: quantity of output, quality of output, timelessness of output, presence at work and cooperativeness. Organisations use various terms to describe this process. Performance review, annual appraisal, performance evaluation, employee evaluation and merit evaluation are some of the terms used (Carrell & Halfield, 2006:262). Armstrong & Baron (2005:135) support the opinion that although the management of performance is a continuous process, formal performance reviews clearly provide a good opportunity to analyse and to reflect on performance problems and to agree to solutions.

In order for a manager or supervisor to come to a conclusion that the employee is performing or underperforming, the performance needs to be evaluated this is done by means of performance appraisal. Performance appraisal (PA) is the ongoing process of evaluating and managing both the behaviours and outcomes in the workplace (Carrell & Halfield, 2006:262). Despite the poor track record organisations have in implementing appraisal processes well, the research supports the linkage between feedback and performance. Early studies concluded that objective feedback as a means for improving individual and group performance has been "impressively effective" and has been supported by a large number of literature reviews over the years (Cummings & Worley, 2009:431).

Performance appraisal involves collecting and disseminating performance data to improve work outcomes. It is the primary human resources management intervention for providing performance feedback to individuals and work groups. Performance appraisal is a systematic process of jointly assessing work-related achievements, strengths and weaknesses. It can also facilitate career counselling provide information about the strength

and diversity of human resources in the company, and link employee performance with rewards (Cummings & Worley, 2008:420).

During PA, individuals who have challenges with their performance can be identified. How non-performance in the workplace is managed has a direct impact on the profitability of the organisation. Managers sometimes feel that they are too busy or have other pressing decisions to make, to manage non-performance. They feel that somehow it will sort itself out, and that people are just going through a difficult patch. The truth of the matter is that if Managers do not take positive action, considerable damage can be done both in terms of the relationships between people within the company and with customers. This in turn affects the reputation of the organisation (Anon).

An Employers and Manufacturers Association review of the 521 cases which went before the Employment Relations Authority in 2008 showed that 67% fell in favour of employees. Part of the problem is that in many cases employers do not follow the required process, especially when it comes to dealing with poor performance in the workplace (Atkins, 2009:22).

Eskom developed and implemented a Performance Enhancement Programme with the aim of addressing poor performance and associated negative results thereof in the company.

## **1.2. PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The Performance Enhancement Programme (PEP) implemented by Eskom, was designed for “close supervision” to ensure that the organisation, represented by the responsible manager, does all that is reasonable to enable the employee to perform at an acceptable level. It is not a punitive measure, but rather a responsible effort of the organisation to rectify performance problems and to assist employees (Nyalungu, 2004:12).

The purpose of this study is to examine the effectiveness of this programme (PEP) and the causes and consequences of not utilizing the Performance Enhancement Programme to address poor performance within Eskom.

This study further aims to reveal the attitudes and beliefs of the supervisors and managers over the Performance Enhancement Programme, and to identify the contributing factors towards these attitudes and beliefs. First determine whether training provided for supervisors and managers is sufficient, and then determine why some supervisors and managers are using the Performance Enhancement Programme and others do not use it at all.

Poor performance needs to be managed in the workplace therefore it is the responsibility of managers and supervisors to manage poor performance. The challenge for the company under research is to get the buy-in of all employees in support of the Performance Enhancement Programme designed to address poor performance, as this will determine the effectiveness of the programme.

It is imperative for managers and supervisors to manage poor performance. The main focus of the research is to measure the effectiveness of PEP and to identify contributing factors leading to the PEP not being used as expected.

### **1.3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The objectives of the study are divided into primary and secondary objectives.

#### **1.3.1. Primary objective**

The primary objective of the study is to investigate the effectiveness of Performance Enhancement Programme (PEP) used by Eskom.

#### **1.3.2. Secondary objective**

The specific objectives of this research are:

- Identify contributing factors for Managers and Supervisors to use PEP;
- Identify contributing factors for Managers and Supervisors not to use PEP;
- To measure the importance of these factors for PEP usage;
- If possible come with an alternative method to deal with non-performance.

### **1.4. SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

The research will be focusing on Senior Supervisors and Managers from different disciplines within Eskom. All the Supervisors and Managers are Power Utility Employees based in Gauteng and the Free State that falls under North Western Region Distribution.

The research includes both male and females of various ages, Power Utility Managers as well as Supervisors. The population is based in both Gauteng and the Free State. The size of the population is 422, while the sample size consists of 210 participants.

## **1.5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This research will consist of two phases, namely a literature review and an empirical study, which will be conducted by means of a questionnaire. A quantitative research method will be used.

### **1.5.1 Phase 1: Literature review**

The literature study will focus on performance at the workplace in general, performance appraisal and measures used by different companies to address non-performance.

### **1.5.2 Phase 2: Empirical study**

This phase of the study will consist of a survey conducted on a sample of 210 of the managers of the North West Region of Eskom, by means of a questionnaire. The measuring instrument will consist of structured questions developed by the researcher. The questionnaire will be phrased in English. There is no existing data to compare with the results of the research.

Confidentiality of information is imperative, thus participants will be assured that the information provided will be treated confidential and the results of the research are mainly for research purposes. The participants will be requested to complete a set of questionnaires which will be very easy to complete as it is divided into sections.

## **1.6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

- The findings of the research may be limited to Power Utility Distribution North Western region however the information gained may be used to guide future investigations examining the effectiveness of PEP used in the Power Utility.
- No previous research has been undertaken on this topic and as a result searching for information on the topic may be challenging.
- The population is based in Gauteng and the Free State, which may affect the distribution of questionnaires.
- The performance of employees and the results are treated with confidentiality, which can affect the end result of the research.

## **1.7. LAYOUT OF THE STUDY**

### **Chapter one: Introduction**

- Chapter one introduces the researched topic.

### **Chapter two: Literature review**

- Chapter two presents a literature review

### **Chapter three: Research Methodology and Results**

- Chapter three presents and discusses the research methodology and the results thereof.

### **Chapter four: Conclusion and Recommendations**

- Chapter four presents the conclusion drawn from the research and the recommendations made by the researcher.

## **1.8. SUMMARY**

In this Chapter the introduction performance, poor performance and human enhancement were introduced. The research motivation was covered and some of the research questions were addressed.

In Chapter two the literature review is going to be conducted. The main purpose is to understand what performance, poor performance and performance enhancement are. In performance enhancement the focus will be on ways to enhance performance to get the expected output from the employees.

# CHAPTER 2

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter two will explore the literature and will focus on performance, performance management and enhancement of employee performance. The aim of this chapter is to identify factors that are essential for an effective performance management system in order to be able to compare and investigate the effectiveness of the Performance Enhancement Programme used in the Power Utility.

### 2.2. PERFORMANCE

Performance is defined as realising goals and meeting expectations. This definition is limited because it says nothing about the unlocking of human potential. A popular way to describe performance is by means of the following formula:

***Performance=Skills and abilities X Motivation X Resources.***

With this formula as departure point, the manager's task is to see to it that the members have the required skills and abilities (effective selection and training), that they are motivated and have the necessary resources (equipment, tools, information) to do their work (Coetsee, 2003:139).

Performance is often defined simply in output terms - the achievement of quantified objectives, but performance is a matter not only of what people achieve but how they achieve it. The Oxford English Dictionary confirms this by including the phrase 'carrying out' in its definition of performance. 'The accomplishment, execution, carrying out, working out of anything ordered or undertaken'. High performance results from appropriate behaviour, especially discretionary behaviour, and the effective use of the required knowledge, skills and competencies (Armstrong, 2006:7).

Performance refers to how well an employee is fulfilling the requirements of the job. Basically, an employee's performance is determined by a combination of three factors - effort, ability and direction. Effort refers to how hard a person works, ability is concerned with the person's capability, And direction refers to how well the person understands what is

expected. Performance is often confused with effort. Although a person's performance is somewhat dependent on effort, it should be measured in terms of the results achieved, not in terms of the effort expended, Rue *et al.*, (2010:291).

An employee's performance can be influenced by conditions that are not under the employee's direct control. These factors include inadequate working facilities and equipment, restrictive policies that affect the job, lack of cooperation from other people and departments, and even luck. One job of the supervisor is to work with other levels of management to eliminate factors that can negatively affect the performance of employees, Rue *et al.*, (2010:292).

***Three types of performance criteria can be found:***

- **Trait-based criteria:** Focus on the personal characteristics of the employee, e.g. loyalty, dependability, creativity and communication skills. Here the focus is on what a person is and not on what he or she does or accomplishes on the job.
- **Behaviour-based criteria:** These are concerned with specific behaviours that lead to the job success.
- **Results or outcome based criteria:** Focus on what was accomplished or produced rather than how it was accomplished or produced, Grobler *et al.*, (2006:264).

"It does not work in our organisation": A remark often heard when talking to managers about the performance evaluation system in their organisation. The most important reason for this remark is that many managers and employees report that they experience it as threatening, demotivating and that they see it as a waste of time (Coetsee, 2003:142). Rue adds that to obtain an acceptable level of performance, all three of the factors that determine performance must be present to some extent. If an employee puts forth a great deal of effort, has above-average ability, but lacks a good understanding of the job, the probable results would be unsatisfactory performance. If an employee understands what is expected on the job, works very hard, but lacks the ability to do the job, his or her performance would also be poor. Finally, if an employee has good ability, understands the job, but is lazy and exerts little effort; his or her performance is also likely to be poor, Rue *et al.*, (2010:292).

Coetsee's view, after having looked at the performance evaluation systems in a variety of organisations, is that many of the systems are out-dated, badly designed and managed, and contribute very little to equitable rewards, the recognition of performance and of employee contributions and, in some cases, are even instrumental in creating a demotivating climate (Coetsee, 2003:142).



Another observation is that, in a significant number of cases where the performance evaluation system fails, it could not be ascribed to the particular system or technique used, but rather to how the system was designed, implemented, applied and managed (Coetsee, 2003:143).

## **2.3 POOR PERFORMANCE**

The term 'performance' is a neutral term and includes performance levels ranging from poor or under-performance, through acceptable performance, to outstanding performance. The under-performance of employees is an indication that supervisors and managers are also under-performing. It is their task to make their team members successful (Coetsee, 2003:148). Russel (2008:67) agrees that the manager in today's working world is only as good as the team he is leading. On the other hand, Stanley (2007:8) feels that an employee with habitually poor performance can drive a supervisor to the brink and drain an organisation of valuable resources. Even though highly motivated professional managers and supervisors have the capacity to deal with a chronic poor performer, management energy would be better used in organisational efficiencies.

Where an employee falls short of the standards, the manager is required to follow a clearly prescribed process to correct the employee, give him or her real and reasonable opportunity to reach the standards, and to follow a formal procedure where he or she does not. If the employee fails in this, the manager either has to tolerate the poor performance or assess whether the organisation is exposed to the risk of unfair dismissal or constructive unfair dismissal claims. The situation may result in a manager being the subject grievance sitting and harassment for simply trying to do his or her job. In face of such behaviour, many managers simply let the whole thing hang (Russell, 2011:07). Atkins (2009:22) adds that poor performance issues can seriously impact on productivity, team spirit and workplace culture. If the correct process is followed when dealing with the problem, it may remedy the problem in the early stages without the need for further action.

Early detection and correction gives the poor performer a chance to learn and turn - to receive coaching and turn around the bad behaviours before those behaviours become the norm (Russel, 2008: 66). All managers are familiar with employees who exhibit "below standard" performance. Often, these people are not terrible employees, they are just not doing what they should be doing. "This is a problem faced by many managers", says Jennifer Forgie, managing partner at *OnPoint Consulting*. "They are hesitant to deal with performance issues, so they send indirect messages and ignore the situation hoping it will

go away” (Forgie, 2007:3). Laff (2007:98) agrees that managers need to address performance issues early and directly by identifying the problem and warning an employee about the consequences of poor performance.

The impact on the organisation as a whole can be dramatic, since 92% of human resources practitioners say poor individual performance affects the motivation and morale of fellow employees. More than half of the human resource executives say that poor performers are responsible for more complaints from customers (White, 2008:66).

### **2.3.1 Causes of Under-performance**

Under-Performance is a result of one or more of the following:

*Employees who:*

- Don't know what to do;
- Can't do the work (unable);
- Don't want to do the work (apathetic); and
- Don't have the psychological equipment and/or mindset to do the work.

*Managers-leaders who do not:*

- Inspire with a vision (goal and values);
- Energise and support their team members;
- Empower people (necessary knowledge, skills, freedom, etc.);
- Create an atmosphere of fun and enjoyment in which people experience job satisfaction;
- Trust people and regard them as trustworthy.

The key to obtaining good performance, therefore, is to encourage effort by employees, to develop their ability, and to clearly communicate what they are expected to do on the job. A supervisor can use several means to ensure that employees are properly directed Rue *et al.*, (2010:293). The creation of a motivating climate is probably the most appropriate method of transforming under-performance into good performance (Coetsee, 2003:149).

### **2.3.2 Researched causes of poor performance**

According to research the following can contribute to poor performance:

#### ***The lack of promotion***

The opportunity to grow in a career sense, to be promoted to higher levels of responsibility, is endemic to the American culture. Such opportunity for vertical mobility is seen as crucial for one's psychological health and life satisfaction. Therefore, what happens when the opportunity for promotion and career growth no longer exists? There are many possible behavioural implications of having attained a plateau; from the organisation's perspective a key concern is the person's level of performance. But again in the interviews conducted with a number of corporate executives, they report that some plateaued managers continued to perform at high levels while the level of performance of other managers diminishes, Carnassa *et al.*, (1981:8).

#### ***Workplace stressors***

Over the past four decades, significant changes have occurred within the workplace. The increase in information communication technology, the globalization of many industries, company restructuring, and changes in job contracts and workplace pattern, have all contributed to the transformation of the nature of work. Jones, Huxtable, Hodgson and Price (2003) estimates that up to 5million British employees felt "very" or "extremely" stressed by their work. They estimated that on average, each person affected took 28.5 days off from work per year and that stress, depression, or anxiety was the second most prevalent type of work-related ill-health after musculo-skeletal disorders, Edwards *et al.*, (2007:99).

The model suggests that there is a curvilinear relation between stressors and performance. This theory, that originates from the activation theory of motivation, argues that low levels of stressors initially increase performance but an optimum is then reached after which increased stress levels negatively affects performance, Edwards *et al.*, (2007:100).

#### ***Psychological contract breach***

Psychological contract breach occurs when an employee feels that the organisation has failed to deliver satisfactorily on its promises. For example, an employee may have the expectation that the organisation will provide training and development. This expectation serves as a foundation of the psychological contract and failure on the part of the organisation to provide development opportunities, results in contract breach. Psychological

contract has negative consequences for employees and the organisation (Restubog *et al.*, 2006:299).

The social exchange theory argues that when one party provides something to another, it expects the other party to reciprocate by providing some contributions in return. Thus, when an organisation fails to provide the promised returns (i.e. psychological contract breach) employees may withhold their contributions to the organisation (Restubog *et al.*, 2006:230).

### ***Absenteeism***

The impact of health on work is complex, but has generally been understood in terms of absence from the workplace, termed 'absenteeism', or remaining in the workplace despite illness, termed 'presenteeism'. The costs of work absence have consistently been demonstrated to be high. Research has shown that work characteristics and conditions of employment, as well as an individual's perceptions of work, are occupational risk factors for absence and performance in the workplace (Wynne-Jones *et al.*, 2009:556).

### ***Negative job attitude***

Few topics in industrial and organisational psychology have received as much attention as has the relation between job attitudes and performance. Positive job attitude, such as commitment and satisfaction, are accompanied by better work outcomes (Riketta, 2008:472).

## **2.4 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT**

Performance management is an integrated process of defining, assessing and reinforcing employee work behaviours and outcomes. Organisations with a well-developed performance management process often outperform those without this element of organisation design. Performance management includes practises and methods for goal setting, performance appraisal and reward systems. These practices jointly influence the performance of individuals and work groups (Cummings & Worley, 2009:421).

Performance management can again be defined as a systematic process for improving organisational performance by developing the performance of individuals and teams - It means getting better results from the organisation, the teams and individuals by understanding and managing performance within an agreed framework of planned goals,

standards and competence requirements (Armstrong, 2006:1 and Meyer & Kirsten, 2005:59).

It is evident from the above definition that the aim of performance management is not to identify the shortcomings of staff members, but rather to create an environment in which they can be developed to improve their performance. Moreover, employee performance is dependent on the support of management (Meyer & Kirsten, 2005:60).

Performance management is a way of measuring and making sure that the activities of everyone in the organisation are aligned with the overall shared mission, vision and goals of the company. An appropriate performance management program explains what performance mean, how it is measured and provides timely feedback to those responsible for accomplishing the tasks. Most performance management programs are designed to align employee activities to the firm's goals, provide useful data to make administratively educated decisions about employees, and to provide appropriate feedback to employees, so that they can correct their shortcomings in a timely manner and build on the strength (Mujtaba & Shuaib, 2010:112). Armstrong (2006:8) agrees that performance is about upholding the values of the organisation - 'living the values'. One of the most fundamental purposes of performance management is to align individual and organisational objectives. This means that everything people do at work leads to outcomes that further the achievement of the organisational goals. Dervitsiotis (2001:689) also agrees that encouraging individual learning and the development of a shared vision for an organisation, have made participatory management a prerequisite for the effective motivation and mobilization of all human resources in a firm; through the development of a compelling shared vision, one in which employees can see a reflection of their own personal vision.

Goal setting specifies the kinds of performances that are desired; performance appraisal assessed those outcomes; reward systems provide the reinforcement to ensure that desired outcomes are repeated (Cummings & Worley, 2009:422). Armstrong (2006:54) adds that objectives describe something that has to be accomplished. Objectives or goals define what the organisations, functions, departments and individuals are expected to achieve over a period of time.

Goal setting involves managers and subordinates in jointly establishing and clarifying employee goals. In cases such as management by objectives, it can also facilitate employee counselling and support. It generates goals in several defined categories, at different organisational levels, to establish clear linkages with business strategy. The process of

establishing challenging goals involves managing the level of participation and goal difficulty. Once goals have been established, the way they are measured is an important determinant of member performance (Cummings & Worley, 2009:422).

Feedback is a very important part of any performance management system and should be given careful attention and consideration. Feedback to employees should be presented in such a way that it results in better performance, enhanced productivity, higher motivation and increased morale. Performance management is a system that is made up of several interdependent internal processes. It begins when a job is initially defined and ends when an employee leaves the company. Appraisals are just one part of an overall process that covers everything from recruitment and selection to goal setting, performance measurement and review, as well as training and development. Performance management relates to everything that takes place between these two events (Mujtaba & Shuaib, 2010:112).

Because performance management occurs in a larger organisational context, at least three contextual factors determine how these practises affect work performance: business strategy, workplace technology, and employee involvement. High levels of work performance tend to occur when goal setting, performance appraisal and reward systems are aligned jointly with these contextual factors (Cummings & Worley, 2009:422).

Tools such as reward systems, job design, leadership and training should join PA's as part of a comprehensive approach to performance. According to recent studies in the USA, the number one desire of Human Resource (HR) executives is to design performance management systems to achieve business goals. Companies are interested in finding ways to get their strategic goals implemented at lower levels by moving the responsibility further down the organisational hierarchy. A model of the organisational/employee performance management cycle appears in Figure 2.3. This model provides guidance to managers and individuals and the teams they manage on - what performance management activities they will be expected to carry out. In Table 2.1, 20 key requirements for an effective performance management system are identified (Grobler, 2006:262).

**Table 2.1: Twenty key requirements for an effective performance management system**

1	The performance management system is owned by line management and driven from top of the organisation.
2	Managers understand and accept the need to measure performance at all levels in a consistent way.
3	Managers accept that the performance management processes that have been defined are needed in their businesses.
4	Managers have the knowledge and skills needed and are committed to manage their subordinates (and be managed) this way.
5	The way consequences and rewards are managed in the organisation reinforces this process in a consistent and positive way.
6	There is no other management process in place that conflict with the performance management process.
7	The whole process is transparent and can be openly challenged and defended.
8	Position guide clearly define the jobs of the team leader and all the team members in output terms without any gaps or overlaps.
9	Each team develops measurable unit targets for the current planning period that reflect their contribution to implementing the short and long-term strategy of the business.
10	All the performance targets that are set add significant value to the business and are stretching, yet achievable.
11	Managers allocate all their unit targets between themselves and their

	team members, appropriately to the jobs they are doing.
12	Managers negotiate with each of their team members specific, measurable and stretching performance targets to which they are all committed.
13	Every team member sees the targets they personally accepted as contributing to their unit's performance targets equitably with other team members.
14	Managers and their team members accept that their rewards should reflect their achievement of the targets they accepted.
15	Managers regularly review both unit and individual performance with those concerned and take appropriate action to ensure that targets are reached or exceeded.
16	Managers, jointly with each of the team members, assess each other's performance for the full period under review.
17	Both manager and subordinate accept and sign-off the subordinate's performance assessment as valid, balanced and fair.
18	Recorded performance assessments for each unit clearly discriminate between the more effective and less effective performers.
19	Consequences and rewards for each individual are accepted as fairly reflecting their unit's results and their own individual performance.
20	The effectiveness of the performance management system is formally evaluated at least once a year and appropriate improvements are made for the next cycle.



Performance management is a complete system that encompasses goal alignment, education, communication and continuous feedback can lead to the recognition of top performers. This recognition is important as organisations try to retain their top talent and improve the performance of all employees in an effort to positively influence the customer, client or a patient's experience. Effective performance management involves a complete system of goals setting, training, communication and ongoing feedback as a practice on which research often has important implications (Mujtaba & Shuaib, 2010:112).

The overall aim of performance management is to establish a high performance culture in which individuals and teams take responsibility for the continuous improvement of the business process and for their own skills and contributions within a framework provided by affective leadership. Its key purpose is to focus people on doing the right things by achieving goal clarity (Armstrong, 2006:2).

Management performance measurement is a complex task since multiple inputs and outputs are involved in the process. The concept of performance has always accompanied the management of firms or, more in general, complex organisations, but its meaning is not universally shared by the scientific community and experts (Tardivo & Viassone, 2010:99).

The Balance Scorecard (BSC) is a tool of strategic control, often of difficult implementation, and such that it not always meets the sharing by the management direction. It is not only a simple methodology to measure organisation performance, but it is a project with the final aiming of implementing a new management system (Tardivo & Viassone, 2010:99).

Performance management has had a long ascendancy, and in all probability has a long road ahead. Hatry (2008), for instance finds it hard to believe that performance management will continue far into the future. Nonetheless, performance management is not without its problems. Practitioners, managers, consultants, and academics have sought solutions in response to the paradoxical and often problematic nature of performance management (Van Dooren, 2011:420).

During the past several years, no other aspect of performance management has perhaps gained as much attention in the popular press as the use of forced distributions or ranking. Advocates argue that forced distribution systems reduce or eliminate artificially inflated ratings, thereby enabling organisations to identify and adequately reward top performers, while also holding poor performers accountable (Smither & London, 2009:599).

Goal setting can affect performance in several ways. It influences what people think and do by focusing their behaviour in the direction of the goal, rather than elsewhere. Goals energize behaviour, motivating people to put forth the effort to reach difficult goals that are accepted, and when goals are difficult but achievable, goal setting prompts persistence over time. Goal-setting interventions have been implemented in organisations such as 3M, Time Warner, Clear Channel Communications and Price Waterhouse Coopers (Cummings & Worley, 2009:422).

## **2.5 PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL**

Performance appraisal is a process by which a superior evaluates and judges the work performance of subordinates. Performance appraisal systems include the process and procedures involved in implementing, managing and communicating the events involved in performance appraisal. In many cases it is a formal process and is a part of the personnel management policy (Walsh, 2003:13).

Performance appraisal is one of the most complex and controversial techniques used to monitor workers, determine pay, retain workers, and promote excellence. It must ascertain the productivity of an employee and fairly measure the worker's effort. To effectively evaluate performance, the criteria and methods are important factors and should be used to support the organisations excellence (Chen & Fu, 2008:163).

A performance appraisal strategy should focus on employees' personal capability and their professional expression. Firstly, the "personal capability criterion" focuses on the employees themselves and their intelligence and ability. It also emphasizes the knowledge and aptitude of employees and it is often delineated by past job specification. Appraisal ought to take into account current job specifications as well as stressing continued excellence and future creativity. Secondly, the "professional expression criterion" should be appraised as well. This factor centres on employees' behaviour and outcomes. This criterion highlights the attitude, course and representation and the result of their assigned labours (Chen & Fu, 2008:163).

Performance Appraisal is the on-going process of evaluating and managing both the behaviour and outcomes in the workplace. Employee performance common to most jobs includes: quantity of output, quality of output, timelessness of output, presence at work and cooperativeness. Organisations use various terms to describe this process: performance

review, annual appraisal, performance evaluation, employee evaluation and merit evaluation are some of the terms used (Grobler *et al.*, 2006:262).

Most organisations have some kind of evaluation system that is used for performance feedback, pay administration, and in some cases, counselling and developing employees. Therefore performance appraisal represents an important link between goal-setting processes and reward systems (Cummings & Worley, 2009:428). Numerous organisations employ a formal or informal assessment system that measures employee performance and contribution. Performance appraisal is a mandated process in which, for a specific period of time, all or a group of an employees' working behaviour or traits are individually rated, judged, or described by a rater, and the results are kept by the organisation (Walsh, 2003:13).

Performance appraisal has been discredited because too often it has been operated as a top-down and largely bureaucratic system owned by the HR department rather than by line managers. It often was backward looking, concentrating on what had gone wrong, rather than looking forward to future development needs. Performance appraisal schemes existed in isolation. There was a little or no link between them and the needs of the business (Armstrong, 2006:9).

One recent survey of over 300 North American companies, for example, found that 65% reported a link between performance ratings and rewards, 43% used the system equally for performance development and decision making, and 53% of the organisations believed that the system was aligned with organisational values and priorities. Abundant evidence, however, indicates that the organisations do poor job appraising employees. As one study put it, "The appraisal of performance appraisals is not good...in fact, our review indicates that regardless of a program's stated purpose, few studies show positive effects". Another study found that only 55% believed that the appraisal process adequately distinguished between poor, average and good performance appraisal. Some innovations have been made in enhancing employee involvement, balancing organisational and employee needs, and increasing the number of raters. These lesser form of appraisal are being used in such organisations as Alliant Energy, Goldman Sachs and Monsanto (Cummings & Worley, 2009:428).

### ***Dissatisfaction with Performance Appraisal***

In the survey conducted the respondents predicted that the widespread use of performance appraisal will continue, ranking it first in importance among human resource management. In spite of the current ubiquitous use of performance appraisal systems and its perceived importance in the future, there is considerable contention over its efficiency and usefulness. Surveys through the years have indicated relative lack of satisfaction towards the effectiveness of performance appraisal systems in both private and public organisations (Walsh, 2003:14).

One common theme of recent research is that attitudes of the system's users toward the process determine to a large degree the ultimate effectiveness of a performance appraisal system.

Employees' perception of fairness of the performance appraisal has been shown to be linked to satisfaction with the system. Fairness of performance appraisal has been studied by a number of researchers over time. The most important performance review faced by organisations is the perceived fairness of the performance review and the performance appraisal system. The findings suggested that most employees perceived their performance appraisal system as neither accurate nor fair (Walsh, 2003:28).

### ***Training***

There is disagreement about whether affective appraisal flows from the appraiser's trained skills or natural ability. In some ways, this is similar to the continuing argument about whether selection for hiring is a skill or ability. However the function of PA involves much more fine-tuning than gross categorisation of the applicant's performance when hiring. For this and other reasons, there is general agreement that training will improve the performance of the rater. Clearly, every rater needs information about the PA system used, the forms and ratings and the legal issues involved in the PA process (Grobler, 2006:288). Stanley (2007:9) agrees that proper training must be provided, so each and every employee has the opportunity to do their job thoroughly. Any doubts about the employee receiving the proper training should be addressed with additional training. Clip & Save (2000) argues that most organisations seem to take the one 'size fits all' approach to addressing their performance problems - Training with a capital T. The drawback of haphazardly applying that approach, is that training is the right answer only when the problem is caused by lack of knowledge or skills. Instead, there must be a clear understanding within an organisation that training does not solve problems associated with any of the following factors: inadequate information,

hiring the wrong person for the job, old and outdated tools/resources, poorly designed incentive programs and poor processes.

### ***Formal and Informal methods***

Many supervisors only annually or bi-annually think about the appraisal process - whenever the HR department notifies them that an employee's anniversary date is approaching and the appraisal must be completed. Feeling greatly relieved on completing the mandatory appraisal, some supervisors do not tackle the often painful subject of performance until it is time to complete another appraisal form. This trend unfortunately prevails in many South African companies. This mechanical approach to appraisal may facilitate decision-making about pay increases, but it neglects the fact that performance feedback for developmental purposes is the continuous responsibility of supervision. Regular informal appraisal sessions inform employees how they are functioning and how they can improve their performances (Grobler, 2006:289). Amah (2008:40) states that employees seek feedback when they are not sure of how well they are performing and most recently it has been established that they also utilise various feedback strategies even when they perceive that they know how well or poorly they have performed. Good work should not go unnoticed, and frequent supervisory recognition is an important technique for sustaining high levels of employee motivation (Grobler, 2006:289).

### ***Appraisal system evaluation***

An organisation's PA programme is generally created and implemented to meet both evaluative and developmental objectives. Many organisations fail to assess periodically whether those objectives are being achieved. Often, appraisal programmes are set in motion and left to function - sometimes dismally - without a thorough examination of their effectiveness. In extreme cases, ill-conceived and poorly implemented appraisal programmes may contribute to negative feelings between employees and management, perceptions of unfairness, hindered career development and discriminatory (and illegal) employment practices (Grobler, 2006:289).

One method of evaluating the appraisal system is for upper management to review the appraisals conducted by lower-level managers. Providing feedback to managers about the quality of their performance appraisals has several advantages. It is relatively easy and inexpensive, and because managers are aware that their performance as appraisers will be evaluated, there is a tendency to reduce errors of leniency, strictness and central tendency. Most importantly, when managers observe the ratings of other managers, the leniency error

can be significantly reduced in their own ratings. Without such information, managers may not know how lenient or strict they are as raters (Grobler, 2006:290).

### ***The appraisal interview***

Performance-related feedback has been described as one of the most important methods for enhancing employee development and improving individual performance. Most PA administrators require that these interviews take place to provide performance feedback to employees. Thus, employees learn where they stand in the eyes of the organisation and are coached and counselled about how performance may be improved (Grobler, 2006:290). Amah (2008:40) add that the information gathered during the feedback processes are valuable resources used in regulating behaviour and improving current and future performance.

The appraisal interview is a very troublesome and difficult obligation for many managers. Some managers devise ways to avoid the interview even though it may be required by company policy. In other cases, the interview is glossed over or conducted in a mechanical fashion; its value is then highly suspecting (Grobler, 2006:291). On the other hand Amah (2008:40) stated that employees adopt feedback, seeking behaviour to draw attention to good performance, while in the latter, they can adopt either feedback avoidance behaviour, to avoid getting negative feedback completely, or feedback mitigating behaviour, to short circuit the likely negative feedback.

A recent study in the USA found that supervisors avoid performing formal PA's for a complex set of reasons. The study identified five situational variables that contributed to supervisors' failure to rate subordinates - if the subordinates had worked for the current supervisor for only short time; if the subordinate had little job experience; if there was little trust between the supervisor and the subordinate; if the supervisor did not initiate a lot of structure for the subordinates; and/or if the subordinate had little confidence in the appraisal system; the supervisor was more likely to avoid performing the appraisal (Grobler, 2006:291).

### ***Appraisal and Poor Performance***

Managing high performers is usually easy. Mostly they manage themselves. Getting poor performers to improve is the real challenge, and for them performance appraisal is critical, but managers often avoid the emotional hassle involved in confronting the poor performer. This is unfortunate because it takes away the most powerful tool the employee and the managers have for improving the employee's performance (King, 1984:92). On the other

hand, Amah (2008:42) stated that negative feedback is very diagnostic and highly valued by employees, since it provides information for behaviour adjustment. Consequently, a supervisor who has expertise in giving feedback has a potential to provide negative feedback in perceived poor performance which addresses all areas of the poor performance. Smither and London (2009:589) argues that feedback plays a vital role in performance management, yet feedback does not always enhance performance.

The first step in managing poor performance is to make sure if the employee is a poor performer. Sometimes managers mistakenly identify employees as poor performers because their personalities are not appealing or their methods are unorthodox. A poor performer is simply someone who is not accomplishing the work. If the employee's level of work consistently falls short of requirements even after those requirements have been made clear and the person has acknowledged them, the supervisor need to take special steps to either turn the performance around or move the employee out of the job (King, 1984:92).

When he or she analyses the performance of such a person, the supervisor needs to look for patterns of behaviour that might be creating the problem. Where there are such patterns, the supervisor needs to look for their causes. If the cause is something in the work environment, the supervisor needs to change it to support a proper behaviour and enable the employee to succeed (King, 1984:92).

## **2.6 SOUTH AFRICA'S PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL DILEMMA**

Despite the enthusiasm regarding performance management by various companies, a comprehensive survey of nine leading South African organisations has been undertaken according to the way employee performance is managed and rewarded in South Africa. Major problems that were identified during the survey included the existence of a rather negative working culture; changes in corporate strategy did not result in corresponding behaviour changes; and insufficient line management support for performance management. Regarding periodic and formal performance reviews, the following became apparent: lack of follow-up of performance reviews; over-emphasis on the appraisal aspect at the expense of development; inadequate performance information; and inadequately maintained objectivity. In a separate study conducted among companies in South Africa recently, it appears that more than 60% of the organisations interviewed did not have a formal performance management system. Despite these problems, the existence of a good performance review system can be of great value to the organisation, the department and the individual (Grobler, 2006:264).

## 2.7. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

With the new legislation pertaining to labour relations, employment equity, and the constitution, the possibility of legal review of terminations, promotions, pay decisions and other HR issues are becoming a reality in South Africa, for example, the Labour Relations Act, No.66 of 1995, stipulates that, when considering a dismissal, it must be both procedurally and substantively fair. Thus, when dismissing an employee on grounds of poor work performance the input received from the performance appraisal exercise in the company will be vital (Grobler, 2006:267).

Poor work performance is the subject of complaint far more often than misconduct, but it is far less well managed. In legal terms, it is known as 'capability', which refers to an employer's skills, ability, aptitude and knowledge in relation to the job that he or she is employed to do (Russell, 2011:07).

## 2.8 TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT OR SYSTEM APPROACH

The late W. Edwards Deming, the 'father' of TQM, lists performance appraisals as one of the 'seven deadly diseases' of management practices. Deming argued that PAS should be completely abandoned. TQM advocates contend that PA actually is a harmful device because it misdirects managerial attention. Their argument is that PA systems are attempts by management to place blame for poor organisational performance on lower-level, front-line employees. They contend that this is a critical error because TQM should be focused on system factors instead of person factors of performance (Grobler, 2006:287).

## 2.9 PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT

No tried and true solutions exist when it comes to helping employees turn around their poor performance. Just because you found out the solution once before, does not mean that the solution will work again in a different situation with a different employee. The following needs to be analysed to pinpoint poor performance:

***Ability x Motivation x Environment = Performance.***

For performance issues, the contributing factors need to be considered to determine where negative issues can be solved and where positive forces can be improved (Brecher, 2007:20). Dervitsiotis (2001:689) suggests that this simply means that sustainable performance improvement cannot be realised using a command-and-control model of



management, however, this mindset is still present in many companies today. Effective adaption for survival and success requires a new 'social model' in which the participation of all employees becomes an indispensable factor. White (2008:67) adds that correcting poor performance should be challenging, should be well structured and should have consistent follow up. Changing personal behaviours is not easy and requires significant re-tooling.

Researchers have long been interested in how leaders can motivate employees in the workplace. Recent research, however, has pointed to the need to direct attention to the ways in which organisations can invigorate their employees at work. As an effective experience, vigour is a fundamental motivational factor in the workplace that may have significant implications on both the individual and organisational levels. Invigorated employees report a sense of vitality and well-being and are helpful in shaping a better working atmosphere, Carmeli *et al.*, (2009:1553). Yang *et al.*, (2006:79) agrees that managers need to take appropriate actions to enhance human activities and thereby reach expected human performance.

#### ***How to address poor performance***

Supervisors need to be aware of employees' work patterns, and be prepared to respond in the most helpful manner.

#### ***To raise the supervisor's awareness level and improve responsiveness to employee needs, the following action tools should be considered:***

- Get to know each member of the staff individually;
- Together set mutually agreed-upon goals;
- Set up regular follow-up systems whereby the supervisor can monitor the progress of each individual.

Have the strength to give a "push" when necessary and have the wisdom and confidence to give appropriate rewards for a job well done (Gootnick & Margaret, 2000:18). White (2008:66) argues that poor performers need what is called "teachable moments" when they fail to meet expectations. The manager needs to take these failures and turn them into opportunities to teach the correct methods, approach and attitude.

***The following are suggested to help in improving employees' performance:***

- Design specific key actions to correct the poor performances negatively impacting your team of employees, other departments and ultimately the customer and the bottom line;
- Follow up weekly in the beginning to ensure that new behaviours are taking hold and modifications are happening;
- The key to addressing poor performance is in knowing when to be patient and when to provide relief for everyone involved, by providing the opportunity to the poor performer to find another job that better fits his skills (White, 2008:67).

Talking with employees about their performance problems can be an uncomfortable moment for any manager, but it is also a crucial part of the job and if done well, will ultimately make a manager's job much easier (Anon, 2010:6).

***The following seven steps to planning and executing such discussions:***

- Schedule the meeting and set the stage;
- Describe the problem;
- Reinforce performance standards;
- Develop a plan for improvement;
- Offer your help. Inject positive comments if possible and emphasize potential (Anon, 2010:6).

Poor performance is one of employers' most common complaints. Managers faced with difficult conversations about work standards and potentially litigious staff, often avoids dealing with it or do not handle it very well, but ignoring the issue can demotivate other staff, so it is necessary to tackle poor performance.

***Seven steps to improve poor performance:***

- Assess capability;
- Set clear standards;
- Provide feedback;
- Do not delay;
- Focus on the facts;
- Give them time to improve;
- Clarify duty to act (Russel, 2010:28).

Any change must be driven by threats or an opportunity from the external environment within the organisation operates. If change is to be successful, it must in turn be aligned with the organisation's mission, strategy, and goals and carried out with due attention to comparisons between desired and actual performance. Human Performance Enhancement (HPE) focuses on solving human performance problems and seizing human performance improvement opportunities (Rothwell, 2005:37).

Many different solutions may been used to improve human performance. Selection of any solution is dependent upon the cause and the nature of the performance problem, and the criteria used to evaluate a solution must include its potential to make a measurable difference in the performance system. Many solutions - that are called human performance enhancement strategies - are capable to solve human performance problems or to take advantage of improvement opportunities. Such strategies are not limited to training; they should be chosen on the basis of the human performance problems they are to solve or the human performance improvement opportunities they are to cultivate (Rothwell, 2005:41). Even more important is Gilbert's Behaviour Engineering Model (BEM). The BEM is a holistic performance enhancement model, intended to bring a comprehensive perspective to troubleshooting existing human performance problems or identifying possible human performance improvement opportunities (Rothwell, 2005: 43).

### ***Human performance improvement for tactical teams***

Human performance improvement (HPT) can be described as a systematic and systemic process of identifying and removing barriers to individual and organisational performance (Hughes, 2004:367). Hau (2008:390) points out that removing barriers to individual and organisational performance is like allowing and encouraging human beings to participate in sport because this preserve their health and working capacity, prevent impairments, and remedy damage to their health. The goal was to rebuild the working capacity of people so that they could deliver work performance of the highest level with great endurance.

The law enforcement community faces more challenges today than ever before. Such phrases such as weapon of mass destruction, terrorist cell and homeland security have become common vernacular. Tactical teams, as well as police departments, must show that they appropriately select, properly train, and enhance the responsibility of their officers. Human performance technology (HPT), which originated in general systems theory and behaviourism, increases profitability in businesses by either reducing operating costs or increasing profit streams. In law enforcement systems, HPT brings together the performance

of the officer, benefits of technology, and complexities of the legal system to tackle challenging situations and provide outstanding public services (Hathaway, 2008:1). Hughes (2004:368) add that HPT promotes the following characteristics: it draws from a diverse group of disciplines and practices; it accesses a rigorous analysis of present and desired levels of performance; it identifies the courses for the performance gap; it offers a wide range of interventions with which to improve performance; it guides performance management; and it evaluates the results.

Hau (2008:394) argues that there are questions about the malleability of the human constitution in human performance through sports. Is human performance potential determined by heredity, and if so, how could it still be enhanced? Herbst believed that the degree of malleability of the human body was determined through heredity, but he also thought that it was well worth researching whether genetic “minus-variants” could be changed through physical exercise.

### ***Technological transformation of human beings***

Although the concepts of improving human performance and synergism of the four component technologies are not on themselves truly innovative, the aspects of novelty rather appears to be hidden in the way proponents of Nanotechnology, Biotechnology, Information Technology and Cognitive Science (NBIC) convergence intend to achieve improved human performance, by technologically reshaping ourselves. Up to now we have been improving our performance through education, study and exercise. Furthermore, human beings have developed houses, clothes, and technological instruments like telephones, telescopes, cars and computers - thus technologically transforming our natural surroundings to serve the improvement of our performance (Gordijn, 2006:728).

Human beings have already taken the first cautious steps to technologically reshape themselves, for example by means of cosmetic surgery and dentistry, “smart drugs,” mood enhancers, sports doping, and growth hormones (Gordijn, 2006:728). Wolbring (2008:25) argues that the issue is not new. Ancient Greeks used the term ‘techne’, to characterize a convergence of certain disciplines, skills and knowledge. Many different types of convergences exist. To converge the area of science and technology (S&T), has received much attention in recent years.

The vision put forward in the NBIC report impacts basically on every human being, and nearly every aspect of society, how we live and interact with one another and our

surroundings - the topic of human performance enhancement was not seen as dangerous; as a topic which would trigger negative reaction by the public (Wolbring, 2008:29).

Nanotechnology may be poised to transform medicine with potential uses spanning all aspects of disease diagnosis, prevention and treatment, as well as HPE applications such as embedded intelligence, however, at present there is a lack of comprehensive and conclusive information on the long-term health and safety effects of nano-material's (Diller, 2008:40). Preliminary evidence, for example, suggests that the large surface and potentially lifelong surveillance area of insoluble nano-particles can trigger inflammatory responses, and a substantial body of evidence supports the conclusion that chronic inflammation can predispose an individual to cancer. Although we need more research into the health effects of nanotechnology before we can consider human use, such concerns highlight the larger issues of prolonged and potentially lifelong surveillance when using HPE agents. Current fiscal realities make such a program impracticable and unlikely to be implemented (Diller, 2008:41).

Widespread use of NBIC enabled enhancement technologies will result in an increasingly close association of the body with technology, which could trigger a negative change in attitudes towards the body. Firstly, the body and its functions will become inter-wined with technology. In the future, for example, complete warehouses of NBIC manufactured bio-hybrid replacement human cells, tissue and organs could perhaps be set up, hence, those who could afford them could purchase replacement body parts whenever necessary. Furthermore, bio-electronic systems to improve normal sensory, motorial and cognitive properties and skills will become increasingly common practice. Widespread and invasive use of such bio-electronical systems that will enhance central bodily functions will make it increasingly difficult to distinguish between our body's own functions and technology's functions. Secondly, the body will progressively become a part of the technological systems and network, for instance, the body and its functions might constantly be checked and monitored with the help of nano-sensors, registering possible emerging health threats. These detecting gadgets might be linked with computer systems enabling automatic responses for a broad variety of common disorders and ailments (for instance by activating certain nano-metric drug release systems) (Gordijn, 2006:729).

Both developments will contribute to a more technologically inspired image of the body as something very similar to a machine. The body will increasingly be regarded as a whole, made up of many different components that might be fixed, enhanced or replaced if

necessary. Development, functions and appearance of the body will seem less and less fixed by nature and less frequently accepted without change, and more frequently controllable by technology. Instead of being in charge of our own health we might increasingly trust technology to take over this responsibility (Gordijn, 2006:729).

## **2.10 REWARD SYSTEMS**

Reward system interventions are used to illicit and maintain desired levels of performance. To the extent that rewards are available, durable, timely, visible and performance contingent, they can support and reinforce organisational goals, work designs, and employee involvement. There are four types of rewards intervention: skill-based pay, pay for performance, gain sharing and promotions can be used to reward individual, team or organisation performance. Each system represents a flexible intervention that is effective in improving employee performance and satisfaction (Cummings & Worley, 2009:437).

## **2.11 PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMME (PEP)**

The Performance Enhancement Programme (PEP) is designed to be a process of “close supervision” to ensure that the organisation, represented by the responsible manager, does all that is reasonable to enable the employee to perform at an acceptable level. It is not a punitive measure, but rather a responsible effort of the organisation to rectify performance problems and to assist employees. It should be applied with care, discretion and good judgement (Nyalungu, 2003:12).

PEP typically runs for a period of one to three months. The duration will vary according to the merits of each particular case. The duration of the programme will typically be longer where training is required. When considering whether or not to use the PEP, the manager shall consider whether the poor performance is due to the employee being unwilling or unable. An unwilling employee, who refuses to perform according to the standards laid down, can be dealt with through the disciplinary process (Nyalungu, 2003:12).

## **2.12 SUMMARY**

- Poor performing employees affect the performance of the company, therefore poor performance need to be managed. If left unattended it will affect the performance of those who are performing;

- No tried and true solutions exist when it comes to helping employees turn around their poor performance. Just because you found the solution once before, does not mean that solution will work again in a different situation with a different employee, therefore it is important to treat each situation differently;
- Supervisors need to be aware of employee's work patterns, and be prepared to respond in the most helpful manner. If supervisors care about the company and their subordinates, they will ensure that they keep a close eye on the performance of their subordinates which benefit both the company and the employee;
- Many different solutions may be used to improve human performance. Selection of any solution is dependent upon the cause and the nature of the performance problem, and the criteria used to evaluate a solution must include its potential to make a measurable difference in the performance system;
- Many solutions - that are called human performance enhancement strategies - are capable to solve human performance problems or to take advantage of improvement opportunities. Such strategies are not limited to training; they should be chosen on the basis of the human performance problems they are to solve or the human performance improvement opportunities they are to cultivate;
- Although the concepts of improving human performance and synergism of the four component technologies are not in themselves truly innovative, the aspects of novelty rather appears to be hidden in the way proponents of Nanotechnology, Biotechnology, Information Technology and Cognitive Science (NBIC) convergence intend to achieve improved human performance, by technologically reshaping ourselves. Up to now we have been improving our performance through education, study and exercise.
- Human beings have already taken the first cautious steps to technologically reshape themselves, for example by means of cosmetic surgery and dentistry, "smart drugs," mood enhancers, sports doping, and growth hormones. Depending on the cause of non-performance, for example if the contributor is the employee having low IQ, it may be easily resolved by using the technology and therefore managers need not worry about employees' performance and focus their energy on other things which are regarded as important.

- Though using technology may seem as the easy and suitable method to enhance employee performance, it is not yet approved as the recommended way of enhancing performance. Recommending an employee to be enhanced technologically again, may be a challenge, because the employee involved should give his or her concern e.g. for a chip to be inserted in the employee's brain. If the employee concerned refuses for the chip to be inserted in his or her brain, the manager will still be left with poor performance to manage.
- This takes us back to the fact that there is no other alternative currently accepted that managers should use to enhance performance, except managing it. The 'how' part of managing poor performance should be the main focus for managers.
- The Performance Enhancement Programme is one of the methods used by the power utility company to try and manage poor performance. If the technology was the approved and affordable method to enhance performance, managers will recommend that as the best method to enhance employee performance provided the employee gives concern. Managers should take the employee through the process of the Performance Enhancement Programme, challenging as it may be for some managers, but currently that is the legal method.



# CHAPTER 3

## EMPIRICAL STUDY

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter three presents and discusses the research methodology and the results thereof. The results are based on the objectives of the study in relation to the problem statement of the research. The discussion will contain the findings related to a questionnaire distributed to the participants.

### 3.2 METHODOLOGY

Quantitative research will be conducted in the analysis of the data. A survey will be conducted using a questionnaire as measuring instrument. The sample consists of Eskom managers and supervisors which includes both males and females of various ages. The age categories used are between the age of 20 to 30, 31 to 40, 41 to 50, 51 to 60 and above 60. The TASK job grading was used for man-grading. Grades are between T10-T13, M14-M16, M17-M18, P14-P18, G14-G16 and other, which can be anything above the stated grades. The targeted population is based in Gauteng - Benoni/Nigel; the Free State - Bloemfontein, Welkom and Bethlehem; and Northern Cape - Kimberley.

The individual questions will be analysed using descriptive analysis and Cronbach's alpha will be applied to determine reliability of the sample.

### 3.3 GATHERING OF DATA

#### 3.3.1 Development and construction of the questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed from the literature review and the experience of employees with the implementation of the Performance Enhancement Programme within Eskom. The questionnaire is relevant to the problem statement of the research. The information gathered is the information that respondents entered on the questionnaires distributed to them.

The questionnaire is divided into four sections, focusing on the objective of the study. The layout of the questionnaire is as follows:

**Section A: Biographical Information**

- Gender
- Age
- Man-grade
- Area of work
- Years working for the company
- Department

**Section B: The effectiveness of the Performance Enhancement Programme****Section C: Contributing factors for Managers and Supervisors to use the Performance Enhancement Programme****Section D: Contributing factors for Managers and Supervisors not to use the Performance Enhancement Programme.**

In Section A the respondents had to select the relevant answer by circling the appropriate box.

Section B, C and D - a four point Likert scale was used to measure responds that ranged from 'strongly agree' with a value of one, 'somehow agree' with a value of two, 'somehow disagree' with a value of three and 'strongly disagree' with a value of four. The Likert scale gives a measure of the actual position on the continuum, instead of indicating whether the respondent was favourably inclined on an issue or not. The specific responses to the items are combined so that individuals with the most favourable attitudes will have the highest scores, while individuals with the least favourable (or unfavourable) attitudes will have the lowest scores (Gliem & Gliem, 2003:82).

**3.3.2 Data collection**

Copies of the questionnaire were distributed to 148 North West Region managers and supervisors. The idea was to get as much response as possible. Of the 148, four employees excused themselves from participating, reasons being that they felt that they were aware of the Performance Enhancement Programme, therefore there was no need to fill in the questionnaire; the other employees felt that they had no idea what PEP is, and therefore taking part in the study will distort the results; and some responded by just saying PEP is the

right tool and it should be used. Therefore only 144 questionnaires were considered, out of 144 distributed only 42 respondents returned the questionnaire.

The technique used to distribute the questionnaires included distribution through email and personal delivery to participants. The aim was to distribute the questionnaire to managers and supervisors of the North West Region. As stated before, the participants are based in Benoni/Nigel, Bloemfontein, Bethlehem, Welkom and the Kimberley Area.

A period of one week for completion of the questionnaire was allowed. Only a limited amount of questionnaires were completed after one week. The questionnaire was resent to non-respondents and they were given another week to respond. A total of 42 questionnaires were returned, which were used for the study. The main reason for non-returns could be attributed to limited time for the respondents to complete the questionnaires.

### **3.4 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION OF THE RESPONDENTS**

#### **3.4.1 Gender of the respondents**

The purpose of question A1, in section A (refer to Annexure A) was to determine the gender of the participants in the questionnaire. The biggest category is represented by male, with the percentage of 61.9% followed by female, with 33.3 %. Two of the respondents did not indicate their gender.

**Table 3.1: Gender**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Female	14	33.3
Male	26	61.9
Total	40	95.2
Missing	2	4.8
Total	42	100

#### **3.4.2 Age of the respondents**

The purpose of question A2, in Section A of the questionnaire, was to determine the age group of the category of the respondents. The biggest category is represented by the 31 – 40-year age group with 54.8% (refer to Table 3.2) and then followed by the age group of 41 - 50 with 21.4% and then lastly 51 - 60 age group with 16.7%.

**Table 3.2: Age**

Age group	Frequency	Percentage
31-40 years old	23	54.8
41-50 years old	9	21.4
51-60 years old	7	16.7
Total	39	92.9
Missing	3	7.1
Total	42	100

**3.4.3. Respondents man grades**

The purpose of question A3 (refer to Annexure A), is to determine the man-grade of the respondents. The biggest category that responded to the questionnaire is the man-grade T10-T13, with 59.5%. The next category of respondents was the P14-P18 with 14.3%. The left categories responded in small numbers, M14-M16 (9.5%) and M17-M18 (7.1%) which it is a good response, because we do not have too many in this category and the G14-G16 and other with 2.4%, respectively. Three of the respondents did not indicate their age group.

**Table 3.3: Mangrades**

Mangrade	Frequency	Percentage
T10-T13	25	59.5
M14-M16	4	9.5
M17-M18	3	7.1
P14-P18	6	14.3
G14-G16	1	2.4
Other	1	2.4
Total	40	95.2
Missing	2	4.8
Total	42	100

**3.4.4 Respondents' work stations**

The purpose of question A4 (refer to Annexure A), is to find the area of work of the respondents. The respondents are based in Gauteng, the Free State and Northern Cape, therefore it is important to know which respondents have returned the questionnaires. The majority of the respondents are from Benoni/Nigel with 40.5%, followed by Bloemfontein with

28.6%, Welkom with 16.7%, Kimberley with 7.1% and Bethlehem with 2.4%. Two of the respondents did not indicate their area of work.

**Table 3.4: Area of work**

Area of work	Frequency	Percentage
Benoni/Nigel	17	40.5
Bloemfontein	12	28.6
Kimberley	3	7.1
Welkom	7	16.7
Bethlehem	1	2.4
Total	40	95.2
Missing	2	4.8
Total	42	100

#### 3.4.5 Respondents' years of experience

The purpose of the question A5 (refer to Annexure A), was to determine the years of the respondents' experience at work. The dominant category is the +5 years' experience group with 92.9%, and 2-5 years with 2.4% only. Two of the respondents did not indicate their years of experience.

**Table 3.5: Experience**

Number of years	Frequency	Percentage
2-5 years	1	2.4
+5 years	39	92.9
Total	40	95.2
Missing	2	4.8
Total	42	100

#### 3.4.6 Departments of the respondents

The purpose of the question A6 (refer to Annexure A), is to determine the department in which the respondents work. The biggest category of the respondents is the engineering department, with 69%. The next department was sales and customer department with 14.3%, then Human Resource with 7.1%, and last Finance with 4.8%. Departments such as Commercial, Communications, Information, Risk management etc., did not participate in the survey, though the questionnaire was also distributed to them. Two of the respondents did not indicate the departments they work in.

**Table 3.6: Departments**

Department	Frequency	Percentage
Engineering	29	69.0
Human Resource	3	7.1
Sales and Customer	6	14.3
Finance	2	4.8
Total	40	95.2
Missing	2	4.8
Total	42	100

### 3.5 THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMME (PEP)

#### 3.5.1 The Performance Enhancement Programme is the right tool to address poor performance

The purpose of statement B1 is to determine whether the respondents consider PEP to be the right tool to address poor performance in the work place - 50% of the respondents feel that the PEP is the right tool to address poor performance, 33.3% of them somehow agree, 11.9% of them somehow disagree and only 4.8% of them strongly disagree. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agree that PEP is the right tool to address poor performance with a mean of 1.71.

**Table 3.7: Question B1**

B1	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	21	50
2-Somehow agree	14	33.3
3-Somehow Disagree	5	11.9
4-Strongly Disagree	2	4.8
Total	42	100

#### 3.5.2 Employee performance improves after being taken for the Performance Enhancement Programme

The purpose of statement B2 is to find out whether the employee's performance improves after being taken for PEP - 59.5% of the respondents somehow agree; 19.0% of them feel that the employee's performance improves after being taken for PEP; 14.3% somehow disagree; and only 7.1% strongly disagree. It can be observed in Annexure B that the

respondents somehow agree that the employee's performance improves after being taken for PEP with a mean of 2.10.

**Table 3.8: Question B2**

B2	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	8	19.0
2-Somehow agree	25	59.5
3-Somehow Disagree	6	14.3
4-Strongly Disagree	3	7.1
Total	42	100

### **3.5.3 The Performance Enhancement Programme increases the stress level of employees**

The purpose of statement B3 is to determine whether PEP increases the stress level of employees - 33.3% of the respondents somehow agree ; 31.0% somehow disagree; 19.0% strongly disagree and 16.7% of the respondents strongly agree that PEP increases the stress level of the employees. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that PEP increases the stress level of employees with a mean of 2.52.

**Table 3.9: Question B3**

B3	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	7	16.7
2-Somehow agree	14	33.3
3-Somehow Disagree	13	31.0
4-Strongly Disagree	8	19.0
Total	42	100

### **3.5.4 The only reason I take employees for the Performance Enhancement Programme is because I don't want to be disciplined**

The purpose of statement B4 is to find out whether the only reason supervisors and managers take employees for PEP, is because they do not want to be disciplined - 66.7% of the respondents strongly disagree; 26.2% of them somehow disagree and 7.1% of the respondents somehow agree that the only reason they take employees for PEP is because they do not want to be disciplined. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents strongly disagree that the only reason they take employees for PEP it is because they don't want to be disciplined with a mean of 3.60.

**Table 3.10: Question B4**

B4	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	0	0
2-Somehow agree	3	7.1
3-Somehow Disagree	11	26.2
4-Strongly Disagree	28	66.7
Total	42	100

**3.5.5 I believe giving an employee a target score irrespective of performance is fair**

The purpose of statement B5 is to find out whether supervisors and managers believe that giving an employee a target score, irrespective of their performance, is fair - 69% of the respondents strongly disagree; 14.3% of them somehow agree; 11.9% of them somehow disagree; and 4.8% strongly agree that to give employees a target score irrespective of their performance is fair. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agree with a mean of 3.45.

**Table 3.11: Question B5**

B5	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	2	4.8
2-Somehow agree	6	14.3
3-Somehow Disagree	5	11.9
4-Strongly Disagree	29	69.0
Total	42	100

**3.5.6 Employees who have been recommended for the Performance Enhancement Programme lose interest at work.**

The purpose of the statement (B6) is to find out whether employees who have been recommended for PEP, lose interest at work - 50% of the respondents somehow disagree ; 19% somehow agree; and another 19% strongly disagree; and the remaining 9.5% strongly agree that employees who have been recommended for PEP lose interest at work. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that those employees who have been recommended for PEP, lose interest at work with a mean of 2.80.



**Table 3.12: Question B6**

B6	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	4	9.5
2-Somewhat agree	8	19.0
3-Somewhat Disagree	21	50.0
4-Strongly Disagree	8	19.0
Total	41	79.6

### 3.5.7 The reason why I use the Performance Enhancement Programme is to get rid of trouble makers

The purpose of statement B7 is to find out whether the respondents use PEP to get rid of trouble makers - 69.0% of the respondents strongly disagree; 23.9% of them somehow disagree; and 7.1% of them somehow agree that the only reason they use PEP is to get rid of the trouble makers. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents strongly disagree that the reason they use PEP is to get rid of trouble makers with a mean of 3.62.

**Table 3.13: Question B7**

B7	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	0	0
2-Somewhat agree	3	7.1
3-Somewhat Disagree	10	23.9
4-Strongly Disagree	20	69.0
Total	42	100

### 3.5.8 I believe poor performance should be managed

The purpose of statement B8 is to determine whether respondents believe poor performance should be managed - 81.0% of the respondents strongly agree; 14.3% of them somehow agree; and only 4.8% somehow disagree that poor performance should be managed. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents strongly agree that poor performance should be managed with a mean of 1.24.

**Table 3.14: Question B8**

B8	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	34	81.0
2-Somewhat agree	6	14.3
3-Somewhat Disagree	2	4.8
4-Strongly Disagree	0	0
Total	42	100

### 3.5.9 I have confidence in the Performance Enhancement Programme

The purpose of statement B9 is to find out whether the respondents have confidence in PEP - 38.1% of the respondents somehow agree; 35.7% of them strongly agree; 19% somehow disagree; and the remaining 7.1 % strongly disagree that they have confidence in PEP. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agree that they have confidence in PEP with the mean of 1.98.

**Table 3.15.**

B9	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	15	35.7
2-Somewhat agree	16	38.1
3-Somewhat Disagree	8	19.0
4-Strongly Disagree	3	7.1
Total	42	100

### 3.5.10 The company I work for is a good company therefore there is no need to take employees for the performance enhancement programme

The purpose of statement B10 is to find out whether the respondents think that they are working for a good company therefore there is no need to refer employees to PEP - . 52.4% of the respondents strongly disagree; 31.0% of the respondents somehow disagree; 9.5% of them somehow agree; and only 4.8% strongly agree that they work for a good company and therefore there is no need to take employees for PEP. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that the company they work for it is a good company therefore there is no need to take employees for PEP with a mean of 3.34.

**Table 3.16: Question B10**

B10	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	2	4.8
2-Somewhat agree	14	9.5
3-Somewhat Disagree	13	31.0
4-Strongly Disagree	22	52.4
Total	41	97.6

### 3.5.11 The employee feedback on the Performance Enhancement Programme is that it helps to improve performance

The purpose for statement B11 is to find out the employee's feedback from the managers and supervisors whether PEP, is that it helps to improve performance- 38.1% of the respondents somehow agree ; 35.7% of them somehow disagree and 26.2% strongly agree that employee feedback on PEP is that it helps to improve performance. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agree that the employee's feedback on PEP is that it helps to improve performance with a mean of 2.10.

**Table 3.17: Question B11**

B11	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	11	26.2
2-Somewhat agree	16	38.1
3-Somewhat Disagree	15	35.7
4-Strongly Disagree	0	0
Total	42	100

### 3.5.12 I believe that if the Performance Enhancement Programme is used as expected it can improve the performance of my business unit

The purpose of statement B12 is to find out if the respondents believe that if PEP is used as expected, it can improve the performance of the business unit - 59.5% of the respondents strongly agree ; 33.3% of them somehow agree, 4.8% of them t strongly disagree and 2.4% somehow disagree that if PEP is used as expected it will improve the performance of the business unit. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agree that if PEP is used as expected it can improve the performance of the business unit with a median of 1.52.

**Table 3.18: Question B12**

B12	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	25	59.5
2-Somewhat agree	14	33.3
3-Somewhat Disagree	1	2.4
4-Strongly Disagree	2	4.8
Total	42	100

### 3.5.13 I believe that supervisors/managers give employees fair rating according to their performance

The purpose of statement B13 is to determine whether supervisors and managers give fair rating to the employees according to their performance - 50.0% of the respondents somehow agree; 23.8% of them strongly agrees; 14.3% strongly disagree; and 11.9% somehow disagree that supervisors and managers give employees fair rating according to their performance. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agree that supervisors and managers give employees fair ratings according to their performance with a mean of 2.17.

**Table 3.19: Question B13**

B13	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	10	23.8
2-Somewhat agree	21	50.0
3-Somewhat Disagree	5	11.9
4-Strongly Disagree	6	14.3
Total	21	100

### 3.5.14 I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme is to frustrate the employees until they leave the organisation

The purpose of statement B14 was to find out whether the respondents are using PEP for what it is meant for - 66.7% of the respondents strongly disagree; 28.6% of them somehow disagree; and only 4.8% somehow agree that PEP is being designed to frustrate employees until they leave the organisation. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents strongly disagree that PEP is designed to frustrate the employees until they leave the organisation with a mean of 3.62.

**Table 3.20: Question B14**

<b>B14</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1-Strongly agree	0	0
2-Somehow agree	2	4.8
3-Somehow Disagree	12	28.6
4-Strongly Disagree	28	66.7
Total	42	100

### **3.6 CONTRIBUTING FACTORS FOR MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS TO USE PEP**

#### **3.6.1 I know what the Performance Enhancement Programme is**

The purpose of statement C1 is to find out whether the respondents know what PEP is - 59.5% of the respondents strongly agree; 28.6% of them somehow agree; 9.5% of them somehow disagree; and only 2.4% strongly disagree that they know what PEP is. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agree that they know what PEP is with a mean of 1.55.

**Table 3.21: Question C1**

<b>C1</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1-Strongly agree	25	59.5
2-Somehow agree	12	28.6
3-Somehow Disagree	4	9.5
4-Strongly Disagree	1	2.4
Total	42	100

#### **3.6.2 I knew about the Performance Enhancement Programme before becoming a manager/supervisor**

The purpose of statement C2 is to determine whether respondents knew of PEP before becoming managers/supervisors - 42.9% of the respondents strongly agree; 28.6% of them somehow agree; 14.3% of them somehow disagree; and 11.9% strongly disagree that they knew of PEP before becoming managers/supervisors. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agree that they knew of PEP before becoming managers/supervisors with a mean of 1.95.

**Table 3.22: Question C2**

<b>C2</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1-Strongly agree	18	42.9
2-Somewhat agree	12	28.6
3-Somewhat Disagree	6	14.3
4-Strongly Disagree	5	11.9
Total	41	97.6

### **3.6.3 I learnt about Performance Enhancement through training**

The purpose of statement C3 was to determine whether the respondents learnt about PEP through training - 40.5% of the respondents somehow agree; 23.8% of them somehow disagree; 16.7% of them strongly agree; and 19.0% strongly disagree that they learnt about PEP through training. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agree that they learnt about PEP through training with a mean of 2.45.

**Table 3.23: Question C3**

<b>C3</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1-Strongly agree	7	16.7
2-Somewhat agree	17	40.5
3-Somewhat Disagree	10	23.8
4-Strongly Disagree	8	19.0
Total	42	100

### **3.6.4 The training provided addressed my needs regarding Performance Enhancement Programme**

The purpose of statement C4 was to determine whether training provided to the respondents addressed their needs regarding PEP - 3.3% of the respondents somehow agree; 26.2% of them strongly disagree; 19.0% of them strongly agree; and 19.0% somehow disagree respectively that training provided addressed their training needs regarding PEP. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agrees that the training provided addressed their training needs regarding PEP with a mean of 2.54.

**Table 3.24: Question C4**

C4	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	8	19.0
2-Somewhat agree	14	33.3
3-Somewhat Disagree	8	19.0
4-Strongly Disagree	11	26.2
Total	41	97.6

### **3.6.5 I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme is the right tool to address poor performance**

The purpose of statement C5 was to find out whether PEP is the right tool to address poor performance - 40.5% of the respondents feel that PEP is the right tool to address poor performance; 35.7% of them somehow agree and 23.8% somehow disagrees that PEP is the right tool to address poor performance. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents strongly agree that PEP is the right tool to address PEP with a mean of 1.83.

**Table 3.25: Question C5**

C5	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	17	40.5
2-Somewhat agree	15	35.7
3-Somewhat Disagree	10	23.8
4-Strongly Disagree	0	0
Total	42	100

### **3.6.6 I believe an alternative tool should be used to address poor performance**

The purpose of statement C6 was to determine whether the respondents prefer an alternative tool than PEP - 47.6% of the respondents somehow disagree; 31.0% of them somehow agree; 16.7% of them somehow disagree; and 4.8% somehow disagree that an alternative tool should be used to address poor performance. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow agree that an alternative tool should be used with a mean of 2.40.

**Table 3.26: Question C6**

C6	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	7	16.7
2-Somewhat agree	13	31.0
3-Somewhat Disagree	20	47.6
4-Strongly Disagree	2	4.8
Total	42	100

### **3.6.7 I learnt about the Performance Enhancement Programme after I was appointed as a manager/supervisor**

The purpose of statement C7 was to determine whether the respondents learnt about PEP after they were appointed in management positions - 28.6% of the respondents somewhat agree/disagree; 26.8% strongly disagree; and 14.3% strongly agree that they learnt about PEP after they were appointed as managers. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somewhat disagree that they learnt about PEP after they were appointed in management positions with a mean of 2.68.

**Table 3.27: Question C7**

C7	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	6	14.3
2-Somewhat agree	12	28.6
3-Somewhat Disagree	12	28.6
4-Strongly Disagree	11	26.2
Total	41	100

### **3.6.8 I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme will improve the performance of my department**

The purpose of statement C8 was to determine from the respondents whether they believe PEP will improve the performance of their departments - 47.6% of the respondents somewhat agree, 38.1% of them somewhat agree; 11.9% somewhat agree; and 2.4% somewhat agree that PEP will improve the performance of their departments. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents strongly agree that PEP will improve the performance of their departments with a mean of 1.79.



**Table 3.28: Question C8**

C8	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	16	38.1
2-Somewhat agree	20	47.6
3-Somewhat Disagree	5	11.9
4-Strongly Disagree	1	2.4
Total	42	100

### 3.6.9 I will recommend the Performance Enhancement Programme when an employee is not performing

The purpose of statement C9 is to find out whether the respondents will recommend PEP when an employee is not performing - 54.8% of the respondents strongly agree; 31.0% of them somewhat agree; 11.9% somewhat disagree; and 2.4% strongly agree that they will recommend PEP when an employee is not performing. Refer to Annexure B, where the mean value is 1.62. Looking at the mean value of 1.62 which is moving towards two meaning 'somewhat agree', it means on average 42 of the respondents somewhat agree that they will recommend PEP when the employee is not performing.

**Table 3.29: Question C9**

C9	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	23	54.8
2-Somewhat agree	13	31.0
3-Somewhat Disagree	5	11.9
4-Strongly Disagree	1	2.4
Total	42	100

### 3.6.10 Employees are comfortable with the Performance Enhancement Programme

The purpose of statement C10 was to find out from the respondents whether the employees are comfortable with PEP - 45.2% of the respondents somewhat disagree; 28.6% somewhat agree; 19.0% strongly disagree; and 7.1% strongly agree that employees are comfortable with PEP. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somewhat agree that employees are comfortable with PEP with a mean of 2.76.

**Table 3.30: Question C10**

C10	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	3	7.1
2-Somewhat agree	12	28.6
3-Somewhat Disagree	19	45.2
4-Strongly Disagree	8	19.0
Total	42	100

### 3.6.11 Employees support the Performance Enhancement Programme as the right tool

The purpose of statement C11 was to find out from the respondents whether employees support PEP as the right tool - 38.1% of the respondents somehow disagree; 31.0% of them somehow agree; 21.4% strongly disagree; and 9.5% strongly agree that employees support PEP as the right tool. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that employees support PEP as the right tool with a mean of 2.71.

**Table 3.31: Question C11**

C11	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	4	9.5
2-Somewhat agree	13	31.0
3-Somewhat Disagree	16	38.1
4-Strongly Disagree	9	21.4
Total	42	100

### 3.6.12 I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme benefits both the employee and the employer

The purpose of statement C12 was to determine the respondents attitude towards PEP, whether it benefits both the employer and the employee - 47.6% of the respondents feel that PEP benefit both the employee and the employer; 35.7% of them somehow agree; 14.3% somehow disagree ; and 2.4% strongly disagrees that PEP benefit both the employee and the employer. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents strongly agree that PEP benefits both the employee and the employer with a mean of 1.71.

**Table 3.32: Question C12**

<b>C12</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1-Strongly agree	20	47.6
2-Somewhat agree	15	35.7
3-Somewhat Disagree	6	14.3
4-Strongly Disagree	1	2.4
Total	42	100

### **3.7 CONTRIBUTING FACTORS FOR MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS NOT TO USE PEP**

#### **3.7.1 I need training to be able to address poor performance**

The purpose of statement D1 was to find out whether the respondents need training to be able to deal with poor performance - 35.7% of the respondents somewhat agree; 31.0 % of them strongly agree; 26.2% somewhat disagree; and 7.1% strongly disagree that they need training to be able to deal with poor performance. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somewhat agree that they need training to be able to deal with poor performance with a mean value of 2.10.

**Table 3.33: Question D1**

<b>D1</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1-Strongly agree	13	31.0
2-Somewhat agree	15	35.7
3-Somewhat Disagree	11	26.2
4-Strongly Disagree	3	7.1
Total	42	100

#### **3.7.2 I know the process involved in the Performance Enhancement Programme**

The purpose of statement of D2 was to determine whether the respondents know the process involved in PEP - 52.4% of the respondents somewhat agree; 26.4% of them strongly agree; 16.7% of them somewhat disagree and 4.8% strongly disagree that they know the process involved in PEP. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somewhat agree that the process involved in PEP with a mean of 2.00.

**Table 3.34: Question D2**

D2	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	11	26.2
2-Somewhat agree	22	52.4
3-Somewhat Disagree	7	16.7
4-Strongly Disagree	2	4.8
Total	42	100

### 3.7.3 I learnt about Performance Enhancement through my colleagues

The purpose of statement D3 was to find out whether the respondents learnt about PEP through their colleagues - 40.5% of the respondents somehow disagree; 26.2% of them strongly disagree; 21.4% of them somehow agree; and 11.9% strongly agree that they learnt about PEP through their colleagues. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that they learnt about PEP through their colleagues with a mean of 2.81.

**Table 3.35: Question D3**

D3	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	5	11.9
2-Somewhat agree	9	21.4
3-Somewhat Disagree	17	40.5
4-Strongly Disagree	11	26.2
Total	42	100

### 3.7.4 I have been trained but need more training to be able to manage poor performance

The purpose of statement D4A was to determine whether the respondents have been trained but still need training to be able to manage poor performance - 33.3% of the respondents somehow agree; 33.3% of them somehow agree; 16.7% of them strongly disagree; and 14.3% strongly agree that they have been trained but they need more training to be able to manage poor performance. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that they have been trained but still need more training to be able to deal with poor performance with the mean of 2.54.

**Table 3.36: Question D4A**

D4A	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	6	14.3
2-Somewhat agree	14	33.3
3-Somewhat Disagree	14	33.3
4-Strongly Disagree	7	16.7
Total	41	97.6

### 3.7.5 I received training regarding the Performance Enhancement Programme

The purpose of statement D4B was to find out whether the respondents received training regarding PEP - 38.1% of the respondents somewhat agree; 31.0 % of them strongly disagree; 16.7% of them strongly agree; and 1.9% somewhat disagree that they received training regarding PEP. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somewhat disagree that that they received training regarding PEP with a mean of 2.59.

**Table 3.37: Question D4B**

D4B	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	7	16.7
2-Somewhat agree	16	38.1
3-Somewhat Disagree	5	11.9
4-Strongly Disagree	13	31.0
Total	41	97.6

### 3.7.6 The performance management training should be compulsory to attend within the first six months of appointment in management a position

The purpose of statement D5 was to find out from the respondents whether performance management training should be compulsory to attend within the first six months of appointment in a management position - 69.0% of the respondent strongly agree; 14.3% of them somewhat agree; 11.9% of them somewhat disagree; and 4.8% strongly disagree that performance management training should be compulsory to attend within the first six months of appointment in a management position. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somewhat agrees that performance management training should be compulsory to attend within the first six months of appointment in a management position with a mean of 1.52.

**Table 3.38: Question D5**

D5	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	29	69.0
2-Somewhat agree	6	14.3
3-Somewhat Disagree	5	11.9
4-Strongly Disagree	2	4.8
Total	42	100

### 3.7.7 I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme is designed for bad mannered employees

The purpose of statement D6 was to find out whether the respondents believe that PEP is designed for bad mannered employees - 61.9% of the respondents strongly disagree; 19.0% of them somehow disagree; 9.5% strongly agree; and 9.5% somehow agree that PEP is designed for bad mannered employees. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that PEP is designed for bad mannered employees with a mean of 3.33.

**Table 3.39: Question D6**

D6	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	4	9.5
2-Somewhat agree	4	9.5
3-Somewhat Disagree	8	19.0
4-Strongly Disagree	26	61.9
Total	42	100

### 3.7.8 I believe poor performance should be managed by Human Resources

The purpose of statement D7 was to determine how the respondents feel about poor performance being managed by Human Resources - 57.1% of the respondents strongly disagree; 28.6% of them somehow disagree; 7.1% of them strongly agree; and the other 7.1% somehow agree that poor performance should be managed by Human Resources. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents strongly disagree that poor performance should be managed by Human Resources with a mean of 3.36.

**Table 3.40: Question D7**

D7	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	3	7.1
2-Somewhat agree	3	7.1
3-Somewhat Disagree	12	28.6
4-Strongly Disagree	24	57.1
Total	42	100

### **3.7.9 I believe enrolling an employee for the Performance Enhancement Programme will ruin the relationship with my subordinates.**

The purpose of statement D8 was to find out whether the respondents believe that enrolling an employee for PEP will ruin the relationship with their subordinates - 42.9% of the respondents somehow disagree; 7.1% of them somehow agree; and the other 7.1% strongly agree that enrolling an employee for PEP will ruin the relationship with their subordinates. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that enrolling an employee for PEP will ruin the relationship with their subordinates with a mean of 3.21.

**Table 3.41: Question D8**

D8	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	3	7.1
2-Somewhat agree	3	7.1
3-Somewhat Disagree	18	42.9
4-Strongly Disagree	18	42.9
Total	42	100

### **3.7.10 The Performance Enhancement Programme is experienced as a disciplinary measure for employees**

The purpose of statement D9 was to find out whether PEP is experienced as a disciplinary measure for employees - 35.7% of the respondents strongly disagree; 23.8% of them somehow agree; 21.4% of them somehow disagree; and 19.0% strongly agree that PEP is experienced as a disciplinary measure for employees. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that PEP is experienced as a disciplinary measure for employees with a mean of 2.74.

**Table 3.42: Question D9**

D9	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	8	19.0
2-Somehow agree	10	23.8
3-Somehow Disagree	9	21.4
4-Strongly Disagree	15	35.7
Total	42	100

### 3.7.11 I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme is for incompetent people

The purpose of statement of D10 was to find out from the respondents whether they believe that PEP is for incompetent people - 45.2% of the respondents strongly disagree; 26.2% of them somehow agree; 19.05 of them somehow disagree; and 9.5% strongly agree that PEP is for incompetent people. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that PEP is for incompetent people with a mean of 3.00.

**Table 3.43: Question D10**

D10	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	4	9.5
2-Somehow agree	11	26.2
3-Somehow Disagree	8	19.0
4-Strongly Disagree	19	45.2
Total	100	100

### 3.7.12. I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme is time consuming

The purpose of statement D11 was to find out whether the respondents believe that PEP is time consuming - 35.7% of the respondents somehow disagree; 33.3% of them strongly disagree; 16.7% of them strongly agree; and 14.3% somehow agree that PEP is time consuming. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that PEP is time consuming with a mean of 2.86.



**Table 3.44: Question D11**

D11	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	7	16.7
2-Somewhat agree	6	14.3
3-Somewhat Disagree	15	35.7
4-Strongly Disagree	14	33.3
Total	42	100

### 3.7.13 I believe that individuals should worry about their performance therefore management should not be involved

According to the response received on statement D12, 52.4% of the respondents strongly disagree; 31.0% of them somehow disagree; 11.9% of them somehow agree; and 4.8% strongly agree that individuals should worry about their own performance and management should not be involved. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that the individuals should worry about their own performance and that management should not be involved with a mean of 3.31.

**Table 3.45: Question D12**

D12	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	2	4.8
2-Somewhat agree	5	11.9
3-Somewhat Disagree	13	31.0
4-Strongly Disagree	22	52.4
Total	42	100

### 3.7.14 I believe that the reason why people are not performing is because they are just lazy

The purpose of statement D13 was to find out if the respondents believe that employees' non-performance are the result of the laziness - 35.7% of the respondents strongly disagree; 33.3% of them somehow disagree; 26.2% of them somehow agree; and 4.8% strongly agree that the reason why people are not performing is because they are just lazy. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that employees are not performing because they are lazy with a mean of 3.00.

**Table 3.46: Question D13**

D13	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	2	4.8
2-Somehow agree	11	26.2
3-Somehow Disagree	14	33.3
4-Strongly Disagree	15	35.7
Total	42	100

### 3.7.15 I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme has a stigma which I don't want to be associated with

The purpose of statement D14 was to find out whether the respondents believe that PEP has a stigma which they don't want to be associated with - 52.4% of the respondents strongly disagree; 26.2% of them somehow disagree; 11.9% of them somehow agree; and 7.1% strongly agree that PEP has a stigma which they don't want to be associated with. It can be observed in Annexure B that the respondents somehow disagree that PEP has a stigma which they don't want to be associated with, with a mean of 3.27.

**Table 3.47: Question D14**

D14	Frequency	Percentage
1-Strongly agree	3	7.1
2-Somehow agree	5	11.9
3-Somehow Disagree	11	26.2
4-Strongly Disagree	22	52.4
Total	41	97.6

## 3.8. RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

Cronbach's alpha is a reliability test technique that requires only a single test administration to provide a unique estimate of the reliability for a given test. Cronbach's alpha is the average value of the reliability coefficients one would obtain for all possible combinations of items when split into two half-tests (Gliem & Gliem, 2003:84).

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1. However, there is actually no lower limit to the coefficient. The closer Cronbach's alpha coefficient is to 1.0 the better the internal consistency of the items in the scale. Based on the formula  $\alpha = \frac{rk}{1+(k-1)r}$  where k is the number of items considered and r is the mean of the inter-item correlations, the size of alpha is determined by both the number of items in the scale and the mean inter-

item correlations. George and Mallery (2003:231) provide the following rule of thumb:”  $\geq .9$  - Excellent,  $\geq .8$  - Good,  $\geq .7$  - Acceptable,  $\geq .6$  - Questionable,  $\geq .5$  - Poor, and  $< .5$  - Unacceptable”. While increasing the value of alpha is partially dependent upon the number of items in the scale, it should be noted that this has diminishing returns. It should also be noted that while a high value for Cronbach’s alpha indicates good internal consistency of the items in the scale, it does not mean that the scale is un-dimensional (Gliem & Gliem, 2003:87).

**3.8.1. Class A: The effectiveness of PEP**

As indicated in Table 3.48, the Cronbach’s alpha for the above class is 0.117. According to the above rule of thumb, when the value of Cronbach’s alpha is less than 0.5, it is said to be unacceptable. The Cronbach’s alpha is 0.117, suggesting that there is no internal consistency among the measured items.

**Table 3.48: Class A Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha
.117

**3.8.2. Class B: Contributing factors for managers and supervisors to use PEP**

As indicated in Table 3.49, the Cronbach’s alpha for the above class is 0.72. According to the rule of thumb, when the value of Cronbach’s alpha is bigger than 0.7, it is acceptable. The Cronbach’s alpha is 0.720, suggesting there is internal consistency among the measured items.

**Table 3.49: Class B Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha
.720

**3.8.3 Class C: Contributing factors for managers and supervisors not to use PEP.**

As indicated in Annexure E, Table E1, the Cronbach’s alpha for the above class is 0.442, therefore the value is less than 0.5, which is unacceptable. The Cronbach’s alpha is 0.442, suggesting that there is no internal consistency among the measured items.

**Table 3.50. Class C Reliability Statistics**

<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>
.0442

### **3.9 SUMMARY**

This chapter dealt with the results and the discussion of the empirical study. The results were analysed and discussed in detail. Chapter four will be focusing on the conclusion and recommendations of the study.

# CHAPTER 4

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to conclude on the effectiveness of the Performance Enhancement Programme implemented within Eskom. This chapter will further provide tangible recommendations to the performance enhancement programme (PEP). In Chapter three it was stated that Class A (the effectiveness of PEP) and C (contributing factors for supervisors and managers not to use PEP), cannot be used collectively to draw conclusions. Only Class B (contributing factors for supervisors and managers to use PEP) may be used as a group to come up with conclusions and recommendations, therefore Class A and C items will be discussed individually.

### 4.2 CONCLUSIONS

#### 4.2.1 Bibliography information results

Comparing the number of participants, the male participants were the majority with the percentage of 61.9%. There were three categories of different age groups which participated, with the 32 – 40-years group having the majority of participants. The questionnaires were distributed to managers on different levels as well as supervisors. The majority who responded to the questionnaire was the category one being the T10-T13. The regional areas that participated in the North Western Region were, Benoni/Nigel which had the majority of participants, followed by Bloemfontein. The majority of the respondents had more than five years' experience, and the engineering department being the majority of participants, followed by sales and customer.

#### 4.2.2 The effectiveness of the Performance Enhancement Programme: Class A

- The respondents were asked whether PEP is the right tool to address poor performance; 42 of the respondents somehow agreed that PEP is the right tool address poor performance, which leaves room for improvement, because their mean is 1.71 which is moving towards two. If it was one, one could say there is no doubt that PEP is the right tool to use;
- When the respondents were asked whether employees' performance improve after being taken for PEP, 42 of the respondents somehow agreed that employees' performance improve after being taken for PEP. This indicates that the respondents

have confidence in PEP or they have seen the PEP results, but there is still a lot of intervention to be done, either from PEP implementation or the employee's responsiveness towards PEP;

- When the respondents were asked whether PEP increases the stress level of employees, 42 of the respondents somehow disagreed that PEP increases the stress level of employees, meaning that the respondents somehow disagree that PEP causes stress to the employees who have been sent to PEP;
- When the respondents were asked whether the only reason why they take employees for PEP was because they don't want to be disciplined, they strongly disagree that the only reason why they take employees for PEP is that they don't want to be disciplined. This clearly indicates that supervisors and managers know their responsibilities;
- When the respondents were asked whether giving an employee a target score irrespective of their performance, was fair, 42 of them somehow agreed, which it is a good indication that the supervisors and managers understand the importance of performance appraisal. If employees are fairly rated then it is easier to identify those who need to be recommended for PEP and to give credit to excellent performers without limiting them to a target score;
- When respondents were asked whether employees who have been recommended for PEP lose interest at work, 40 of them somehow disagreed that employee's lose interest at work when they are recommended for PEP. meaning that this should not be a worrying factor to the managers and supervisors, but when there is a need for poor performance management it should be done;
- When the respondents were asked whether they use PEP to get rid of trouble makers, 42 of them strongly disagreed on that. This means supervisors and managers are aware of the importance of PEP and they know the process they should take to discipline trouble makers;
- When the respondents were asked whether they believe poor performance should be managed, 42 of them strongly agreed that poor performance should be managed. Supervisors and managers believe that poor performance should be managed therefore it is the responsibility of each manager to address the issue and ensure that poor performance is managed;
- When the respondents were asked whether they have confidence in PEP, they somehow agreed that they have confidence on PEP. Meaning there is no need to introduce a new process or programme of addressing poor performance;

- When the respondents were asked whether the company they work for it is a good company and therefore there will be no need to take employees for PEP, 40 of the respondents somehow disagreed that they need not to take employees for PEP because they are working for a good company. The respondents are aware that poor performance can tarnish the image of the company therefore there is no need to use the image of the company as an excuse when one has to deal with poor performance;
- When the respondents were asked whether employees' feedback on PEP helps improving their performance, 42 of the respondents somehow agreed that employees feels that PEP does help to improve their performance. This shows a positive feedback from the employees, meaning that there is no need to worry about PEP - it is a good process to address poor performance;
- When the respondents were asked if PEP can be used as expected to improve the performance of their business unit, 42 of them somehow agreed that if PEP is used as expected it can improve the performance of their business unit, meaning that the respondents agreed that PEP is not used as expected and if it can be used as expected performance can improve;
- When the respondents were asked about whether they believe that managers and supervisors give employees fair rating according to their performance, 42 of them somehow agreed that supervisors and managers gives employees fair rating according to their performance. This indicates that supervisors and managers believe in the rating they give employees and again on the ratings their colleagues are giving their subordinates;
- When the respondents were asked whether they believe that PEP is used to frustrate employees until they leave the organisation, 42 of them strongly disagreed, meaning supervisors and managers understand the purpose of PEP. This gives confidence that managers and supervisors are not misusing PEP;

#### **4.2.3 Contributing factors for Managers and Supervisors to use PEP: Class B**

- As stated in Chapter three the Cronbach's alpha for Class B is equal to 0.720 which is acceptable. Concluding the results for this Class, it is evident that supervisors and managers are using PEP. Referring to Annexure D, per items Cronbach's Alpha is satisfactory. It is therefore correct to conclude that the questions stated on Annexure A, section C, are the contributors for managers to use PEP effectively.

#### **4.2.4 Contributing factors for Managers and Supervisors not to use PEP: Class C**

- When the respondents were asked whether they needed training to be able to deal with poor performance, on average 42 of them somehow agreed that they need training to be able to deal with poor performance, meaning that the respondents feel that there is a need for training for them to be able to deal with poor performance effectively;
- When the respondents were asked whether they know the process involved in PEP, on average 42 of them somehow agreed that they know the steps involved in PEP. Looking at the question above, the respondents said there is a need for training, but on the other hand they are aware of the steps involved in PEP, meaning that, though the respondents knows the steps involved, they still need training;
- When the respondents were asked whether they learnt about PEP through their colleagues, on average 42 of them somehow disagreed that they learnt about PEP through their colleagues. This could only mean that training played an important role for the respondents to be informed about PEP;
- When the respondents were asked whether training provided to them was adequate, or whether they still needed more training, on average 41 of them somehow agreed that they have been trained and they still need more training. In concluding this item the respondents could be responding to the first part of the question where it stated that “I received training”, which could be supported by the next question;
- When the respondents were asked whether they received training regarding PEP, on average 41 of them somehow disagreed that they received training on PEP. This could only mean one thing; there is a need for training regarding managing poor performance. Again this could be leaving some questions unanswered, if the respondents did not learn about PEP through their colleagues how did they learn about PEP, because it is evident that respondents feel that they need training;
- When the respondents were asked whether performance management training should be compulsory to attend within the first six months of appointment in the management position, on average 42 of them somehow agreed that it should be compulsory to attend performance management training in the first six months after their appointment, meaning that there is a need for training, especially in the first six months after their appointment in the management position;
- When the respondents were asked whether they believe that PEP is designed for bad mannered employees, on average 42 of them somehow disagreed that PEP is



designed for bad mannered employees, meaning that the respondents understand the importance of PEP and why it is in place;

- When the respondents were asked whether they believe that poor performance should be managed by human resource, on average 42 of them somehow disagreed that poor performance should be managed by human resource. This could only mean that managers and supervisors are fully aware of their responsibilities, that they are responsible for managing poor performance;
- When the respondents were asked whether they believe that enrolling an employee for PEP will ruin the relationship with their subordinates, on average 42 of them somehow disagreed that enrolling an employee for PEP will ruin the relationship with their subordinates. This means that supervisors and managers trust that employees believe in them that they will be doing what is good for both the employee and the employer;
- When the respondents were asked whether PEP is designed for incompetent people, on average 42 of them disagreed that PEP is designed for incompetent people. This means that managers and supervisors understand the purpose of PEP; this gives confidence that it will not be used for wrong reasons;
- When the respondents were asked whether they believe that PEP is time consuming, on average 42 of them somehow disagreed that PEP is time consuming, meaning none of the managers and supervisors should complain about time because it is said not to be an issue for PEP usage;
- When the participants were asked whether they believe that individuals should worry about their performance and management should not be involved, on average 42 of them somehow disagreed that individuals should worry about their performance and management should not be involved. This means that supervisors and managers are concerned about the employee's performance and that they are aware that they are responsible to manage poor performance;
- When the respondents were asked whether they believe people are not performing because they are just lazy, on average 42 of them somehow disagreed that people are not performing because they are just lazy, meaning that supervisors and managers understand that there are different reasons which could lead to employees not to perform as expected.;
- When asked whether they believe that PEP has a stigma which they don't want to be associated with, on average 41 of them somehow disagreed that PEP has a stigma which they don't want to be associated with, meaning either them or the employees

will be recommended for PEP when the need arise without any of the party feeling ashamed.

### **4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS**

The research conducted highlighted some areas that need immediate attention which may be the barriers for supervisors and managers not to use PEP. The following needs to be addressed to ensure the effective use of PEP:

#### **Training**

- Respondents indicated very clearly that they need training to be able to address poor performance. It is therefore recommended that supervisors and managers should be given the necessary training;
- Supervisors and managers indicated that it should be compulsory for supervisors and managers to attend training regarding the Performance Enhancement Programme during the first six months of appointment;
- It is recommended that the content of the training should be reviewed to ensure that all training needs are addressed. After having attended the training, supervisors and managers should be confident to address or to manage poor performance.

### **4.4 CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE STUDY**

The success of this study is based upon realising the primary and secondary objectives, as indicated in section 1.4 of this study.

#### **4.4.1 Primary Objectives re-visited**

The primary objective of the study was to measure the effectiveness of PEP. Questions were asked specifically in Class A to measure the effectiveness of PEP, but the questions were found not to be reliable to group for the measurement of the effectiveness of the PEP. As a result the study was inconclusive in measuring the effectiveness of the PEP, as each question had to be dealt with individually to come up with conclusions and recommendations. To address the primary objective, the secondary objectives were formulated.

#### **4.4.2 Secondary Objectives re-visited**

The specific objectives of this research were:

- Identify contributing factors for managers and supervisors to use PEP;

- Identify contributing factors for managers and supervisors not to use PEP;
- To measure the importance of these factors for PEP usage;
- If possible, to come with alternative methods to deal non-performance.

The first and third objectives were realised in chapter three when the respondents were asked different questions in order to find out the reasons or contributing factors for managers and supervisors to use PEP. The findings were conclusive in that the questions asked were found reliable to conclude that those are the reasons for managers and supervisors to use PEP.

The second and third objectives were also realised in chapter three where the respondents were asked different questions in order to find out the reasons or contributing factors for managers and supervisors not to use PEP, and if possible to measure the importance of these factors for PEP usage. The findings were inconclusive in that the questions combined were found not to be reliable and therefore each question had to be investigated separately.

The fourth objective which is the last one, was dealt with in chapter two where a literature review was conducted in order to find alternative methods to deal with non-performance. Some of the alternatives were not practical and therefore cannot be used for any recommendations. According to the findings of the study, the supervisors and managers prefer PEP as tool to address poor performance and therefore there is no need to recommend any alternative means of addressing poor performance.

#### **4.5 SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER STUDY**

- There was no evidence found during the study about the effectiveness of PEP, therefore, future studies need to focus on the effectiveness of the Performance Enhancement Programme. As indicated before, the questions formulated did not pass the reliability test, therefore the research on that regard it is inconclusive. It is therefore recommended that for future studies the questionnaire should pass the reliability test before one can come to a conclusion of measuring the effectiveness of PEP;
- Secondly, contributing factors for supervisors and managers not to use PEP also did not pass the reliability test; therefore it is recommended that for future study this category of questionnaire should be reformulated, as they did not pass the reliability test. Again it is recommended that for future study the questionnaire should also pass

the reliability test before one can come to a conclusion that the questions under this category measure the reasons for managers and supervisors not to use PEP;

- Thirdly, for future study, the researcher needs to prove that supervisors and managers do not use PEP as is expected, or prove that this is just a perception;
- Lastly, the study on the effectiveness of PEP should also be conducted on employees not in management positions.

#### **4.6 SUMMARY**

- The purpose of this chapter was to conclude on the findings of the study. The conclusions were made based on the information submitted by the respondents in chapter three;
- The short description of the biographical information was given and the conclusion thereof per questions and categories;
- In this chapter it was concluded that the study did not conclude on the effectiveness of the Performance Enhancement Programme and therefore each question was evaluated as an individual and conclusions were made based on that;
- The contributing factors for supervisors and managers to use PEP were found reliable and therefore conclusions were made based on the questions grouped together;
- The contributing factors for managers and supervisors not to use PEP were found not reliable and therefore each question was treated as an individual and the conclusions were therefore made based on each question;
- The primary and secondary objectives from chapter one were revisited to see whether they were achieved;
- Recommendations for future study were made based on the points discussed above.

## REFERENCES:

- ANON. 2010. Addressing employee performance problems: 7 steps to success. *HR Specialist: New York Employment Law*, 5(1):6, Jan.
- ARMSTRONG, M. & BARON, A. 2005. Managing performance. Londonp: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- ARMSTRONG, M. 2006. Performance management. key strategies and practical guidelines. London: Kogan Page.
- ATKINS, A. 2009. The poor performance disciplinary dilemma. *NZ Business*: 8 Oct. p 22.
- BRECHER, N. 2007. Performance Enhancement. *Journal of Property Management*, 27(4): 20, July/August.
- CARMELI, A., BEN-HADOR, B., WALDMAN, D.A., & RUPP, D.E. 2009. How leaders cultivate social capital and nature employee vigour: implications for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(6):1553-1561.
- CARNAZZA, J.P., KORMAN A.K., FERENCE T.P. & STONER J.A.F. 1981. Plateaued and non-plateaued managers: Factors in job performance. *Journal of Management*, 7(2):7-8.
- CHEN, H.M. & FU, P.C. 2008. A systematic framework for performance appraisal and compensation strategy. *Human System Management*, 27(2):161-162.
- COETSEE, L.D. 2003. Peak performance and productivity: Practical guide for the creation of a motivating climate. Vanderbijlpark: Ons Drukkers.
- CUMMINGS, T.G & WORLEY, C.G. 2009. Organizational development & change. New York, NY: South Western Cengage Learning.
- DERVITSIOTIS, K. 2001. Performance improvement programmes. *Emerging Markets Now*, 12(6):687-700, Sep.
- DILLER, L. 2008. Human performance enhancement. *Air & Power Journal*, Winter:40-41.
- EDWARDS J.A., GUPPY, A. & COCKERTON, T. 2007. A longitudinal study exploring the relationships between occupational stressors, non-work stressors and work performance. *Work and Stress*, 21(2):99-100, April-June.

FORGIE, J. 2007. Deal quickly with performance issues. *Credit Union Executive newsletter*: 3 Sep., p 3.

GLIEM J.R. & GLIEM R.R. 2003. Midwest research to practice in adult, continuing and community. *African Journal for Higher Education*, 16(3):82-87.

GOOTNICK, D. & MARGARET, M. 2000. Monitoring employee performance and behaviour. *Action Tools for Effective Managers*, 16-18.

GORDIJN, B. 2006. Converging NBIC technologies for improving human performance: A critical assessment of the novelty and the prospects of the project. *Journal of Law, Medicine and Medicine*. Winter.

GROBLER, P., WARNICH, S., GARRELL, M.R., ELBERT, N.F. & HATFIELD, R.D. 2006. Human resource management in South Africa. London: Thomson.

HATHAWAY, D.J. 2008. Human performance improvement for tactical teams. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, June. P 1.

HAU, M. 2008. Sport in the human economy: Medicine, psychology, and performance enhancement during the Weimer Republic. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

HUGHES, M. 2004. Mapping communication to a human performance technology framework. *Society for Technical Communication*, 53:367-366.

KING, P. 1984. Performance planning and appraisal. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

LAFF, M. 2007. 30 Days to a more powerful memory. American Society for Training & Development: 98p, May.

MEYER, M. & KIRSTEN, M. 2005. Introduction to human resource management. Claremont: New Book Africa.

MUJTABA, B.J. & SHUAIB, S. 2010. An equitable total rewards approach to pay for performance management. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 11(4):112.

NYALUNGU, VR. 2003. Directive of Eskom in Performance Management. July 12. Unpublished.

REB, J. & GREGURAS, G.J. 2008. Dynamic performance and the performance-Performance rating relation. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1:194-196.

- RESTUBOG, S.L., JIMMIESON, N. & IMER, B. 2006. Haunted by the Past: Effects of Poor Change Management History on Employee Attitudes and Turnover. In: Academy of Management 2007 Annual Meeting Proceedings: Doing Well By Doing Good, 3-8 August. Philadelphia, MI.
- RIKETTA, M. 2008. A casual relation between job attitudes and performance: A Meta-Analysis of panel studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2): 472-476.
- ROTHWELL, W.J. 2005. Beyond training and development. New York, NY. Amacon.
- RUE, H.W., RUE, W.H. & BYARS, H.L. 2010. Supervision key link to productivity. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- RUSSEL, K. 2011. A lesson in performance management from the 'HR Headmistress'. *British Journal of Administrative Management*, 73:6, Winter.
- RUSSEL, K. 2010. How to address poor performance. *British Journal of Administrative Management*, 1:28, Nov.
- SMITHER, J.W. & LONDON, M. 2009. Performance management. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- STANLEY, T.L. 2007. Poor performance and due process. *Journal of Personnel Management*, 68(1): 8-11, Jan.
- TARDIVO, G. & VIASSONE, M. 2010. Creating an innovative social assistential performance management system. *Journal of Financial Management and Analysis*, 23(2):99-110.
- VAN DOOREN, W. 2011. Better performance management. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 34(3):420-426.
- WALSH, M.B. 2003. Perceived fairness of and satisfaction with employee performance appraisal. PhD. Dissertation. Louisiana, KT: Louisiana State University.
- WHITE, R.J. 2008. Pull the plug on poor performance. Prism Business Media. March.
- WHITE, R.J. 2008. Pull the plug on poor performance. *Prism Business Media*: 65-67, Mar.
- WOLBRING, G. 2008. Why NBIC? Why human performance enhancement? *The European Journal of Social Science Research*: 21(1):29-36, Mar.

WYNNE, G., BUCK, R., VARNAVA, A., PHILLIPS, C. & MAIN, C.J. 2009. Impacts on work absence and performance: what really matters? *Occupational Medicine*, 59:556-567.

YANG, C.W, CHEN, C.J. & LIN, C.J. 2006. Applying human reliability growth analysis to system performance enhancement. *Human System Management*, 25: 79-85.



# ANNEXURE A

## QUESTIONNAIRE: EXPLORING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMME WITHIN AN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

This questionnaire must only be completed by Eskom Distribution NWR employees.
--

All information will be treated as **STRICLY CONFIDENTIAL** and will only be used for academic purposes.

### Instruction for completion:

1. Please answer the questions as objectively and honestly as possible.
2. Follow instructions per Section.
3. Please answer all questions.

Thank you very much for your co-operation.

### QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPED BY:

Miss Tsepiso Patricia Lekaota

Tel: 011 741 3563

Fax: 086 537 2071

Email: [lekaottp@eskom.co.za](mailto:lekaottp@eskom.co.za)

**SECTION A: Biographical Information**  
*(Please complete by circling appropriate number)*

**1. Gender**

Female	1
Male	2

**2. Age**

Between 20 and 30	1
Between 31 and 40	2
Between 41 and 50	3
Between 51 and 60	4
Above 60	5

**3. What is your current man-grade?**

T10-T13	1
M14-M16	2
M17-M18	3
P14-P18	4
G14-G16	5
Other	6

**4. In which Regional area is your work station?**

Benoni/Nigel	1
Bloemfontein	2
Kimberly	3
Welkom	4
Bethlehem	5
Other: Specify .....	6

**5. How many years have you worked for the Company?**

Less than 2 years	1
2 years to 5 years	2
More than 5 years	3

**6. In which department do you work?**

Engineering	1
Commercial	2
Communication	3
Human Resource	4
Information	5
Risk Management	6
Sales and Customer	7
Business Strategy	8
Finance	9
Other	10

**SECTION B: Indicate your opinion by ticking with X in the appropriate box.**

**Example:**

No	Question	Strongly Agree	Somehow Agree	Somehow Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		1	2	3	4
B0	I love cherries		X		

**1. The effectiveness of Performance Enhancement Programme (PEP)**

No	Questions	Strongly Agree	Somehow Agree	Somehow Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		1	2	3	4
B1	Performance Enhancement Programme is the right tool to address poor performance				
B2	Employees performance improves after being taken for the Performance Enhancement Programme				
B3	Performance Enhancement Programme increases the stress level of employees				
B4	The only reason I take employees for Performance Enhancement Programme is because I don't want to be disciplined				
B5	I believe giving an employee a target score irrespective of performance is fair				
B6	Employees who have been recommended for the Performance Enhancement Programme lose interest at work				
B7	The reason why I use the Performance Enhancement Programme is to get rid of trouble makers				
B8	I believe poor performance should be managed				
B9	I have confidence in the Performance Enhancement Programme				
B10	The company I work for it is a good company therefore there is no need to take employees for Performance Enhancement Programme				
B11	The employee feedback on Performance Enhancement Programme is that it helps to improve performance				
B12	I believe that if the Performance				

	Enhancement Programme is used as expected it can improve the performance of my business unit				
<b>B13</b>	I believe supervisors/managers give fair employees rating according to their performance				
<b>B14</b>	I believe Performance Enhancement Programme is to frustrate the employees until they leave the organisation				

**SECTION C: Indicate your opinion by ticking with X in the appropriate box.**

**Example:**

No	Question	Strongly Agree	Somehow Agree	Somehow Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		1	2	3	4
<b>B0</b>	<b>I love cherries</b>		X		

**1. Contributing factors for Managers and Supervisors to use PEP**

No	Questions	Strongly Agree	Somehow Agree	Somehow Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		1	2	3	4
<b>C1</b>	I know what the Performance Enhancement Programme is				
<b>C2</b>	I knew about the Performance Enhancement Programme before becoming a manager/supervisor				
<b>C3</b>	I learnt about Performance Enhancement through training				
<b>C4</b>	The training provided addressed my needs regarding Performance Enhancement Programme				
<b>C5</b>	I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme is the right tool to address poor performance				
<b>C6</b>	I believe an alternative tool should be used to address poor performance				
<b>C7</b>	I learnt about the Performance Enhancement Programme after I was appointed as a manager/supervisor				
<b>C8</b>	I believe Performance Enhancement Programme will improve the performance of my department				
<b>C9</b>	I will recommend the performance enhancement programme when an employee is not performing				
<b>C10</b>	Employees are comfortable with the Performance Enhancement Programme				
<b>C11</b>	Employees support the Performance				

	Enhancement Programme as the right tool				
<b>C12</b>	I believe Performance Enhancement Programme benefits both the employee and the employer				

**SECTION D: *Indicate your opinion by ticking with X in the appropriate box.***

**Example:**

No	Question	Strongly Agree	Somehow Agree	Somehow Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		1	2	3	4
<b>B0</b>	<b>I love cherries</b>		X		

**1. Contributing factors for Managers and Supervisors not to use PEP**

No	Questions	Strongly Agree	Somehow Agree	Somehow Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		1	2	3	4
<b>D1</b>	I need training to be able to address poor performance				
<b>D2</b>	I know the process involved in the Performance Enhancement Programme				
<b>D3</b>	I learnt about Performance Enhancement through my colleagues				
<b>D4A</b>	I have been trained but need more training to be able to manage poor performance				
<b>D4B</b>	I received training regarding Performance Enhancement Programme				
<b>D5</b>	The performance management training should be compulsory to attend within the first six months of appointment in management position				
<b>D6</b>	I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme is designed for bad mannered employees				
<b>D7</b>	I believe poor performance should be managed by human resource				
<b>D8</b>	I believe enrolling an employee for Performance Enhancement Programme will ruin the relationship with my subordinates.				
<b>D9</b>	The Performance Enhancement Programme is experienced as a disciplinary measure for employees				
<b>D10</b>	I believe Performance Enhancement Programme is for incompetent				

	people				
<b>D11</b>	I believe that the Performance Enhancement Programme is time consuming				
<b>D12</b>	I believe individuals should worry about their performance therefor management should not be involved				
<b>D13</b>	I believe the reason people are not performing it is because they are just lazy				
<b>D14</b>	I believe Performance Enhancement Programme has a stigma which I don't want to be associated with				

## ANNEXURE B

### Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
B1	42	1	4	1.71	.864
B2	42	1	4	2.10	.790
B3	42	1	4	2.52	.994
B4	42	2	4	3.60	.627
B5	42	1	4	3.45	.916
B6	41	1	4	2.80	.872
B7	42	2	4	3.62	.623
B8	42	1	3	1.24	.532
B9	42	1	4	1.98	.924
B10	41	1	4	3.34	.855
B11	42	1	3	2.10	.790
B12	42	1	4	1.52	.773
B13	42	1	4	2.17	.961
B14	42	2	4	3.62	.582
C1	42	1	4	1.55	.772
C2	41	1	4	1.95	1.048
C3	42	1	4	2.45	.993
C4	41	1	4	2.54	1.098
C5	42	1	3	1.83	.794
C6	42	1	4	2.40	.828
C7	41	1	4	2.68	1.035
C8	42	1	4	1.79	.750
C9	42	1	4	1.62	.795
C10	42	1	4	2.76	.850
C11	42	1	4	2.71	.918
C12	42	1	4	1.71	.805
D1	42	1	4	2.10	.932
D2	42	1	4	2.00	.796
D3	42	1	4	2.81	.969
D4A	41	1	4	2.54	.951
D4B	41	1	4	2.59	1.117
D5	42	1	4	1.52	.890
D6	42	1	4	3.33	1.004
D7	42	1	4	3.36	.906
D8	42	1	4	3.21	.871
D9	42	1	4	2.74	1.149
D10	42	1	4	3.00	1.059
D11	42	1	4	2.86	1.072
D12	42	1	4	3.31	.869

D13	42	1	4	3.00	.911
D14	41	1	4	3.27	.949
Valid N (listwise)	37				



**ANNEXURE C****CLASS A  
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PEP****Table C.1**

<b>Case Processing Summary</b>			
		<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Cases	Valid	40	95.2
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	2	4.8
	Total	42	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**Table C.2**

<b>Reliability Statistics</b>		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.117	.023	14

**Table C.3**

<b>Item Statistics</b>			
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>N</b>
B1	1.73	.877	40
B2	2.13	.791	40
B3	2.50	.987	40
B4	3.58	.636	40
B5	3.43	.931	40
B6	2.78	.862	40
B7	3.63	.628	40
B8	1.25	.543	40
B9	2.00	.934	40
B10	3.33	.859	40
B11	2.10	.778	40
B12	1.55	.783	40
B13	2.18	.984	40
B14	3.63	.586	40

**Table C.4****Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10	B11	B12	B13	B14
B1	1.000	.569	-.193	-.215	-.104	-.491	-.146	.040	.783	-.185	.229	.488	.117	-.306
B2	.569	1.000	-.082	-.300	.100	-.560	-.161	-.134	.625	.014	.438	.549	.235	-.228
B3	-.193	-.082	1.000	.184	.265	.347	.145	.096	-.195	.348	-.267	-.100	.040	.111
B4	-.215	-.300	.184	1.000	-.034	.336	.361	-.204	-.389	.165	-.275	-.239	-.165	.318
B5	-.104	.100	.265	-.034	1.000	.154	-.027	-.216	-.118	.176	.046	-.153	-.195	.159
B6	-.491	-.560	.347	.336	.154	1.000	.219	.014	-.605	.274	-.386	-.268	-.285	.286
B7	-.146	-.161	.145	.361	-.027	.219	1.000	-.320	-.394	.232	-.026	-.300	-.348	.584
B8	.040	-.134	.096	-.204	-.216	.014	-.320	1.000	.152	-.289	.000	.030	.060	-.262
B9	.783	.625	-.195	-.389	-.118	-.605	-.394	.152	1.000	-.288	.353	.526	.223	-.469
B10	-.185	.014	.348	.165	.176	.274	.232	-.289	-.288	1.000	-.395	-.044	.052	.452
B11	.229	.438	-.267	-.275	.046	-.386	-.026	.000	.353	-.395	1.000	.160	.044	-.197
B12	.488	.549	-.100	-.239	-.153	-.268	-.300	.030	.526	-.044	.160	1.000	.338	-.266
B13	.117	.235	.040	-.165	-.195	-.285	-.348	.060	.223	.052	.044	.338	1.000	-.462
B14	-.306	-.228	.111	.318	.159	.286	.584	-.262	-.469	.452	-.197	-.266	-.462	1.000

**Table C.5****Summary Item Statistics**

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	2.555	1.250	3.625	2.375	2.900	.691	14
Inter-Item Correlations	.002	-.605	.783	1.388	-1.294	.090	14

**Table C.6****Item-Total Statistics**

	Scale Mean if Item	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item
--	--------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------

	Deleted				Deleted
B1	34.05	8.510	.206	.684	.009
B2	33.65	7.926	.400	.676	-.090 <sup>a</sup>
B3	33.28	8.358	.175	.369	.016
B4	32.20	10.523	-.144	.290	.177
B5	32.35	9.310	.028	.334	.112
B6	33.00	11.282	-.292	.576	.270
B7	32.15	10.336	-.098	.550	.159
B8	34.53	10.769	-.205	.325	.186
B9	33.78	8.846	.111	.781	.062
B10	32.45	8.921	.131	.531	.054
B11	33.68	9.969	-.049	.439	.148
B12	34.23	8.435	.283	.494	-.021 <sup>a</sup>
B13	33.60	9.579	-.035	.441	.151
B14	32.15	10.438	-.119	.610	.163

**Table C.7**

**Scale Statistics**

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
35.78	10.333	3.214	14

## ANNEXURE D

### CLASS B CONTRIBUTING FACTORS FOR MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS TO USE PEP

**Table D.1**

**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	39	92.9
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	3	7.1
	Total	42	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**Table D.2**

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.720	.730	12

**Table D.3**

**Item Statistics**

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
C1	1.56	.788	39
C2	1.90	1.021	39
C3	2.38	.963	39
C4	2.51	1.097	39
C5	1.82	.790	39
C6	2.38	.847	39
C7	2.77	.986	39
C8	1.79	.767	39
C9	1.62	.782	39
C10	2.69	.832	39
C11	2.64	.903	39
C12	1.72	.826	39

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12
C1	1.000	.172	.227	.205	.125	-.097	-.201	-.021	-.066	-.009	.070	.170
C2	.172	1.000	.014	.072	.074	-.014	-.573	.229	.117	.007	.212	.160
C3	.227	.014	1.000	.805	.335	-.122	.207	.288	.132	.382	.345	.339
C4	.205	.072	.805	1.000	.382	.037	.210	.347	.175	.437	.377	.367
C5	.125	.074	.335	.382	1.000	-.051	.081	.545	.609	.314	.276	.767
C6	-.097	-.014	-.122	.037	-.051	1.000	.141	-.037	-.009	.098	.013	-.142
C7	-.201	-.573	.207	.210	.081	.141	1.000	.214	.087	.200	.348	.209
C8	-.021	-.229	.288	.347	.545	-.037	.214	1.000	.435	.393	.309	.613
C9	-.066	-.117	.132	.175	.609	-.009	.087	.435	1.000	.177	.247	.684
C10	-.009	-.007	.382	.437	.314	.098	.200	.393	.177	1.000	.550	.292
C11	.070	-.212	.345	.377	.276	.013	.348	.309	.247	.550	1.000	.320
C12	.170	-.160	.339	.367	.767	-.142	.209	.613	.684	.292	.320	1.000

**Table D.4**

**Table D.5**

**Summary Item Statistics**

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	2.150	1.564	2.769	1.205	1.770	.207	12
Inter-Item Correlations	.184	-.573	.805	1.378	-1.404	.064	12

**Table D.6****Item-Total Statistics**

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
C1	24.23	26.393	.110	.236	.730
C2	23.90	28.673	-.166	.469	.776
C3	23.41	21.827	.572	.682	.668
C4	23.28	20.208	.658	.706	.649
C5	23.97	22.552	.630	.667	.667
C6	23.41	27.406	-.025	.156	.748
C7	23.03	25.447	.149	.475	.732
C8	24.00	23.526	.509	.483	.684
C9	24.18	24.204	.402	.551	.696
C10	23.10	22.989	.529	.433	.679
C11	23.15	22.923	.482	.417	.683
C12	24.08	22.389	.619	.755	.667

**Table D.7****Scale Statistics**

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
25.79	27.904	5.282	12

**ANNEXURE E****CLASS C****CONTRIBUTING FACTORS FOR MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS NOT TO USE PEP****Table E.1****Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	40	95.2
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	2	4.8
	Total	42	100.0

**Table E.2****Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.442	.442	15

**Table E.3****Item Statistics**

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
D1	2.13	.939	40
D2	1.98	.800	40
D3	2.88	.939	40
D4A	2.53	.960	40
D4B	2.63	1.102	40
D5	1.53	.905	40
D6	3.43	.931	40
D7	3.43	.844	40
D8	3.30	.791	40
D9	2.83	1.107	40
D10	3.05	1.061	40
D11	2.80	1.067	40
D12	3.35	.802	40
D13	3.05	.876	40
D14	3.30	.939	40

**Table E.4****Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	D1	D2	D3	D4A	D4B	D5	D6	D7	D8	D9	D10	D11	D12	D13	D14
D1	1.000	-.439	.251	.068	-.400	.222	.172	.222	.259	.145	.045	.256	-.196	-.008	.131
D2	-.439	1.000	-.038	-.083	.367	.054	-.295	-.098	-.352	-.092	-.210	-.547	-.146	.002	-.297
D3	.251	-.038	1.000	-.409	-.146	-.162	.326	.328	.224	.299	.187	.000	-.247	.008	.189
D4A	.068	-.083	-.409	1.000	.336	-.001	.060	-.093	-.044	-.346	-.102	-.045	.088	-.032	-.378
D4B	-.400	.367	-.146	.336	1.000	-.080	-.116	-.320	-.279	-.265	-.049	-.196	.152	-.193	-.334
D5	.222	.054	-.162	-.001	-.080	1.000	-.485	.103	.097	-.059	-.188	.191	.023	.225	-.069
D6	.172	-.295	.326	.060	-.116	-.485	1.000	.123	.519	.298	.134	.243	.242	-.121	.202
D7	.222	-.098	.328	-.093	-.320	.103	.123	1.000	.303	.246	.405	-.103	.002	.248	.320
D8	.259	-.352	.224	-.044	-.279	.097	.519	.303	1.000	.559	.134	.407	.154	-.022	.497
D9	.145	-.092	.299	-.346	-.265	-.059	.298	.246	.559	1.000	.270	.469	.215	.115	.520
D10	.045	-.210	.187	-.102	-.049	-.188	.134	.405	.134	.270	1.000	.009	.160	.411	.396
D11	.256	-.547	.000	-.045	-.196	.191	.243	-.103	.407	.469	.009	1.000	.353	-.044	.215
D12	-.196	-.146	-.247	.088	.152	.023	.242	.002	.154	.215	.160	.353	1.000	.084	.027
D13	-.008	.002	.008	-.032	-.193	.225	-.121	.248	-.022	.115	.411	-.044	.084	1.000	.000
D14	.131	-.297	.189	-.378	-.334	-.069	.202	.320	.497	.520	.396	.215	.027	.000	1.000

**Table E.5****Summary Item Statistics**

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	2.812	1.525	3.425	1.900	2.246	.327	15
Inter-Item Correlations	.050	-.547	.559	1.106	-1.024	.060	15



**Table E.6**

<b>Item-Total Statistics</b>					
	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
D1	40.05	20.510	.155	.525	.422
D2	40.20	25.292	-.400	.671	.536
D3	39.30	20.369	.172	.533	.418
D4A	39.65	23.567	-.191	.539	.509
D4B	39.55	24.767	-.298	.525	.549
D5	40.65	22.233	-.040	.699	.470
D6	38.75	19.526	.282	.703	.389
D7	38.75	19.372	.354	.466	.375
D8	38.88	18.266	.565	.699	.327
D9	39.35	16.746	.523	.707	.297
D10	39.13	18.471	.342	.512	.364
D11	39.38	19.112	.264	.690	.389
D12	38.83	20.507	.215	.453	.410
D13	39.13	20.728	.153	.394	.423
D14	38.88	19.138	.328	.547	.376

**Table E.7**

<b>Scale Statistics</b>			
Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
42.18	22.712	4.766	15