



BUSINESS SCHOOL
BESIGHEIDSKOOL
SEKOLO SA KGWEBO



SOLEMN DECLARATION - GROUP ASSIGNMENT

Solemn declaration by students

Module: **Strategic Talent Management**

Assignment No.: **Group Assignment**

Assignment due date: **22 September 2020**

We hereby declare that the assignment which we herewith submit to the North-West University as partial completion of the requirements set for the MBA degree, is our own work.

GROUP NAME: Sediba Group

DATE: 02 October 2020

Name	Student number	Signature	% contributed
Bernard Makgaka	32918585	Yes	100%
Liza Coetzee	22841202	Yes	100%
Marylene Maanda	29686415	Yes	100%

Table of Content

1. Executive summary and Introduction
2. Introduction
3. Background and problem statement
4. Research question
5. Research objectives
6. Literature review (theoretical-conceptual framework)
7. Research methodology
8. Research design
9. Data analysis
10. Managerial implications and recommendations
11. Conclusion
12. References list
13. Appendices

Commented [PB1]: Indicate page numbers

1. Executive summary and Introduction

Michael Armstrong defined performance management as “the continuous process of improving performance by setting individual and team goals which are aligned to the strategic goals of the ~~organization~~organisation, planning performance to achieve goals, reviewing and assessing progress, and developing the knowledge, skills, and abilities of people.”

Commented [PB2]: Date and page ?

Businesses exist to generate profit for the shareholders. Shareholders appoint a board to play an oversight role over management. The board is responsible for appointing the management and ensuring that it is held accountable. On an annual basis, businesses normally take a few days for a strategy session. The strategy session is based on the targets set by the board on the management. The management uses the strategy session to determine ways of achieving business objectives and also ways of measuring the success of the business.

Each employed individual has a contribution to make towards the attainment of business objectives. A performance management system is important for businesses to ensure that employees are measured fairly and the indicators are linked to overall business strategy. The attainment of business objectives is normally associated with incentives, so the performance management system needs to be fair and not be based on subjective factors.

From experience, performance appraisal discussions with employees are sometimes perceived as a tool used by managers to deal with employees who might be problematic at work. Performance management is seen as being subjective.

Performance management tools must never be static. They must be revised regularly to align with business objectives and global trends. There is also research work that is done on this field regularly which can enhance the tools used. Reducing performance management to only the review/appraisal process undermines the potential of performance management.

Performance management discussions have also compelled businesses to ask

questions about the type of managers that are employed. Managers need to act as mentors to their team. A mentorship relationship requires regular feedback from the parties in the relationship, so this can assist employees to focus on the set objectives. Mentorship is more proactive as there is regular feedback and corrective measures can be implemented regularly unlike the annual appraisal. Regular performance discussions also help with effective employee development. Based on the performance discussions, managers are well equipped to develop programs that are linked to performance shortcomings identified during performance discussions.

2. Background and problem statement

Perception is defined by [the](#) Cambridge Dictionary as “a belief or opinion, often held by many people and based on how things seem”. Perception is not a confirmed fact or reality but it can influence how people look at things. Performance management must be seen to be effective by employees. Employees need to see performance management resulting in the identification of areas that require intervention. This research will test the effectiveness of performance management according to the sample.

We were unable to confine this research to one entity as a result of challenges with approvals from entity managers. Given the diversity of views from the survey respondents, this research will give an idea of how employees perceive the performance management systems implemented in their workplaces and also flag areas that employers must consider improving on.

Commented [PB3]: What is the problem statement

3. Research question

The research questions were:

- What is the employees' perceived accuracy of the performance management system?
- What is employees' perceived fairness of the performance management system?
- What are the employees' perceptions of the performance management behaviour of their line managers/supervisors?

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 12 pt, Bold, Expanded by 0,05 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0,63 cm + Indent at: 1,27 cm

How employees perceive the effectiveness of a performance management system

4. Research objectives

The research objectives were to measure employees:

- perceived accuracy of the performance management system
- perceived fairness of the performance management system
- perceptions of the performance management behaviour of their line managers/supervisors

This research will assist businesses to gain insight into how employees feel about performance management processes. This will serve as a good basis for management to improve on the areas of weakness identified.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0,63 cm + Indent at: 1,27 cm

5. Literature review (theoretical-conceptual framework)

In the late 1980s performance management was established as a response to the negative aspects of management and merit rating objectives (Armstrong, 2009:10). Strieska and Spickova (2012:2) state that performance management's strength has to be considered as a continuous process of past and future performance systems. Biron *et al.*, (2011:1294) argue that the effectiveness of performance management systems has not yet been ~~theorized-theorised~~ in the literature and thus it creates the need for further investigation.

Performance management has received a preference for appraisals in reach studies (DeNise & Smith, 2014:132). PMS is defined as comprising of four primary stages: firstly, performance planning, secondly, feedback and coaching, thirdly review, and fourthly the outcome (Berntal,1996:25). Rantanen *et al.* (2007:425) suggested that PMS was established as a means through which strategic management functions could be supported within large ~~organizations~~organisations. PMS comprises of a wide variety of activities, with appraisal being a focal point (DeNisi, 2000:124).

Furthermore, Armstrong (2009:1) stated the PMS is a system that consists of interlinking elements designed for high-performance achievements. The system

involves the following process, planning, goal setting, monitoring, feedback, performance assessment, reviewing, coaching, and dealing with under-performance (Armstrong,2009:1).

Slavić *et al*, (2013:55) argue that performance measurement is viewed as a quantifying process, in other words, a process that measures the efficiency and effectiveness of the performed activity. Furthermore, it is also seen as the comparison of the results against expectations that have been agreed on, to guide, motivate, and improvement towards a decision- making (Modipane *et al.*,2019:2).

Demartini (2014:55) defined performance management as a set of mechanisms. The mechanisms are a formal and an informal processes, including systems and networks which ~~organizations~~ organisations make use of to communicate significant objectives and goals which management needs to assist the strategic process and ongoing management of analysis, control, measurement, planning, reward, and management of performance. An appraisal is an event ~~authorized~~ authorised by management which is conducted once or twice a year. This usually involves the assignment of quantitative scores in which the employee's performance is measured (Clause & Briscoe,2009:176). The two terms, performance management, and an appraisal are frequently used interchangeably; nevertheless, the following definitions suggest that appraisal is a significant element of PMS (Biron *et al.*,2011:1296). Performance management is a more evolved version of appraisal (Bretz *et al.*,1992:332). The approach to use to explore PMSE comprises the understanding of employee's perception with a focus on appraisals (Swede & Sowa, 2011:259).

According to Thomas and Lazarova (2014:165), part of the goal of PMS has evaluative and developmental components. Performance management is the strategic initiatives and management development implemented (Hanes & St-Oge, 2012:1175). Also, it is important to note that if PMS is poorly implemented, it may result in employee burnout, job dissatisfaction, increased turnover, and damaged relationships (Smither & London,2009:47).

Fried and Slowik (2004) stated that goal-setting theory suggests that the expectation, instrumentation, and valency of outcomes will be high if the goals are challenging, detailed, and attainable. Goal effects are qualified through the confidence in one's

abilities, commitment to goals, the complexity of tasks, feedback on performance, and consistent and timely feedback (Latham,2016:27).

The PMS is a cycle which consists of various steps that begin with a clarification of expectations. The steps are as follows:- firstly it must be ensured that employees clearly understand what the objective involves and what requirements are needed for the measurement of the objective. Secondly, facilitation of performance, monitoring of performance, providing feedback, coaching, and support. Finally, this results in the acknowledgment of good performance (Modipane *et al.*,2019:2). The process begins when the employee's goals are in line with the ~~organizational~~ organisational goals, the key result areas identified as the core competency and improvements, in agreement with supervisor's actions required to accomplish the objectives, inclusive of the layout of a personal development plan (Rowley & Jackson,2011:21). Performance reviews are significant to the process, in conjunction with the discussions to past and future performance plans between both the employee and the manager (Kirkpatrick,2006:11).

A significant part of the ongoing process of performance management remains the improvement element (Armstrong,2006:20).

Recognition and reward follows and is defined as the methodical process used to connect performance targets with rewards. This is done through, for example, commission, merit pay, or incentive pay bonus (Rowley & Jackson,2011:22).

According to Amos *et al.*, (2012) high performance of employees is rewarded, equally, poor performers should, in turn, be corrected. The specific private sector performance management cycle covers 12 months, starting 01 March and ending 30 April, the five stages applied are performance planning, followed by secondly performance review, performance assessment and appraisals, developing performance, reward, and finally recognition.

The effectiveness constructs of PMS measurements are done with two factors, namely accuracy, and fairness (Modipane *et al.*,2019:3). Effectiveness is defined as the measurement of the success of the system to reach goals. Furthermore, research stated that there is a difference between effectiveness and effectiveness (Vlăsceanu *et al.*,2007: cited by Modipane *et al.*,2019:3). The remaining is measured with the ability to achieve the specified objective with the minimum waste of assets or

materials. The perception in the PMS by employee's effectiveness is measured by placing focus on the fairness and accuracy within PMS context (Luthra & Jain, 2012: cited by Modipane *et al.*, 2019:3). Sharma *et al.* (2016:238) suggested that employee acceptance is a significant factor in the system of performance management. The indication of PMS level of accuracy of the PMS correctness which should portray the alignment of the employees with the ~~organization's-organisation's~~ goals. Furthermore, standards, skills, goal clarity, and behaviors are expected to be aligned with business needs and goals at various levels. To ensure PMS outcomes are met, performance evaluation is measured against the planned standard, evaluated correctly through employee development facilitation and regular feedback (2016:238). The appraisal accuracy process suggests the information concerning the feedback of the process is trustworthy, and a true reflection of the level of the candidate's performance, the feedback is thus considered as fair as it is true and accurate (Roberson & Stewart, 2006:294). The accuracy of employees is defined as the perception of the employee with regards to the employer's use of accurate information during the implementation of the PMS rules, taken into account being the correctness, thoroughness, and relevance of the information (Son & Park, 2016:310). According to Tsai and Wang (2013: cited by Modipane *et al.*, 2019:3), there is an influence on the employee's performance and behavior based on the perceived appraisal accuracy, in effect, this influences the ~~organization's-organisation's~~ performance. Narcisse- and Harcourt, (2008:1153), argued employees should be informed with regards to the performance standards, revised should it be required. Nevertheless, the concerns raised were that the objectives and performance standards were not made clear before the evaluation. Also, the supervisors assume that their job description informs the employee of the ~~organization's-organisation's~~ expectations. If employees are involved in the PMS design, this will assist in the perception of control over the system, as a result, employees perceived appraisal accuracy will be better cultivated Tsai and Wang (2013: cited by Modipane *et al.*, 2019:3).

Feedback and coaching accuracy level at which the employee decides if the feedback and coaching phase of PMS is in the alignment of the employee's planned and delivered performance through feedback and coaching (Sharma *et al.*, 2016:231). When supervisors resetting standards, the monitoring of the employee's performance should be continuing, with constructive feedback during the period of appraisal

(Narcisse & Harcourt, 2008:1154). The critical aspects which should receive focus are feedback and coaching accuracy. The manager's role should be to mentor rather than judge. Furthermore, emphasis should be on identifying performance gaps, planning, and potential employee growth and direction (Mathis & Jackson, 2011:126). It has been reported that most employees have a strong need for knowing how well they are performing, therefore highlighting the significance of continuous feedback. It is of great importance that there should be little surprises during an employee performance review Mathis and Jackson (2011:126). Performance problems should be handled by managers daily and not be left to linger for long periods, it is not wise too only be addressed them during the performance appraisal interview (Ibeogu & Oztüren, 2015:964).

Performance review accuracy was defined by Sharma et al.,(2016:231) as the level to which the employee perceives the measurement of the alignment of the planned performance through the employee's performance against goals assessment, namely behavior, and skills, during the PMS annual performance review phase. Employees must be assessed by their supervisors against a set of performance standards. It has been further suggested that employees should be presented with the opportunity to complete appraisal before it is discussed with the supervisor. Should the development gaps be identified, the appropriate action for performance improvement should be identified by the supervisor (Narcisse & Harcourt, 2008:1154).

Research shows that organizations-organisations that provide clear and adequate information, accompanied by regular face to face communication with concerning changes, results in a happier employees who feel that PMs is fair in comparison to when they are not being provided with information (Tsai and Wang, 2013:2197). Improved interactions between employees and managers are the results of frequent appraisals, which contributes to employee's positive interactional fairness Selvarajan and Cloninger (2012:3065). Well-timed appraised is perceived by the employee as following appropriate procedures for providing feedback, in contradiction to late feedback will be perceived as an unfair procedure (Selvarajan & Cloninger, 2012:3065).

Outcomes accuracy is defined as the level of PMS's outcomes phase ensures that employees perceive the performance-based rating, reward, and or recognition, and

compensation is aligned with the annual performance review of the employee Sharma et al. (2016:227). There is a connection found between the reward system and the result of the PMS, the result being the performance appraisal system to be perceived as effective Lawler (2003:399). Baird et al. (2012), stated the similar as with his findings as he proposes that employees perceive the connection between performance and rewards, are most likely a contributing factor towards the achievement of the ~~organizational-organisational~~ objectives and goals.

Fairness is not necessarily a comprehensive version of the work outputs of employees. More accurately, it is a common feeling where a mutual feeling of equally treated and explanation of decisions and allocation of rewards. Fairness is found that it has a greater influence on employees who have a great interest in their jobs, and in comparison, to those less devoted workers (Collins & Mossholder, 2017:295). Empirical confirmation was provided by Colquitt (2001:386), justice may be seen as comprising of four districts, highly connected factors, namely, outcomes fairness(interpersonal and distributive treatment or equality), the fairness of procedures(procedural), interpersonal and explanation fairness (informational). Measured against the ~~organizational-organisational~~ justice theory, fairness can be further understood as the manner how people are treated as an influence on their judgment of fairness (Lau & Martin-Sardesai, 2012:161). It can further be said that the fair treatment of employees is more likely to foster loyalty Rowland and Hall (2012:282).

Priesemuth *et al.*, (2013:243) suggested that employees who are treated unfairly, are most likely to respond angrily, be resentful and vengeful. Knoll and Gill (2011:326) stated that the faith of the employees in fairness is determined by the appraisal. Therefore, this article will focus on four main components of ~~organizational-organisational~~ justice: procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational justice.

Cho and Sai (2012:231) define procedural justice as the legal process of decision making, where fair results are concluded. Kerwin et al., (2015:389) stated that procedural justice is determined by judgments that are fair in the decision-making process, including policies and procedures within the ~~organizationorganisation~~. It was found by (Lau & Martin- Sardesai, 2012:158) that procedural justice affects job satisfaction.

Distributive justice is a concept based on Adams's (1963:422) equity theory. The recommendation was that consistent resource allocation amongst employees should be a non-negotiable based on the contribution ratio of each employee. Adams (1963:422), perceived rewards allocation is justified when it is aligned with the inputs and comparisons of performance comparisons and inputs with the social field of rewards with referents that are relevant. If an employee takes its job inputs and compares it to those of others, this is the perception that is formed of being treated unjustly or fairly (Kim & Andrew, 2013:202).

In the performance appraisal context, this dimension relates to the employee's perceived fairness of performance rating received (Selvarajan & Cloninger, 2012:3065). Distributive justice is based on employee judgments regarding the fairness of outcomes and the levels of the distributed resources amongst parties (Caza *et al.*, 2011:539). Furthermore, it is based on the deciding perception of the fairness of the outcome experienced (Kerwin *et al.*, 2015:389).

Interpersonal justice is reinforced when the employees are treated with respect and dignity, with no improper remarks or comments made during the implementation of procedures (Colquitt *et al.*, 2001:386). It can be concluded that interpersonal justice indicates the way decision-makers in the origination treat employees with courtesy, respect, and dignity (Kerwin *et al.*, 2015:389). If the employee's performance is lower than expected performance, the employee's attitude varies towards the performance appraisal as it is dependable on the interpersonal treatment received from the later (Tsai & Wang, 2013:2198).

Informational justice is the turning point, to what extent explanation is needed on the outcomes distribution and the ways which were used to conclude such decisions from that outcome (Kerwin *et al.*, 2015: 389). The extent of how the virtual communities show engagement in sharing knowledge to justify the set procedures (Ellis *et al.*, 2009: 138). Furthermore, this relates to the quality of communication exchanged between employees and supervisors (Suliman & Kathairi, 2012:110). Employees who are more involved in the physical, behavioural, and cognitive levels are those who have a positive perception of information justice. They display a greater motivation and commitment to their overall job, have pride in what they do, have a feeling of

excitement, and often would go the extra mile to do their jobs well (Gupta & Kumar, 2012:63).

6. Research methodology

Research method or design is a plan or a framework for data collection, presenting that data and ~~analyzing-analysing~~ it to produce findings, (Schoonenboom & Johnson, 2017). This study will adopt a quantitative approach. The Quantitative approach makes use of numerical data which are statistically ~~analyzedanalysed~~. The quantitative method is particularly suitable for large and wide-scale assessments or surveys. One of the most important strengths of quantitative research is that the study is self-regulating, that is, the method is independent of the researcher's involvement and the procedures can be replicated such that the same results can be obtained no-matter who does the study. Quantitative studies are especially suitable for measuring trends, and since this study intends to establish trends in counterproductive work behavior as well as turnover intentions patterns, the approach is, therefore, appropriate for this research. The results from the quantitative studies can be ~~generalized-generalised~~ to the general population

7. Research design

In general, a research design is a systematic and detailed plan about how the study will be carried out from the inception to completion. The components of the research will include such processes as identification of the problem, sample selection, data collection, data presentation, and interpretation, (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2014). The study will use a cross-section correlation research design to gather the numerical data to be used.

Cross-section correlation research design is ~~characterized-characterised~~ by data collection at a point in time, (Ramona & Danielson, 2012). The design is suitable for this study because it is relevant in assessing the perceived effectiveness of the performance system as well as invalidating other studies. This method is relatively faster, cheaper, and easier to perform and data can only be collected once for the different variables. It also allows any person to ~~analyze-analyse~~ the collected data to conclude, (Gaille, 2018) and validate the findings

8. Sample

The sample denotes the selection of individual participants on which data will be gathered, (Singh & Masuku, 2014). Sampling is necessary as it is not feasible to study whole populations. Sampling allows for the selection of a representative portion of the population to be studied while allowing the findings to be ~~generalizable-generalisable~~ to the greater population, (Umar & Madugu, 2015)

In this case, the population referred to all non-managerial levels of employees. A sample of the participant was selected from working individuals which consisted of males and females from the age of twenty to over sixty years old working across different business sectors. The target sample size was thirty based on the requirement of the assignment.

The study will use a convenience sampling approach in which the participants, as Dörnyei

2007 (as cited in Etikan, Musa, Rukayya & Alkassim, 2016), suggested will be chosen if they meet certain practical conditions like physical closeness, readiness, willingness, and ease of access. This study is to be carried out in three different departments ranges from the department of at one correctional facility mining ---- and the physical closeness and availability/readiness will be met. Correctional staff work in shifts and the use of a convenience sampling approach will come in handy as the questionnaire will be administered to those available and willing to participate will be selected.

For confidentiality participant were not required to provide any identity which could link them to the survey.

9. Data analysis

Introduction

This section gives an analysis of the data collected to examine the employee's perceived effectiveness of the performance management system (PMS). The study was based on a sample of 30 respondents who hold non-managerial positions.

Demographic Analysis

Fifty-three percent of the sample were females while forty-seven comprised of males, with the age groups ranging from 20 years to 49 years of age. This question was placed as a closed-ended question, with selections ending at a maximum age of 49 posing a limitation of the selection of ages by the respondents. One in every two respondents was a government employee or working for a parastatal.

Perceived Accuracy of the PMS system

Turning on to the accuracy of the PMS system, a mode of 10 (33% of the respondents) was observed denoting that the employees moderately agreed that the PMS system is accurate in their ~~organization~~organisation. Furthermore, 70% of the respondents either slightly agreed, moderately agreed, or strongly agreed that the PMS system is accurate in their ~~organization~~organisation. While testing for performance planning accuracy, the table below indicates the different medians obtained for different questions

Question	Median
Performance plan based on PMS gives a clear idea of what is expected of me to meet departmental goals	6.3
Performance plan helps me gain focus	6.7
My manager and I update my goals as the department's goals change	5.8

Based on the median values, a conclusion can be derived that more than 50% of the respondents, either moderately agreed or strongly agreed that a performance plan based on PMS helps in giving a clear idea of what one is expected to achieve in their respective departments while assisting them in gaining focus. The system also acts as a stimulus to managers to update their subordinates on changes within the departments.

Perceived fairness of the performance management system survey

To measure the fairness of the PMS system, different measurement matrices such as procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice have been designed. Under procedural justice, a mean of 3.8 has been derived. This translates that the respondents, to a great extent, collaborated that the procedures followed have been fair, consistent, and upheld ethical and moral standards. The PMS

systems are based on accurate information and appeals against the system are accommodated. On the other hand, the PMS helps distribute work fairly among the employees while the system is justified. This is proven by the mean value of 3.9 obtained from the data.

Perceived performance management behavior of supervisor/line manager

Supervisors or line managers are low-level managers who carry out day to day decisions in an ~~organization~~organisation. They carry the burden of carrying their daily tasks in line with ~~organizational~~organisational goals. However, they must be good in communication as well as coaching skills to form up teams that work towards the common goal.

In terms of achieving the set goals, the data proves that often, the line managers participate in setting goals as given by the mode value of 11 under fairly often. Indicating that most of the respondents agree that line managers participate in setting goals. A median of 3.6 was also derived, denoting effective communication skills since their supervisors are good listeners and provide feedback positively while they are approachable.

10. Managerial implications and recommendations

- Managers need to play a mentor role in their teams.
- Managers need to provide regular feedback on performance-related matters to their teams.
- The performance management system must be fair and not perceived as being subjective.
- Performance management indicators must be clearly defined at the beginning of a performance period.
- The trust relationship between management and their teams requires attention as it has the potential to create a toxic working relationship

11. Conclusion

While evaluating the employees' perceived effectiveness of the performance management system, it can be concluded that the employees perceive the PMS system as the best matrix that improves the performance of ~~organizational~~ organisational processes. Data collected proved that the PMS system helps the ~~organization~~ organisation gain focus towards a common goal while motivating employees to work in teams towards a common goal.

12. References list

- Adams, J. S. 1963. Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422.
- Amos, T. L., Ristow, A., Ristow, L., & Pearse, N. J. (2012). *Human resource management* (3rd edn.). Cape Town: Juta and Co Ltd.
- Armstrong, M., 2006. *A handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Armstrong, M., 2009. *Armstrong's handbook of performance management: An evidence-based guide to delivering high performance*. Kogan Page Publishers. pp.10
- Bernthal, P.R. 1996, "Comparing performance management practices in the United States and Pacific Rim", in Prasad, B.S. (Ed.), *Advances in International Comparative Management*, Vol. 11, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 1-30.
- Biron, M., Farndale, E. and Paauwe, J. 2011, "Performance management effectiveness: lessons from world-leading firms", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 22 No. 6, pp. 1294-1311.
- Biron, M., Farndale, E. and Paauwe, J., 2011. Performance management effectiveness: lessons from world-leading firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(06), pp.1294-1311.
- Bretz, R.D., Milkovich, G.T. and Read, W. 1992, "The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: concerns, directions, and implications", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 321-352.

Caza, A., Caza, B. B., and Lind, E. A. 2011. The missed promotion: An exercise demonstrating the importance of ~~organizational~~organisational justice. *Journal of Management Education*, 35(4), pp.537–563.

Chandak, A.Chandak, S.and Dalpati.(2019)The impact of supply chain strategy and supply chain performance :A study of the Indian context

Cho, Y. J., and Sai, N. 2012. Does ~~organizational~~organisational justice matter in the federal workplace? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 33(3), pp. 227–251.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2014). Questionnaire-data collection-General advise-LeTS Evaluation Resources-Resources-Strategy and Development- LeTS University of Sheffield. DOI nr: <https://doi.org/10.35683/jcm19094.53>

Colquitt, J. A. 2001. On the dimensionality of ~~organizational~~organisational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), pp.386.

Colquitt, J. A. 2001. On the dimensionality of ~~organizational~~organisational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), pp.386.

Demartini, C., 2014. Performance management systems. *Contributions to Management Science*, © Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

DeNisi, A. and Smith, C.E. 2014, “Performance appraisal, performance management, and firm-level performance: a review, a proposed model, and new directions for future research”, *The Academy of Management Annals* , Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 127-179.

DeNisi, A.S. 2000, “Performance appraisal and performance management: a multilevel analysis”, in Klein, K.J. and Kozlowski, S. (Eds), *Multilevel Theory, Research and Methods in ~~Organizations~~Organisations*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 121-156.

Ellis, K. M., Reus, T. H., and Lamont, B. T. 2009. The effects of procedural and informational justice in the integration of related acquisitions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(2), pp.137–161.

Etikan, I., Abubakar, S. & Rukayya, S.A. (2015). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of Theoretical and applied Statistics*. Vol. 5, No. 1, 2016, pp. 1-4. <http://doi.10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>

Fried, Y. and Slowik, L.H., 2004. Enriching goal-setting theory with time: An integrated approach. *Academy of management Review*, 29(3), pp.404-422.

Gaille, B. (2018). 15 Cross Sectional Study Advantages and Disadvantages Retrieved May, 18, 2020 from <https://brandongaille.com/15-cross-sectional-study-advantages-and-disadvantages/>

Gupta, V., and Kumar, S. 2012. Impact of performance appraisal justice on employee engagement: A study of Indian professionals. *Employee Relations*, 35(1), pp.61–78.

Haines III, V.Y. and St-Onge, S., 2012. Performance management effectiveness: practices or context?. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(6), pp.1158-1175.

Ibeogu, P. H., and Ozturen, A. 2015. Perception of justice in performance appraisal and effect on satisfaction: Empirical findings from Northern Cyprus Banks. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, pp.964–969.

Kerwin, S., Jordan, J. S., and Turner, B. A. 2015. ~~Organizational~~~~Organisational~~ justice and conflict: Do perceptions of fairness influence disagreement? *Sport Management Review*, 18(3), pp 384–395.

Kerwin, S., Jordan, J. S., and Turner, B. A. 2015. ~~Organizational~~~~Organisational~~ justice and conflict: Do perceptions of fairness influence disagreement? *Sport Management Review*, 18(3), pp.384–395.

Kim, S., & Andrew, D. P. 2013. ~~Organizational~~~~Organisational~~ justice in intercollegiate athletics: Perceptions of coaches. *Sport Management Review*, 16(2), pp.200–210.

Kirkpatrick, D.L., 2006. *Improving employee performance through appraisal and coaching*. Amacom Books.

Knoll, D. L., & Gill, H. 2011. Antecedents of trust in supervisors, subordinates, and peers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(4), pp.313–330.

Lau, C. M., & Martin-Sardesai, A. V. 2012. The role of organisational concern for workplace fairness in the choice of a performance measurement system. *The British Accounting Review*, 44(3), pp. 157–172.

Lawler, E. E. 2003. Reward practices and performance management system effectiveness. *Organizational Dynamics*, 32(4), pp.396–404.

Luthra, P. and Jain, M., 2012. India's performance management problem. *Gallup Business Journal*.

Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2011). *Human resource management*. Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning. pp126.

Modipane, P.I., Botha, P.A. and Blom, T., 2019. Employees' perceived effectiveness of the performance management system at a North-West provincial government department. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17, pp.3-12.

Priesemuth, M., Arnaud, A., and Schminke, M. 2013. Bad behavior in groups the impact of overall justice climate and functional dependence on counterproductive work behavior in work units. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(2), pp.230–257.

Ramona, D. & Danielson, S. (2012). Data collection methods. Retrieved May, 11, 2020 from

<http://people.uwec.edu/pierch/researchmethods/data%20collection%20methods/data%20collection%20methods.htm>

Rantanen, H., Kulmala, H.I., Lönnqvist, A. and Kujansivu, P., 2007. Performance measurement systems in the Finnish public sector. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*.pp. 415-433

Roberson, Q.M. and Stewart, M.M., 2006. Understanding the motivational effects of procedural and informational justice in feedback processes. *British journal of Psychology*, 97(3), pp.281-298.

Rowland, C. A., and Hall, R. D. 2012. ~~Organizational~~~~Organisational~~ justice and performance: Is appraisal fair? *EuroMed Journal of Business*, 7(3), pp.280–293.

Rowley, C., and Jackson, K., 2011. Introduction: HRM in context. In C. Rowley & K. Jackson (Eds.). *Human resource management: The key concepts* (pp. 19–27). New York: Routledge.

Schoonenboom, R. & Johnson, B.R. (2017). How to construct a mixed methods research design. *Köln Z Soziol*, (Suppl 2) 69:107–131 <http://doi.10.1007/s11577-017-0454-1>

Sharma, N.P., Sharma, T., & Agarwal, M.N (2016). Measuring employee perception of performance management system effectiveness: ~~conceptualization~~~~conceptualisation~~ and scale development. *Employee relations*, 38(2), 224–247 <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-01-2015-006>

Selden, S. and Sowa, J.E. 2011, “Performance management and appraisal in human service ~~organizations~~~~organisations~~: management and staff perspectives”, *Public Personnel Management* , Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 251–264.

Selvarajan, T. T., and Cloninger, P. A. 2012. Can performance appraisals motivate employees to improve performance? A Mexican study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(15), pp.3063–3084.

Sharma, N. P., Sharma, T., & Agarwal, M. N. 2016. Measuring employee perception of performance management system effectiveness: ~~Conceptualization~~~~Conceptualisation~~ and scale development. *Employee Relations*, 38(2), pp.224–247.

Singh, A.S. & Masuku, M. (2014). Sampling technique & determination of sample size in applied statistics research: an overview. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management* Vol. II, Issue 11. Retrieved March, 12, 2020 from <http://ijecm.co.uk/>

Slavić, A., Berber, N. and Leković, B., 2014. Performance management in international human resource management. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 9(1), pp.45-58.

Smither, J.W. and London, M. eds., 2009. *Performance management: Putting research into action* (Vol. 21). John Wiley & Sons.

Son, J.Y. and Park, J., 2016. Procedural justice to enhance compliance with non-work-related computing (NWRC) rules: Its determinants and interaction with privacy concerns. *International Journal of Information Management*, 36(3), pp.309-321.

Suliman, A., and Al Kathairi, M. 2012. ~~Organizational~~Organisational justice, commitment and performance in developing countries: The case of the UAE. *Employee Relations*, 35(1), pp.98–115.

Thomas, D.C. and Lazarova, M.B., 2013. *Essentials of international human resource management: Managing people globally*. Sage Publications.

Tsai, C. J., and Wang, W. L. 2013. Exploring the factors associated with employees' perceived appraisal accuracy: A study of Chinese state-owned enterprises. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(11), pp.2197–2220.

APPENDICE A: QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Gender

Male	Female
1	2

2. Age group

20 – 29	1
30 – 39	2
40 – 49	3
50 – 59	4
60 and older	5

SECTION B: PERCEIVED ACCURACY OF THE PMS SURVEY

What is your perceived accuracy of the PMS in your organisation?

Instructions: Using the response scale below, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item. Make a cross in the appropriate box. Please answer all the questions honestly and accurately by making a cross in the appropriate box. If you make a mistake, just draw a line through the cross and make a new cross in the selected box.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	----------------	------------------	----------------

No.	Statements	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
Performance Planning Accuracy								
1	The performance plan based on PMS gives a clear idea of what is expected of me to meet departmental goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	The performance plan helps me focus my efforts through the identification of goals (and/or behaviours/skills) relevant to meet departmental goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	My manager and I update my goals as the department's goals change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Feedback and Coaching Accuracy								
4	The ongoing feedback during the performance cycle gives an accurate assessment of how I am performing against planned performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

[illegible]

No.	Statements	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
10	Performance review results in an accurate performance rating.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	My PMS outcomes (compensation, promotion, reward and/or recognition) are linked to my performance rating.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	My annual performance review is directly related to my PMS outcomes (compensation, promotion, reward and/or recognition).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SECTION C: PERCEIVED FAIRNESS OF THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SURVEY

What is your perceived fairness of the performance management system in your organisation?

Instructions: Using the response scale below, indicate your opinion on each item. Please answer all the questions honestly and accurately by making a cross in the appropriate box. If you make a mistake, just draw a line through the cross and make a new cross in the selected box.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent

Components of Organisational Justice Measurement Items		Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent
Procedural justice						
The following items refer to the performance management system used to arrive at your performance assessment. To what extent:						
1	Have you been able to express your views and feelings during the implementation of the performance management system?	1	2	3	4	5
2	Have you influenced the performance assessment arrived at by the performance management system?	1	2	3	4	5
3	Has the performance management system been applied consistently?	1	2	3	4	5
4	Has the performance management system been free of bias?	1	2	3	4	5
5	Has the performance management system been based on accurate information?	1	2	3	4	5
6	Have you been able to appeal against the performance assessment arrived at by the performance management system?	1	2	3	4	5
7	Has the performance management system upheld ethical and moral standards?	1	2	3	4	5
Distributive justice						
The following items refer to your performance assessment. To what extent:						
8	Does your performance assessment reflect the effort you have put into your work?	1	2	3	4	5
9	Is your performance assessment appropriate for the work you have completed?	1	2	3	4	5

Components of Organisational Justice Measurement Items		Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent
10	Does your performance assessment reflect what you have contributed to the department?	1	2	3	4	5
11	Is your performance assessment justified, given your performance?	1	2	3	4	5
Interpersonal justice						
The following items refer to the interpersonal behaviour of the line manager/supervisor who implements the performance management system. To what extent:						
12	Has he/she politely treated you?	1	2	3	4	5
13	Has he/she treated you with dignity?	1	2	3	4	5
14	Has he/she treated you with respect?	1	2	3	4	5
15	Has he/she refrained from improper remarks or comments?	1	2	3	4	5
Informational justice						
The following items refer to the line manager/supervisor who implements the performance management system. To what extent:						
16	Has he/she been candid in his/her communications with you?	1	2	3	4	5
17	Has he/she explained the performance management system thoroughly?	1	2	3	4	5
18	Were his/her explanations regarding the performance management system reasonable?	1	2	3	4	5

Components of Organisational Justice Measurement Items		Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent
19	Has he/she communicated details of the performance management system promptly?	1	2	3	4	5
20	Has he/she seemed to tailor his/her communications to individuals' specific needs?	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION D: PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOUR SUPERVISOR/LINE MANAGER SURVEY

What is your perceived performance management behaviour of your supervisor or line manager?

After reading each statement, please rate the person you are evaluating in terms of how frequently your manager or supervisor engages in performance management behaviour. Indicate your answer by selecting the description that best represents your observation and or experience. The descriptions range from rarely/never, once in a while, sometimes, fairly often, and very frequently/always. There are no right or wrong answers. The correct answer is the answer that expresses your honest observation or experience. Please make a circle or cross in your answer.

Statements		Rarely/never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Very frequently/always
Process of goal setting						
1.	Ensures that performance goals are linked to the strategic or operational goals of the department	1	2	3	4	5

Statements		Rarely/never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Very frequently/always
2.	Participatively sets goals	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Assists others in setting specific and measurable performance objectives	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Assists others in developing action plans that support performance goals	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Encourages others to set challenging yet attainable goals	1	2	3	4	5
Communication						
6.	Has a communication style that causes others to become defensive*	5	4	3	2	1
7.	Is a good listener	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Is approachable and available to talk with others	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Provides more positive than negative feedback	1	2	3	4	5
Feedback						
10.	Give others timely feedback about their performance	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Give others specific feedback about what is good and bad about performance	1	2	3	4	5

Statements		Rarely/never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Very frequently/always
12.	Assists others in their career planning	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Gives honest feedback	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Explain how someone's behaviour affects him/her and the workgroup when providing feedback	1	2	3	4	5
Coaching						
15.	Shows other to complete difficult assignments and tasks	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Provides the resources needed to get the job done	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Helps identify solutions to overcome performance roadblocks	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Helps people to develop their skills	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Provides direction when it is needed	1	2	3	4	5
Providing consequences						
20.	Gives special recognition for exceptional performance	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Rewards good performance	1	2	3	4	5

Statements		Rarely/never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Very frequently/always
22.	Links recognition and/or rewards to performance	1	2	3	4	5
Establishing/monitoring performance expectations						
23.	Checks work for accuracy and/or quality	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Keeps people informed about changes, deadlines, or problems	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Communicates expectations relating to quality	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Monitors his/her own work performance	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Prioritises tasks and goals	1	2	3	4	5

* Items reverse-scored

Group name: Sediba						
		Contribution				
1. Title page, table of content, executive summary and introduction		6 /10 10%				
		Poor	Below average	Average	Good	Excellent
• Is the title page correct and the title a good representation of the content?					x	
• Is the table of content correct?			x			
• Does the executive summary appropriately demarcate the assignment?				x		
• Does the introduction give a clear and sequential indication of the structure of the assignment?					x	
Additional examiner comments:						
2. Problem statement, objectives and research questions		4/15 15%				
		Poor	Below average	Average	Good	Excellent
• Is the problem statement clearly formulated?		x				
• Are the objectives specified, sufficient and attainable?			x			
• Are the research questions clearly stated?			x			
• Is the research problem contextualised through literature?						
Additional examiner comments:						
3. Literature analysis/handling of sources		13/20 20%				

	Poor	Below average	Average	Good	Excellent
• Does the work provide sufficient evidence of knowledge of the relevant and recent research?				x	
• Has said knowledge been applied in a critical and integrated manner?			x		
• Have central concepts been sufficiently defined?				x	
• Has the assignment been placed within a fundamental theoretical-conceptual framework?				x	
• Independent (own) thought is reflected; Insight into the topic was demonstrated and logical, systematic thought and reasoning is demonstrated			x		
Additional examiner comments:					
4. Research methodology and design	12/15 15%				
	Poor	Below average	Average	Good	Excellent
• Are the research methodology and design clearly explained				x	
• Is the research design or method(s) appropriate to answer the research question(s)?				x	
• Has the group mastered the applicable research methodology?				x	
• Has the method been sufficiently conceptualised concerning research design, population, sample, measuring instruments/methods of measurement concerning the collection of data and/or the statistical analysis?				x	
Additional examiner comments:					

5. Presentation of results , discussion, implications and conclusion		11/20 20%				
		Poor	Below average	Average	Good	Excellent
• Are the results presented in graphs, tables or figures?			x			
• Is an acceptable solution to the research problem provided?			x			
• Are the results clearly linked to the research problem and objectives?				x		
• Are the results compared to the results of similar studies						
• Are the managerial implications and recommendations /generalisations logically justifiable?			x			
• Are the managerial recommendations from the actual findings of the research been made?				x		
• Is the conclusion synthesising the main findings or ideas?				x		
• Is the conclusion aligned with the introduction of the assignment?						
Additional examiner comments:						
6. Logical structure		6/10 10%				
		Poor	Below average	Average	Good	Excellent
• Is the assignment as a whole systematic, logical and well structured?				x		
• Were the arguments clearly unpacked from the problem statement to the conclusions?				x		
• What is the general quality rating of the assignment?				x		
Additional examiner comments:						
7. Documentation and technical finishing		5/10 10%				

	Poor	Below average	Average	Good	Excellent
Has the assignment been presented in an acceptable manner (e.g. references, tables and figures)?			x		
Is the stylistic and technical refinement in order?			x		
Has the assignment been written in an acceptable language, and is it technically well-edited?		x			
Additional examiner comments:					
General Remarks / Comments: Assignment					
The similarity index of 32% is too high. One source was directly copied with 10%					
- Plagiarism Report. Marks deducted for plagiarism infringements -10 (5 % - 20 % out of single source) -20 (21 % - 40 % out of single source) 0 (41 % - 60 % out of single source) - Disciplinary steps (anything higher than 60 %)					
Remarks / Comments: Plagiarism (If applicable) Subtracting: 10 Total mark: 47 /100 Disciplinary Action to be taken (If applicable) YES NO					
Prof PA Botha					
Mark awarded (out of 100%)	47%				